

## **ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION**

Redis Inc. v. Sunil Khatri

Case No. D2025-3595

### **1. The Parties**

Complainant is Redis Inc., United States of America (“United States”), represented by KXT Law, United States.

Respondent is Sunil Khatri, United States.

### **2. The Domain Name and Registrar**

The disputed domain name <redis.digital> is registered with NameCheap, Inc. (the “Registrar”).

### **3. Procedural History**

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the “Center”) on September 5, 2025. On September 5, 2025, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On September 8, 2025, the Registrar transmitted by email to the Center its verification response, disclosing registrant and contact information for the disputed domain name which differed from the named Respondent (Registration Private and Privacy service provided by Withheld for Privacy ehf) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to Complainant on September 8, 2025, providing the registrant and contact information disclosed by the Registrar, and inviting Complainant to submit an amendment to the Complaint. Complainant filed an amendment to the Complaint on September 13, 2025.

The Center verified that the Complaint, together with the amendment to the Complaint, satisfied the formal requirements of the Uniform Domain Name Dispute Resolution Policy (the “Policy” or “UDRP”), the Rules for Uniform Domain Name Dispute Resolution Policy (the “Rules”), and the WIPO Supplemental Rules for Uniform Domain Name Dispute Resolution Policy (the “Supplemental Rules”).

In accordance with the Rules, paragraphs 2 and 4, the Center formally notified Respondent of the Complaint, and the proceedings commenced on September 15, 2025. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was October 5, 2025. Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified Respondent’s default on October 6, 2025.

The Center appointed Jeffrey M. Samuels as the sole panelist in this matter on October 13, 2025. The Panel finds that it was properly constituted. The Panel has submitted the Statement of Acceptance and Declaration of Impartiality and Independence, as required by the Center to ensure compliance with the Rules, paragraph 7.

#### **4. Factual Background**

Complainant Redis Inc. is the wholly owned subsidiary of Redis Ltd. Redis Ltd. is the owner (via change of name) of United States Trademark Registration No. 5,894,148 for the REDIS trademark, issued on October 29, 2019. Redis Ltd. has also filed applications with the United States Patent and Trademark Office seeking registration for a stylized version of “REDIS” (Application Serial No. 98422051) and for a stylized letter “R” in the color “red” (Application Serial No. 99210875). Complainant claims that pursuant to the Redis Ltd. Trademark Policy, Complainant has the right to use and enforce the REDIS-related marks. Complainant has used the REDIS word mark since at least as early as February 2009, and the stylized “REDIS” and “R” since at least as early as April 2024.

The REDIS mark is used on various computer software products and database services. Complainant further asserts that it has offered these goods and services under the REDIS word mark on the websites “www.redis.com” and “www.redis.io” since at least as early as February 2009.

The disputed domain name was registered on March 11, 2025. The domain name’s landing page displays “Wearedis” and advertises software services that overlap with those offered by Complainant, and uses the red color throughout.

#### **5. Parties’ Contentions**

##### **A. Complainant**

Complainant contends that it has satisfied each of the elements required under the Policy for a transfer of the disputed domain name.

Notably, the Complainant contends that the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to the REDIS word mark because the domain name incorporates Complainant’s REDIS word mark in its entirety.

Complainant asserts that Respondent should be considered as having no rights or legitimate interests with respect to the disputed domain name. It alleges that Respondent registered the disputed domain name long after Complainant: (1) registered the REDIS word mark; (2) began using the REDIS word mark; (3) began using the <redis.com> and <redis.io> domain names; (4) began using the REDIS stylized mark; and (5) began using the “R” logo mark.

On information and belief, Complainant indicates that Respondent is not a licensee of Complainant nor otherwise authorized to use Complainant’s REDIS-related marks. Also on information and belief, Complainant maintains that Respondent is not and has not been commonly known as REDIS.

With respect to the issue of bad faith registration and use, Complainant contends that Respondent appears to have registered the disputed domain name, and is using the corresponding website, in an attempt to attract Internet users for commercial gain by creating a likelihood of confusion with Complainant’s marks. Complainant notes that the disputed domain name incorporates the REDIS word mark in its entirety; that the REDIS word mark is used throughout the disputed domain name’s landing page, including next to goods and services similar to those also offered by Complainant; that the landing page flashes the word “Hello,” followed by “Wearedis”; and that the landing page uses the red color throughout.

## **B. Respondent**

Respondent did not reply to Complainant's contentions.

## **6. Discussion and Findings**

### **A. Identical or Confusingly Similar**

It is well accepted that the first element functions primarily as a standing requirement. The standing (or threshold) test for confusing similarity involves a reasoned but relatively straightforward comparison between the Complainant's trademark and the disputed domain name. WIPO Overview of WIPO Panel Views on Selected UDRP Questions, Third Edition ("[WIPO Overview 3.0](#)"), section 1.7.

Complainant, as a wholly owned subsidiary of Redis Ltd., has shown rights in respect of a trademark or service mark for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), sections 1.2.1 and 1.4.

The entirety of the mark is reproduced within the disputed domain name. Accordingly, the disputed domain name is identical to the mark for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 1.7.

The Panel finds the first element of the Policy has been established.

### **B. Rights or Legitimate Interests**

Paragraph 4(c) of the Policy provides a list of circumstances in which the Respondent may demonstrate rights or legitimate interests in a disputed domain name.

Although the overall burden of proof in UDRP proceedings is on the complainant, panels have recognized that proving a respondent lacks rights or legitimate interests in a domain name may result in the difficult task of "proving a negative", requiring information that is often primarily within the knowledge or control of the respondent. As such, where a complainant makes out a *prima facie* case that the respondent lacks rights or legitimate interests, the burden of production on this element shifts to the respondent to come forward with relevant evidence demonstrating rights or legitimate interests in the domain name (although the burden of proof always remains on the complainant). If the respondent fails to come forward with such relevant evidence, the complainant is deemed to have satisfied the second element. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 2.1.

Having reviewed the available record, the Panel finds Complainant has established a *prima facie* case that Respondent lacks rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name. Respondent has not rebutted Complainant's *prima facie* showing and has not come forward with any relevant evidence demonstrating rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name such as those enumerated in the Policy or otherwise.

The Panel finds the second element of the Policy has been established.

### **C. Registered and Used in Bad Faith**

The Panel notes that, for the purposes of paragraph 4(a)(iii) of the Policy, paragraph 4(b) of the Policy establishes circumstances, in particular, but without limitation, that, if found by the Panel to be present, shall be evidence of the registration and use of a domain name in bad faith.

In the present case, for the reasons set forth by Complainant, the Panel finds that Respondent, by using the disputed domain name in connection with similar services as those offered by Complainant while using the REDIS mark throughout the landing page, including in the copyright notice, has intentionally attempted to attract, for commercial gain, Internet users to its website by creating a likelihood of confusion with

Complainant's mark as to the source, sponsorship, affiliation, or endorsement of such site and of the goods and services offered at such site, within the meaning of paragraph 4(b)(iv) of the Policy.

The Panel finds that Complainant has established the third element of the Policy.

## **7. Decision**

For the foregoing reasons, in accordance with paragraphs 4(i) of the Policy and 15 of the Rules, the Panel orders that the disputed domain name <redis.digital> be transferred to Complainant.

*/Jeffrey M. Samuels/*

**Jeffrey M. Samuels**

Sole Panelist

Date: October 27, 2025