

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

Kiniksa Pharmaceuticals International, plc v. Mugira James
Case No. D2025-3693

1. The Parties

The Complainant is Kiniksa Pharmaceuticals International, plc, United Kingdom, represented by Kiniksa Pharmaceuticals, United States of America ("US").

The Respondent is Mugira James, Uganda.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <kiniksacorp.com> is registered with eNom, LLC (the "Registrar").

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the "Center") on September 11, 2025. On September 11, 2025, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On September 12, 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 (Unknown) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on September 12, 2025, providing the registrant and contact information disclosed by the Registrar, and inviting the Complainant to submit an amendment to the Complaint. The Complainant filed an amended Complaint on September 12, 2025.

The Center verified that the Complaint together with the amended 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 the Respondent of the Complaint, and the proceedings commenced on September 17, 2025. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was October 7, 2025. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent's default on October 8, 2025.

The Center appointed Luis Miguel Beneyto Garcia-Reyes 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

The Complainant is a financial technology company and it is well known in the sectors including digital banking and electronic payments. The Complainant promotes its business including a user-centric digital platform accessible via its website “www.revolut.com”.

The Complainant is the owner of the following trademark registrations and applications protecting the term “kiniksa” as the only word element:

- US registrations n°5566176 KINIKA in class 5, registered on September 18, 2018
- US registration n°5566177 KINIKA in class 44, registered on September 18, 2018
- US registration n° 5566178 KINIKA in class 42, registered on September 18, 2018

The disputed domain name was registered on April 2, 2025. The website identified by the disputed domain name is currently inaccessible, but the Complainant has provided evidence showing that the disputed domain name has been used for engaging in conduct with the purpose of creating among the public the appearance of a sponsorship and/or affiliation between the website identified by the disputed domain name and the Complainant.

5. Parties' Contentions

A. Complainant

The 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 Complainant is a biopharmaceutical company which offers its products under the KINIKA trademark since at least 2017.

The Complainant owns, among others, US registrations n°5566176 KINIKA in class 5, US registration n°5566177 KINIKA in class 44 and 5566178 KINIKA in class 42, all of them registered on September 18, 2018.

The disputed domain name is confusingly similar to the Complainant's trademark as it incorporates KINIKA in its entirety and the term “corp” for the abbreviation of “corporation”.

The Respondent has never been licensed to register or use the mark KINIKA or the disputed domain name; the Respondent is not using the disputed domain name in connection with a bona fide offer of goods or services and is not making a legitimate non-commercial or fair use of the disputed domain name. Consequently, the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name <kiniksacorp.com>

The Respondent is using the e-mail [...]@kiniksacorp.com to persuade suppliers to ship goods without payment engaging in a fraudulent and deceptive practice, and has used e-mail addresses with the intention to pose as actual and fictional employees of the Complainant. Consequently, the Respondent has registered and used the disputed domain name in bad faith.

Based on the above-described allegations, the Complainant requests that the disputed domain name be transferred to the Complainant.

B. Respondent

The Respondent did not reply to the Complainant's contentions

6. Discussion and Findings

According to paragraph 4(a) of the Policy, the Complainant must prove: i) that the disputed domain name is identical or confusingly similar to a trademark or service mark in which the Complainant has rights; ii) that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the disputed domain name; and iii) that the Respondent has registered and used the disputed domain name in bad faith.

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.

The Complainant has shown rights in respect of a trademark or service mark for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 1.2.1.

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

Although the addition of other terms (here, "corp", which is a mere abbreviation of "corporation") may bear on assessment of the second and third elements, the Panel finds the addition of such term does not prevent a finding of confusing similarity between the disputed domain name and the mark for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 1.8.

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 the Complainant has established a *prima facie* case that the Respondent lacks rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name. The Respondent has not rebutted the 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.

In addition, the composition of the disputed domain name is inherently misleading as it effectively impersonates or suggests sponsorship or endorsement by the Complainant. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 2.5.1.

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

C. Registered and Used in Bad Faith

The Panel finds that the Complainant has submitted sufficient evidence to conclude that there is indeed bad faith registration and use of the disputed domain name on the part of the Respondent pursuant to paragraph 4(b)(iv) of the Policy.

This conclusion is reached based on the Panel's findings below:

- Considering the Respondent's use of the disputed domain name and the movements and communications made, as proven by the Complainant, it can only be concluded that the disputed domain name was registered with the purpose of creating a false impression of association or commercial connection with the Complainant in the minds of the public. Additionally, in the absence of a response to the Complaint by the Respondent, it must also be concluded that it is not plausible that the creation of the disputed domain name was the result of an exercise of inventiveness on the part of the Respondent, but rather that the Respondent was aware of the existence of the Complainant and/or its trademarks. For all these reasons, the Panel determines that the disputed domain name was registered in bad faith.
- Although the domain name in dispute is currently inactive, the Complainant has provided evidence showing that the disputed domain name was indeed used, as already commented, for engaging in conduct and sending communications with the purpose of creating the appearance of a connection or affiliation between the website identified by the disputed domain name and the Complainant. Consequently, the Panel decides that the disputed domain name has been used in bad faith

The Panel finds that the 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 <kiniksacorp.com> be transferred to the Complainant.

*/Luis Miguel Beneyto Garcia-Reyes/
Luis Miguel Beneyto Garcia-Reyes*
Sole Panelist
Date: October 27, 2025