

## **ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION**

Kion Group AG v. zeng shuyu

Case No. D2026-0314

### **1. The Parties**

The Complainant is Kion Group AG, Germany, represented by Bettinger Scheffelt Partnerschaft mbB, Germany.

The Respondent is zeng shuyu, China.

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

The disputed domain name <kiongroup-global.com> is registered with GoDaddy.com, LLC (the “Registrar”).

### **3. Procedural History**

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the “Center”) on January 26, 2026. On January 27, 2026, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On January 27, 2026, 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, Domains By Proxy, LLC) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on January 28, 2026, 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 January 28, 2026.

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 January 29, 2026. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was February 18, 2026. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent’s default on February 19, 2026.

The Center appointed Andrea Cappai as the sole panelist in this matter on February 25, 2026. 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 KION Group AG, a German multinational engineering and logistics technology company headquartered in Frankfurt am Main, Germany. It was established in 2006 as a result of the separation of the materials handling division of Linde AG. The Complainant operates in the field of material handling and intralogistics, including industrial trucks and warehouse automation solutions. The record materials report that it has more than 42,000 employees worldwide and operations and sales/service locations in over 100 countries.

The Complainant is the owner, among others, of the following trademark registrations:

- KION – International Registration No. 1693404 – April 22, 2022 (Classes 7, 9, 12, 35, 36, 37, 39, 41, and 42).
- KION – United States of America Registration No. 7,497,689 – September 10, 2024 (Classes 7, 9, 12, 35, 36, 37, 39, 41, and 42).
- KION GROUP – International Registration No. 1134793 – May 8, 2012 (Classes 7, 9, 12, 20, 36, and 39).

The Complainant promotes its products and services globally through its main website at the domain name <kion.com>. The Complainant also owns, among others, the domain names <kion.de>, <kiongroup.com>, and <kion.group>.

The disputed domain name is <kiongroup-global.com>. The disputed domain name was registered on January 18, 2026.

At the time of the Complainant's printout filed with the Complaint, the disputed domain name resolved to a parking page stating that "kiongroup-global.com is parked free [...]" and inviting Internet users to "Get This Domain".

No further information about the Respondent appears on the record.

#### 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 disputed domain name is confusingly similar to its KION GROUP trademark, because it incorporates that mark in its entirety, and the addition of the descriptive term "global" and the ".com" generic Top-Level Domain ("gTLD") does not dispel confusing similarity. The Complainant further submits that, on the contrary, the term "global" reinforces the impression of an official, international, or group-wide presence of the Complainant.

The Complainant also submits that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name, asserting that the disputed domain name resolves to a parked website which does not display any original content of the Respondent and does not evidence any bona fide offering of goods or services or any legitimate noncommercial or fair use, and that the Respondent is not commonly known by the disputed domain name.

Finally, the Complainant argues that the disputed domain name was registered and is being used in bad faith, asserting that the Respondent targeted the Complainant and that the disputed domain name is being passively held without any plausible good-faith use, and further submitting that a public MXToolbox lookup shows the disputed domain name is configured with active mail exchanger ("MX") records, which, according to the Complainant, indicates that it is technically enabled to send and receive email even if it resolves only to a parked website..

## **B. Respondent**

The Respondent did not reply to the 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 Select UDRP Questions ("[WIPO Overview 3.1](#)"), section 1.7.

The Complainant has shown rights in respect of a trademark or service mark for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), 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 3.1](#), section 1.7.

Although the addition of other terms, such as "global", 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 3.1](#), 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 recognised that proving that 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 3.1](#), 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.

The Respondent has not been authorised by the Complainant to use the Complainant's trademarks, and there is no evidence on the record that the Respondent has been commonly known by the disputed domain name. Further, at the time the Complaint was filed, the disputed domain name resolved to parking page stating that "kiongroup-global.com is parked free [...]" and inviting Internet users to "Get This Domain", alongside generic third-party content. On this record, the Panel sees no evidence that the Respondent has used, or made demonstrable preparations to use, the disputed domain name in connection with a bona fide offering of goods or services, nor is there any indication of legitimate noncommercial or fair use.

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, the Panel notes that the Respondent registered the disputed domain name incorporating the Complainant's KION GROUP trademark in its entirety together with the descriptive term "global". In light of the composition of the disputed domain name, the timing of its registration, and the Complainant's contention that "global" reinforces an association with its international business, and absent any explanation from the Respondent, the Panel finds it reasonable to infer that the Respondent was aware of the Complainant and its trademark at the time of registration and targeted the Complainant. More likely than not, the Respondent registered the disputed domain name for the purpose of mimicking the Complainant's domain names <kion.com> and <kiongroup.com>.

At the time the Complaint was filed, the disputed domain name resolved to a parking page and inviting Internet users to "Get This Domain".

Paragraph 4(b) of the Policy sets out a list of non-exhaustive circumstances that may indicate that a domain name was registered and used in bad faith, but other circumstances may be relevant in assessing whether a respondent's registration and use of a domain name is in bad faith. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 3.2.1.

Panels have found that the non-use of a domain name would not by itself prevent a finding of bad faith under the doctrine of passive holding. To the contrary, in looking at the totality of circumstances in each case, panels have found that the registration and non-use of a domain name can still constitute bad faith for purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 3.3. Having reviewed the available record, the Panel notes the distinctiveness of the Complainant's trademark, and the composition of the disputed domain name, and finds that in the circumstances of this case the passive holding of the disputed domain name does not prevent a finding of bad faith under the Policy.

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 <kiongroup-global.com> be transferred to the Complainant.

*/Andrea Cappai/*

**Andrea Cappai**

Sole Panelist

Date: March 11, 2026