

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

Kinopoisk LLC v. Artur Ararat, Dmitrii Popov, and Domain Privacy, Domain Name Privacy Inc.

Case No. D2026-2053

1. The Parties

The Complainant is Kinopoisk LLC, Russian Federation, represented by Brand Monitor LLC, Russian Federation.

The Respondents are Artur Ararat, Russian Federation, Dmitrii Popov, Russian Federation, and Domain Privacy, Domain Name Privacy Inc., Cyprus.

2. The Domain Names and Registrars

The disputed domain names <kinopoisk.gold>, <kinopoisk.net>, and <kinopoisk.vip> are registered with NameSilo, LLC

The disputed domain name <kinopoisk.website> is registered with PDR Ltd. d/b/a PublicDomainRegistry.com

The disputed domain name <kinopoisk.cc> is registered with Names On The Drop LLC (collectively, the “Registrars”).

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the “Center”) on May 13, 2026. On May 13, 2026, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrars requests for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain names. On May 13, May 14, and May 18, 2026, the Registrars transmitted by email to the Center their verification responses, disclosing registrant and contact information for the disputed domain names which differed from the named Respondent (The RDAP server redacted the value, Dmitrii Popov) and contact information in the Complaint.

The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on May 19, 2026 with the registrant and contact information of nominally multiple underlying registrants revealed by the Registrars, requesting the Complainant to either file separate complaint(s) for the disputed domain names associated with different underlying registrants or alternatively, demonstrate that the underlying registrants are in fact the same entity

and/or that all domain names are under common control. The Complainant filed an amended Complaint on May 22, 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 Respondents of the Complaint, and the proceedings commenced on June 3, 2026. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was June 23, 2026. Pursuant to paragraph 5(b) of the Rules, it was extended to June 26, 2026. The Response was filed with the Center on June 24, 2026 by the Respondent Artur Ararat.

The Center appointed Olga Zalomiy as the sole panelist in this matter on July 3, 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 one of the largest Russian language online platforms dedicated to movies and television series. The Complainant has used its yet unregistered KINOPOISK mark since 2003 in connection with an online platform relating to films and television programs. It subsequently expanded its use of the mark to streaming services and obtained trademark registrations, such as:

- the Russian Federation Registration No. 727944 for the KINOPOISK trademark, registered on September 16, 2019;
- the Russian Registration Registration No. 733871 for the KINOPOISK HD trademark, registered on July 11, 2019; and
- the Russian Registration Registration No. 773816 for the KINOPOISK ORIGINALS trademark, registered on February 9, 2020.

The Complainant owns a domain name <kinopoisk.ru> incorporating its KINOPOISK trademark.

The disputed domain name <kinopoisk.gold> was registered on September 25, 2024, <kinopoisk.net> on June 19, 2025, <kinopoisk.vip> on June 18, 2023, <kinopoisk.website> on July 23, 2025, and <kinopoisk.cc> on December 2, 2022. The disputed domain names <kinopoisk.gold>, <kinopoisk.net> and <kinopoisk.vip> redirect users to a website operating under the domain name <fbdomen.cfd>. That website does not itself provide the requested content; rather, it instructs users on how to locate a movie or television show of interest.

The disputed domain name <kinopoisk.cc> redirects to a website, displaying pay-per-click advertisement movie-related links. The Complainant has also provided evidence showing that this disputed domain name is listed for sale for USD 588.

The disputed domain name <kinopoisk.website> does not resolve to any active website.

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 names.

Notably, the Complainant contends that the disputed domain names are identical to its KINOPOISK trademark, because the disputed domain names reproduce the Complainant's mark in its entirety.

The Complainant submits that the Respondents have no rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain names. The Complainant contends that because the term "kinopoisk" is not a dictionary word and has no independent meaning in English or other languages, the Respondents have no reason to choose the term "kinopoisk" for inclusion into the disputed domain names other than to create likelihood of confusion with the Complainant's well-known trademark. The Complainant claims that the disputed domain names were registered many years after the Complainant had established trademark rights and after the Kinopoisk platform became widely known among Internet users. The Complainant argues that the Respondents, who have no connection to the Complainant, have not been authorized or licensed to use the KINOPOISK trademark in connection with the disputed domain names or for any other purposes.

The Complainant asserts that the Respondents registered and used the disputed domain name in bad faith, because the Respondents used the disputed domain names to mislead Internet users looking for the Complainant's streaming platform into accessing the Respondents' websites where they could access content without paying for the Complainant's services. The Complainant contends that the Respondents could not have been unaware of the Complainant's trademark at the time of the disputed domain names' registration because of the Complainant's widespread recognition as one of the major online services dedicated to movies and TV series.

B. Respondents

The Respondents Dmitrii Popov and Domain Privacy, Domain Name Privacy Inc. did not reply to the Complainant's contentions.

The Respondent Artur Ararat contends that the Complainant has not satisfied all three of the elements required under the Policy for a transfer of the disputed domain names. He states at the outset that he has no ownership, administrative control, or legal or factual relationship with the domain names <kinopoisk.website> and <kinopoisk.cc>.

The Respondent contends that, although the disputed domain names incorporate the term "kinopoisk," he has not used, imitated, or targeted the Complainant's registered trademarks, trade dress, or logos on the website associated with the disputed domain names.

The Respondent further asserts that he has rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain names <kinopoisk.gold>, <kinopoisk.net>, and <kinopoisk.vip> because the website associated with these disputed domain names is distinct from the Complainant's website. According to the Respondent, Internet users are unlikely to conclude that the Respondent's website is owned by or affiliated with the Complainant because it features a different layout, navigation structure, content, and user interface, which together create a different overall commercial impression.

Finally, the Respondent contends that the Complainant has failed to establish that the disputed domain names <kinopoisk.gold>, <kinopoisk.net>, and <kinopoisk.vip> were registered and are being used in bad faith. The Respondent argues that the Complainant has provided no evidence that the Respondent offered to sell these disputed domain names to the Complainant. The Respondent also maintains that the Complainant has failed to demonstrate that the Respondent intentionally attempted to attract Internet users to his website by creating a likelihood of confusion with the Complainant's trademarks. According to the Respondent, the website associated with the disputed domain names neither claims an affiliation with the Complainant nor presents itself as official resource of the Complainant.

6. Discussion and Findings

Consolidation: Multiple Respondents

The amended Complaint was filed in relation to nominally different domain name registrants. The Complainant alleges that the domain name registrants are the same entity or mere alter egos of each other, or under common control. The Complainant requests the consolidation of the disputes against the multiple disputed domain name registrants pursuant to paragraph 10(e) of the Rules.

The Respondent Artur Ararat states that he neither owns nor exercises administrative control over the disputed domain names <kinopoisk.website> and <kinopoisk.cc>. He contends that he did not configure any DNS records for those domain names or redirect or forward any traffic associated with them. However, the Respondent does not dispute his ownership of the disputed domain names <kinopoisk.gold>, <kinopoisk.net>, or <kinopoisk.vip>.

Paragraph 3(c) of the Rules states that a complaint may relate to more than one domain name, provided that the domain names are registered by the same domain name holder.

In addressing the Complainant's request, the Panel will consider whether (i) the disputed domain names or corresponding websites are subject to common control; and (ii) the consolidation would be fair and equitable to all Parties. See WIPO Overview of WIPO Panel Views on Select UDRP Questions (["WIPO Overview 3.1"](#)), section 4.11.2.

The Panel notes that the disputed domain names <kinopoisk.gold>, <kinopoisk.net>, and <kinopoisk.vip> were registered by the Respondent Artur Ararat who does not dispute his ownership of those domain names.

As to the remaining two disputed domain names, <kinopoisk.website> and <kinopoisk.cc>, the Panel finds the Complainant has not established that they are under common control together with the disputed domain names <kinopoisk.gold>, <kinopoisk.net>, and <kinopoisk.vip>. Although all five disputed domain names share an identical naming pattern, the similarities end there. The disputed domain names <kinopoisk.website> and <kinopoisk.cc> are registered by two different registrants through two different registrars, both of which differ from the Respondent and the registrar associated with the other three disputed domain names. Moreover, while the three disputed domain names registered by the Respondent Artur Ararat redirect Internet users to the same website and use the same name servers, the website associated with <kinopoisk.cc> displays different content, and <kinopoisk.website> does not resolve to an active website, and the latter two domain names use different name servers.

On the record before it, the Panel finds the evidence insufficient to establish that all five disputed domain names are subject to common control. In the absence of such evidence, consolidating disputes against all named Respondents into a single proceeding would not satisfy the requirement that consolidation be fair and equitable.

Accordingly, the Panel will decide the Complaint regarding the disputed domain names <kinopoisk.gold>, <kinopoisk.net>, and <kinopoisk.vip> (referred to below as the "Disputed Domain Names"), registered in the name of Artur Ararat (referred to below as the "Respondent").

The Panel declines to consolidate the disputes regarding the domain names <kinopoisk.website> and <kinopoisk.cc>. This decision is made without prejudice to the possibility of refiling complaints regarding these two domain names.

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 Panel finds the mark is recognizable within the Disputed Domain Names. The inclusion of the generic Top-Level Domains ".net", ".vip" and ".gold" is typically disregarded in the context of the confusing similarity assessment, being a technical requirement of registration. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.11.1. Accordingly, the Disputed Domain Names are identical to the mark for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), 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 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 Names. 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 Names such as those enumerated in the Policy or otherwise.

The evidence on record shows that the Respondent is not commonly known by the Disputed Domain Names. Nor is the Respondent making a legitimate noncommercial or fair use of the Disputed Domain Names, or using them in connection with a bona fide offering of goods or services, as the Disputed Domain Names redirect Internet users to a website operating under a different domain name that offers services competing with the Complainant's subscription-based streaming services. In addition, the Respondent has not been authorized by the Complainant to use the Complainant's trademark in a domain name. The mere fact that the website to which the Disputed Domain Names redirect has a different look and feel from the Complainant's official website does not establish any rights or legitimate interests on the part of the Respondent, in view of other circumstances of the case.

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, who resides in the Russian Federation, registered the Disputed Domain Names several years after the Complainant had registered and begun using the KINOPOISK trademark in the territory of the Russian Federation. The Panel further notes that the Complainant's trademark is a transliteration of the Russian words "kino" and "poisk", meaning "movie" and "search" in English. While the mark is composed of dictionary terms in the Russian language, it has acquired widespread recognition through the Complainant's longstanding use. The Complainant has used its yet unregistered KINOPOISK mark since 2003 in connection with an online platform relating to films and television programs. It subsequently expanded its use of the mark to streaming services and obtained trademark registrations.

In the absence of any explanation from the Respondent for registering domain names identical to the Complainant's trademark, coupled with the Respondent's use of the Disputed Domain Names to redirect Internet users to a website offering movie and television streaming services, the Panel finds it more likely than not that the Respondent was aware of the Complainant's rights in the KINOPOISK trademark and targeted it at the time of registration. The Panel therefore concludes that the Respondent registered and uses the Disputed Domain Names in bad faith to capitalize on the reputation and goodwill associated with the Complainant's trademark.

The UDRP establishes that, for purposes of paragraph 4(a)(iii), "bad faith" registration and use of a domain name can be established by a showing of circumstances indicating that the respondent is using the domain name to intentionally attempt to attract, for commercial gain, Internet users to the respondent's website or other online location, by creating a likelihood of confusion with the complainant's mark as to source, sponsorship, affiliation or endorsement of the respondent's website or location, or of a product or service on the respondent's website or location. See Policy, paragraph 4(b)(iv).

Prior UDRP panels have found "the following types of evidence to support a finding that a respondent has registered a domain name to attract, for commercial gain, Internet users to its website by creating a likelihood of confusion with the complainant's mark: (i) actual confusion, (ii) seeking to cause confusion (including by technical means beyond the domain name itself) for the respondent's commercial benefit, even if unsuccessful, (iii) the lack of a respondent's own rights to or legitimate interests in a domain name, (iv) redirecting the domain name to a different respondent-owned website, even where such website contains a disclaimer, (v) redirecting the domain name to or mimicking the complainant's (or a competitor's) website, and (vi) absence of any conceivable good faith use." [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 3.1.4.

Here, the Respondent, who has no rights or legitimate interests in the Disputed Domain Names, registered domain names identical to the Complainant's trademark and redirected them to a different domain name that hosted a website offering competing movie and television shows streaming services. This conduct demonstrates that the Respondent registered and has used the Disputed Domain Names to intentionally attract, for commercial gain, Internet users to the Respondent's websites or other online location by creating a likelihood of confusion with the Complainant's mark as to the source, sponsorship, affiliation, or endorsement of the Respondent's websites or other online location, or of the products or services offered there.

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 names <kinopoisk.gold>, <kinopoisk.net>, and < kinopoisk.vip> be transferred to the Complainant.

The Complainant is denied regarding the disputed domain names <kinopoisk.website> and <kinopoisk.cc>.

/Olga Zalomiy/

Olga Zalomiy

Sole Panelist

Date: July 15, 2026