

## **ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION**

Redis Inc. v. Faheel Kamran  
Case No. D2025-2160

### **1. The Parties**

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

Respondent is Faheel Kamran, United States.

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

The disputed domain name <cloudredis.com> (the “Domain Name”) is registered with Spaceship, Inc. (the “Registrar”).

### **3. Procedural History**

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the “Center”) on June 2, 2025. On June 3, 2025, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the Domain Name. On June 4, 2025, the Registrar transmitted by email to the Center its verification response disclosing registrant and contact information for the Domain Name which differed from the named Respondent (Registration Private and Withheld for Privacy ehf) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to Complainant on June 4, 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 June 6, 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 June 12, 2025. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was July 2, 2025. Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified Respondent’s default on July 3, 2025.

The Center appointed Kimberley Chen Nobles as the sole panelist in this matter on July 7, 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, founded in 2011 and headquartered in San Francisco, California, provides memory databases, database software, and database-as-a-service services.

Complainant owns United States registered trademark number 5,894,148 for the REDIS word mark, registered on October 29, 2019. In addition, Complainant owns and operates the domain names <redis.com> and <redis.io>.

The Domain Name was registered on May 5, 2025. At the time of filing of the Complaint, the Domain Name redirected to Complainant's <redis.io> landing page. In particular, according to WhereGoes ("www.wheregoes.com"), a uniform resource locator (URL) redirect checker website, the user is first redirected from Respondent's Domain Name to <redis.com> and then <redis.io>, the latter two being domain names owned by Complainant.

#### **5. Parties' Contentions**

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

Complainant contends that it has satisfied each of the elements required under the Policy for a transfer of the Domain Name.

Notably, Complainant contends that (i) the Domain Name is confusingly similar to Complainant's trademark; (ii) Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in the Domain Name; and (iii) Respondent registered and is using the Domain Name in bad faith.

In particular, Complainant contends that it has a trademark registration for REDIS and that Respondent registered and is using the Domain Name with the intention to confuse Internet users looking for bona fide and well-known REDIS products and services.

Complainant notes that it has no affiliation with Respondent, and that Respondent redirects users to Complainant's website.

Complainant further contends that Respondent is using the Domain Name as a tool to exploit Complainant's reputation for its own commercial gain, and that Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in the Domain Name. Further, Complainant contends that Respondent has acted in bad faith in acquiring and setting up the Domain Name, when Respondent clearly knew of Complainant's rights.

##### **B. Respondent**

Respondent did not reply to Complainant's contentions.

#### **6. Discussion and Findings**

Under paragraph 4(a) of the Policy, to succeed Complainant must satisfy the Panel that:

(i) the Domain Name is identical or confusingly similar to a trademark or service mark in which Complainant has rights;

(ii) Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the Domain Name; and

(iii) the Domain Name was registered and is being used in bad faith.

Section 4.3 of the WIPO Overview of WIPO Panel Views on Selected UDRP Questions, Third Edition ("[WIPO Overview 3.0](#)") states that failure to respond to the complainant's contentions would not by itself mean that the complainant is deemed to have prevailed; a respondent's default is not necessarily an admission that the complainant's claims are true.

Thus, although in this case, Respondent has failed to respond to the Complaint, the burden remains with Complainant to establish the three elements of paragraph 4(a) of the Policy by a preponderance of the evidence.

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

Ownership of a trademark registration is generally sufficient evidence that a complainant has the requisite rights in a mark for purposes of paragraph 4(a)(i) of the Policy. See [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 1.2.1.

Complainant has provided evidence of its rights in the REDIS trademark, as noted above under section 4. Complainant has therefore proven that it has the requisite rights in the REDIS trademark.

With Complainant's rights in the REDIS trademark established, the remaining question under the first element of the Policy is whether the Domain Name, typically disregarding the Top-Level Domain ("TLD") in which it is registered (in this case, ".com"), is identical or confusingly similar to Complainant's trademark. See, e.g., *B & H Foto & Electronics Corp. v. Domains by Proxy, Inc. / Joseph Gross*, WIPO Case No. [D2010-0842](#).

Here, the Domain Name is confusingly similar to Complainant's REDIS trademarks. The REDIS trademark is recognizable in the Domain Name.

In particular, the Domain Name's inclusion of the term "cloud" before the REDIS mark does not prevent a finding of confusing similarity between the Domain Name and the REDIS trademark.

Thus, the Panel finds that Complainant has satisfied the first element of the Policy.

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

Under paragraph 4(a)(ii) of the Policy, a complainant must make a prima facie showing that a respondent possesses no rights or legitimate interests in a disputed domain name. See, e.g., *Malayan Banking Berhad v. Beauty, Success & Truth International*, WIPO Case No. [D2008-1393](#). Once a complainant makes out such a prima facie showing, the burden of production shifts to the respondent, though the burden of proof always remains on the complainant. If the respondent fails to come forward with relevant evidence showing rights or legitimate interests, the complainant will have sustained its burden under the second element of the UDRP.

From the record in this case, it is evident that Respondent was, and is, aware of Complainant and its REDIS trademarks, and does not have any rights or legitimate interests in the Domain Name. In addition, Complainant asserts that Respondent is not authorized to promote Complainant's goods or services and is not related to Complainant. Respondent is also not known to be associated with the REDIS trademark and there is no evidence showing that Respondent has been commonly known by the Domain Name.

In addition, Respondent has not used the Domain Name in connection with a bona fide offering of goods or services or a legitimate noncommercial or fair use. Rather, at the time of filing of the Complaint, Respondent used the Domain Name to redirect users to Complainant's website. Internet users or consumers may assume that the Domain Name is legitimately connected to Complainant's webpage and any marketing or

other promotional material from Respondent's Domain Name affiliated email address, – i.e., cloudredis.com email address originated from Complainant, and be deceived.

Accordingly, Complainant has provided evidence supporting its prima facie claim that Respondent lacks any rights or legitimate interests in the Domain Name. Respondent has failed to produce countervailing evidence of any rights or legitimate interests in the Domain Name.

Thus, the Panel concludes that Respondent does not have any rights or legitimate interests in the Domain Name, and Complainant has met its burden under paragraph 4(a)(ii) of the Policy.

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

The Panel finds that Respondent's actions indicate that Respondent registered and is using the Domain Name in bad faith.

Paragraph 4(b) of the Policy provides a non-exhaustive list of circumstances indicating bad faith registration and use on the part of a domain name registrant, namely:

“(i) circumstances indicating that you have registered or you have acquired the domain name primarily for the purpose of selling, renting, or otherwise transferring the domain name registration to the complainant who is the owner of the trademark or service mark or to a competitor of that complainant, for valuable consideration in excess of your documented out-of-pocket costs directly related to the domain name; or

(ii) you have registered the domain name in order to prevent the owner of the trademark or service mark from reflecting the mark in a corresponding domain name, provided that you have engaged in a pattern of such conduct; or

(iii) you have registered the domain name primarily for the purpose of disrupting the business of a competitor; or

(iv) by using the domain name, you have intentionally attempted to attract, for commercial gain, Internet users to your website or other online location, by creating a likelihood of confusion with the complainant's mark as to the source, sponsorship, affiliation, or endorsement of your website or location or of a product or service on your website or location.”

The Panel finds that Complainant has provided ample evidence to show that registration and use of the REDIS trademark predate the registration of the Domain Name. Complainant is also well established and known. Indeed, the record shows that Complainant's REDIS trademark and related products and services are known and recognized. Therefore, the Panel is of the view that Respondent was aware of the REDIS trademarks when it registered the Domain Name. See [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 3.2.2; see also *TTT Moneycorp Limited v. Privacy Gods / Privacy Gods Limited*, WIPO Case No. [D2016-1973](#).

The Panel thus finds that Respondent's awareness of Complainant's trademark rights at the time of registration suggests bad faith. See *Red Bull GmbH v. Credit du Léman SA, Jean-Denis Deletraz*, WIPO Case No. [D2011-2209](#); *Nintendo of America Inc v. Marco Beijen, Beijen Consulting, Pokemon Fan Clubs Org., and Pokemon Fans Unite*, WIPO Case No. [D2001-1070](#); and *BellSouth Intellectual Property Corporation v. Serena, Axel*, WIPO Case No. [D2006-0007](#).

Further, the composition of the Domain Name, which includes Complainant's REDIS trademark and an additional term “cloud” suggests Respondent's actual knowledge of Complainant's rights in the REDIS trademarks at the time of registration of the Domain Name and its effort to opportunistically capitalize on the registration and use of the Domain Name.

Moreover, Respondent registered and is using the Domain Name to confuse and mislead consumers. In particular, at the time of filing of the Complaint, Respondent used the Domain Name to redirect users to Complainant's website. Internet users or consumers may assume that the Domain Name is legitimately connected to Complainant's webpage and any marketing or other promotional material from Respondent's Domain Name affiliated email address, – i.e., cloudredis.com email address originated from Complainant, and be deceived.

Indeed, UDRP panels have consistently held that Respondent's use of the Domain Name to trade off goodwill in Complainant's well-known trademark constitutes bad faith. See *Philip Morris Products S.A. v. homn mohmoodi*, WIPO Case No. [D2022-4158](#). Such use of the Domain Name is also disruptive to Complainant's business and potentially damaging to Complainant's reputation and goodwill, and is evidence of bad faith.

Finally, the Panel also notes the reputation of the REDIS trademark, and the failure of Respondent to submit a response to the Complaint or to provide any evidence of actual or contemplated good-faith use, and the implausibility of any good-faith use to which the Domain Name may be put.

Accordingly, the Panel finds that Respondent registered and is using the Domain Name in bad faith and Complainant succeeds under the third element of paragraph 4(a) 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 Domain Name <cloudredis.com> be transferred to Complainant.

*/Kimberley Chen Nobles/*

**Kimberley Chen Nobles**

Sole Panelist

Date: July 21, 2025