

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

GitLab Inc. v. Kamlesh K

Case No. D2025-4511

1. The Parties

The Complainant is GitLab Inc., United States of America (“United States” or “USA”), represented internally.

The Respondent is Kamlesh K, India.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <gitlab.careers> 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 October 31, 2025. On October 31, 2025, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On October 31, 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, Domains By Proxy, LLC) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on November 5, 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 November 7, 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 November 17, 2025. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was December 7, 2025. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent’s default on December 9, 2025.

The Center appointed Gill Mansfield as the sole panelist in this matter on December 16, 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 corporation registered in Delaware, USA that operates an AI powered DevSecOp's (Development, Security & Operations) platform. It began in 2011 as an open source project to enable a team of programmers to collaborate and is now a publicly traded company on the Nasdaq Global Market with over 50 million estimated registered users and an active community of more than 4900 contributors.

The Complainant, and a predecessor entity, have been trading under the GITLAB mark since 2011 and the Complainant has various trademark registrations for GITLAB and GITLAB formative trademarks including (inter alia):

- European trademark registration number 013751169 for GITLAB (word mark) registered on September 8, 2015 in classes 9 and 42.
- Canadian trademark registration number TMA972072 for GITLAB (word mark) registered on May 30, 2017 in classes 9 and 42.
- United States trademark registration number 6073595 for GITLAB (word mark) registered on June 9, 2020 in classes 9 and 42.

The Complainant is also the registrant of the domain names <gitlab.com> registered on January 15, 2004 and <gitlab.org> registered on January 19, 2010, from which the Complainant makes its products and services available.

The disputed domain name was registered on September 18, 2025 and at the time of the Complaint resolved to an inactive webpage.

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 identical to a trademark in which it has rights. It submits that the disputed domain contains the GITLAB trademark in its entirety with only the addition of the generic top-level domain ("gTLD") ".careers" and that the disputed domain name is also identical to the Complainant's own domain names. It submits that the gTLD is viewed as a standard registration requirement and as such should be disregarded under the first element confusing similarity test.

It further contends that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the disputed domain name. It states that the disputed domain name was registered long after the Complainant (and its predecessor) started providing services under the GITLAB mark. In addition, that the mark itself consists of an arbitrary term that has no meaning outside of its use to identify the Complainant as the source of certain products and services and it is unlikely that the Respondent independently came to be known by this name. The Complainant also submits that the Respondent is not affiliated with the Complainant, is not a licensee of the Complainant, nor is the Respondent otherwise authorised to use the Complainant's GITLAB mark for any purpose.

The Complainant states that although the Respondent has not established a website associated with the disputed domain name, the Complainant has received multiple reports that the Respondent is actively using an email address associated with the disputed domain name "...@gitlabs.careers" to impersonate the Complainant, claiming to represent Gitlab USA, purporting to recruit candidates for employment at Gitlab and instructing those candidates to provide a "CPD USA accredited certificate" to proceed with the recruitment process. The Complainant submits that this impersonation of the Complainant demonstrates that the Respondent is not using the disputed domain name in connection with a bona fide offering of goods or services. It also states that this impersonation creates a substantial risk of confusion particularly among potential recruitment candidates who may reasonably assume that they are interacting with the Complainant's recruitment team. It contends that the Respondent is not commonly known by the disputed domain name, nor is the use of the disputed domain name a legitimate noncommercial or fair use pursuant to the Policy.

The Complainant also contends that the disputed domain name was registered and is being used in bad faith. It submits that the Respondent knowingly registered the disputed domain name containing the Complainant's mark to capitalise on the Complainant's reputation, and that the use of ".careers" in conjunction with the GITLAB mark demonstrates a deliberate intention to target individuals seeking career opportunities with the Complainant, which it argues is evidence of bad faith. The Complainant further submits that the Respondent's use of the email address "...@gitlab.careers" associated with the disputed domain name to impersonate the Complainant's human resources team constitutes clear evidence of bad faith registration and use. It also suggests that the request for candidates to provide documentation allows the Respondent to extract personal information and credentials from those candidates under false pretences. It points to the proximity in time between the registration of the disputed domain name and the initiation of the Respondent's impersonation of the Complainant's human resources team as demonstrating that the disputed domain name was registered with the specific intent of impersonating the Complainant and not for any legitimate purpose. It also asserts that the impersonation creates a likelihood of confusion with the Complainant's GITLAB mark and directly harms the Complainant's reputation.

B. Respondent

The Respondent did not reply to the Complainant's contentions.

6. Discussion and Findings

Under paragraph 4(a) of the Policy the Complainant carries the burden of proving:

- (i) that the disputed domain name is identical or confusingly similar to a trademark or service mark in which the Complainant has rights, and
- (ii) that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the disputed domain name, and
- (iii) that the disputed domain name has been registered and is being used 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 identical to the mark for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 1.7.

The applicable Top-Level Domain (“TLD”) in a domain name is a standard registration requirement and as such, the TLD “.career” in the disputed domain name is disregarded for the purposes of the first element confusing similarity test. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 1.11.1

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.

The Respondent is not a licensee of the Complainant, is not affiliated with the Complainant and is not authorised to use the Complainant’s GITLAB trademark in any way. There is no evidence to suggest that the Respondent is commonly known by the disputed domain name. It is clear from the available record that GITLAB is a made up word with no meaning outside of its use to identify the Complainant as the source of certain products and services, and the Panel notes that the name provided by the Respondent to the Registrar is “Kamlesh K”.

There is also no evidence of use or demonstrable preparations to use the disputed domain name for a bona fide offering of goods or services, or legitimate noncommercial or fair use of the disputed domain names. As noted above, the disputed domain name is identical to the Complainant’s GITLAB trademark. It incorporates the whole of the Complainant’s mark with only the addition of the TLD “.careers”. It also mimics the Complainant’s own legitimate domain names again with only the TLD differing. The Panel also notes that the “.careers” TLD is commonly used in connection with, or to denote, recruitment and career opportunities. As such the disputed domain name could be perceived as an extension of the Complainant’s legitimate domain name for recruitment purpose.

The Panel finds that the composition of the disputed domain name is such as to carry a high risk of implied affiliation which cannot constitute fair use, as it effectively impersonates the Complainant, or suggests affiliation with or sponsorship or endorsement by the Complainant. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 2.5.1.

However, the record also shows that the Respondent has actively used an email address associated with the disputed domain name to impersonate the Complainant, claiming to represent Gitlab USA in its interactions with potential candidates for employment at Gitlab, purporting to engage in recruitment activities with potential candidates, and instructing those potential candidates to provide documentation to it.

Panels have held that the use of a domain name for illegitimate activity or illegal activity, such as impersonation/passing off, or other types of fraud, can never confer rights or legitimate interests on a respondent. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 2.13.1. Having reviewed the available record, the Panel finds that the Respondent's use of the disputed domain name to impersonate and pass itself off as the Complainant can never confer rights or legitimate interests on the Respondent.

Further, according to paragraph 14(b) of the Rules, the Panel may draw from the lack of response of the Respondent such inferences as it considers appropriate. The Panel is of the view that the lack of response from the Respondent corroborates the absence of any rights or legitimate interests of the Respondent in the disputed domain name.

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.

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 3.0](#), section 3.2.1.

In the present case, the Panel notes that the Respondent registered the disputed domain name many years after the Complainant, and its predecessor entity, started providing services under the GITLAB mark. The Panel finds that the GITLAB mark has achieved significant goodwill and reputation internationally through its use by the Complainant, and notes the composition of the disputed domain name which uses the GITLAB mark in its entirety and replicates the Complainant's legitimate domain names with only the TLD ".careers" differing. In the circumstances, it is implausible that the Respondent did not have knowledge of the Complainant's trademark at the time that the disputed domain name was registered. Moreover, the Respondent's conduct demonstrates the Respondent's actual knowledge and active targeting of the Complainant's GITLAB trademark.

As set out above, the disputed domain name resolves to an inactive webpage.

In this case it is clear from the available records that, although the disputed domain name resolves to an inactive webpage, an email address associated with the disputed domain name has been actively used to impersonate the Complainant (or its human resources or recruitment team) in email correspondence with individuals seeking career opportunities with the Complainant, seeking to mislead them into believing that they are dealing with the Complainant or its employees or representatives, and requesting documentation from them.

Panels have consistently held that the use of a domain name for illegitimate or illegal activity such as impersonation/passing off, or other types of fraud constitutes bad faith. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 3.4. Having reviewed the record, the Panel finds the Respondent's registration and use of the disputed domain name constitutes 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 <gitlab.careers> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Gill Mansfield/
Gill Mansfield
Sole Panelist
Date: December 30, 2025