

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

OKC Holdings Corporation v. YongKui Zhao
Case No. D2025-4631

1. The Parties

The Complainant is OKC Holdings Corporation, United Kingdom, represented by Sheppard, Mullin, Richter & Hampton, LLP, United States of America (“United States”).

The Respondent is YongKui Zhao, Singapore.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <okx.site> 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 November 5, 2025. On November 7, 2025, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On November 21, 2025, following the Complainant’s payment of renewal or registration fees to prevent the disputed domain name being “dropped”, 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 24, 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 25, 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 27, 2025. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was December 17, 2025. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent’s default on December 18, 2025.

The Center appointed Warwick A. Rothnie as the sole panelist in this matter on December 24, 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 operates a business as a cryptocurrency exchange. It provides exchange services for over 350 cryptocurrencies, including Bitcoin and Ethereum.

The business was established in 2013 when it operated as OKcoin. In 2017, it rebranded as OKEX and has been operating under the trademark and name OKX since 2022.

According to the Complaint, the Complainant has customers in over 190 countries and regulatory approvals in the European Union, Singapore, and United Arab Emirates. Reports included in the annexes to the Complaint indicate that the Complainant has over 5 million monthly active users as of 2025. This reflects an increase of 20% over the previous year. The reports also indicate that the Complainant “serves” over 50 million users globally. By at least some measures, the Complainant’s service is the second-largest crypto currency exchange.

The Complaint claims that the Complainant owns numerous registered trademarks relating to cryptocurrency, including in the United States, Mexico, Argentina, and Brazil. Evidence of registered trademarks included in the Complaint include:

- (1) United States Registered Trademark No. 7,239,259, OKX, which was registered in the Principal Register on December 12, 2023 in respect of relevant goods and services in International Classes 9 and 42 and claiming first use in commerce on January 18, 2022;
- (2) United States Registered Trademark No. 7,508,529, OKX, which was registered in the Principal Register on September 17, 2024 in respect of relevant services (including clearing and reconciling financial transactions via a global computer network) in International Classes 35, 36, and 38; for the services in International Classes 35 and 36, claiming first use in commerce on January 18, 2022;
- (3) Brazilian Registered Trademarks Nos 926918257 and 926918400, OKX, which were both filed on June 8, 2022 and registered on July 25, 2023 in respect of goods and services in International Classes 9 and 35 respectively.

According to the Whois report, the disputed domain name was created on September 22, 2023.

Before the Complaint was filed, the disputed domain name redirected to a website “www.exmyit.com” which purported to offer crypto investment services under the brand name “Aurevente”. Screenshots from that website showed a contact email of “[...]@okx.site”.

Following numerous complaints from users and a “scam investigation”, the French regulatory body (Autorité des marchés financiers (“AMF”)) blacklisted the “exmyit” service. The investigation reported that the service had begun in 2025 and users had faced delayed or blocked withdrawals, abrupt shutdowns of accounts, silence from customer support, and, “alarmingly”, demands for deposits of further funds and, after payment, the accounts were still shutdown.

After the Complainant sent a cease and desist letter, the disputed domain name resolved for a time to a parking page provided by the Registrar with pay-per-click (PPC) advertisements. At the time this decision is being prepared, the disputed domain name does not resolve to a website.

According to the Complaint, there is a company registered under the name OKX Global Digital Exchange Ltd associated with the Respondent. The Complaint does not include details of where or when this company is incorporated.

5. Discussion and Findings

No response has been filed. The Complaint and Written Notice have been sent, however, to the Respondent at the electronic and physical coordinates confirmed as correct by the Registrar in accordance with paragraph 2(a) of the Rules. The physical coordinates “Wuhan, Singapore” do not appear to be a valid address. Bearing in mind the duty of the holder of a domain name to provide and keep up to date correct Whois details, therefore, and noting that nothing in the materials of the case suggests that the Center’s electronic notification of the Complaint was not successfully delivered to the Respondent’s email address, the Panel finds that the Respondent has been given a fair opportunity to present his or its case.

When a respondent has defaulted, paragraph 14(a) of the Rules requires the Panel to proceed to a decision on the Complaint in the absence of exceptional circumstances. Accordingly, paragraph 15(a) of the Rules requires the Panel to decide the dispute on the basis of the statements and documents that have been submitted and any rules and principles of law deemed applicable.

Paragraph 4(a) of the Policy provides that in order to divest the Respondent of the disputed domain name, the Complainant must demonstrate each of the following:

- (i) the disputed domain name is identical or confusingly similar to a trademark or service mark in which the Complainant has rights;
- (ii) the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the disputed domain name; and
- (iii) the disputed domain name has been registered and is being used in bad faith.

A. Identical or Confusingly Similar

The first element that the Complainant must establish is that the disputed domain name is identical with, or confusingly similar to, the Complainant’s trademark rights.

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 proven ownership of the registered trademark for OKX identified in section 4 above.

The comparison of the disputed domain name to the Complainant’s trademark simply requires a visual and aural comparison of the disputed domain name to the proven trademarks. This test is narrower than and thus different to the question of “likelihood of confusion” under trademark law. Therefore, questions such as the scope of the trademark rights, the geographical location of the respective parties, the date they were acquired and other considerations that may be relevant to an assessment of infringement under trademark law are not relevant at this stage. Such matters, if relevant, may fall for consideration under the other elements of the Policy. See e.g., [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 1.7.

In undertaking that comparison, it is permissible in the present circumstances to disregard the generic Top-Level Domain (“gTLD”) component as a functional aspect of the domain name system. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 1.11.

Accordingly, the Panel finds that the Complainant has established that the disputed domain name is identical with the Complainant's trademark and the requirement under the first limb of the Policy is satisfied.

B. Rights or Legitimate Interests

The second requirement the Complainant must prove is that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name.

Paragraph 4(c) of the Policy provides that the following circumstances can be situations in which the Respondent has rights or legitimate interests in a disputed domain name:

- (i) before any notice to [the Respondent] of the dispute, [the Respondent's] use of, or demonstrable preparations to use, the [disputed] domain name or a name corresponding to the [disputed] domain name in connection with a bona fide offering of goods or services; or
- (ii) [the Respondent] (as an individual, business, or other organization) has been commonly known by the [disputed] domain name, even if [the Respondent] has acquired no trademark or service mark rights; or
- (iii) [the Respondent] is making a legitimate noncommercial or fair use of the [disputed] domain name, without intent for commercial gain to misleadingly divert consumers or to tarnish the trademark or service mark at issue.

These are illustrative only and are not an exhaustive listing of the situations in which a respondent can show rights or legitimate interests in a domain name.

While 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 often impossible 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. 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.

The Respondent registered the disputed domain name after the Complainant began using the trademark. The disputed domain name was registered before the Complainant registered some of its OKX trademarks but after the applications for registration were filed.

The Complainant states that it has not authorised the Respondent to use the disputed domain name. Nor is the Respondent affiliated with it.

The disputed domain name is not derived from the Respondent's name. According to the Complainant, there is a company, OKX Global Digital Exchange Ltd, which the Respondent "registered and uses". As noted above, the Complaint does not include any details about where or when this company was incorporated under this name. Arguably, therefore, paragraph 4(c)(ii) of the Policy has potential application.

The Respondent, however, has not sought to claim such a justification.

Further, paragraph 4(c)(ii) can be relied on to provide rights or legitimate interests under the Policy only where the adoption and, perhaps, use of the disputed domain name is in good faith. For example, in the case of a person's birth name, there cannot be much, if any, risk that it was adopted with an intention to target a trademark. In contrast, there is a much greater risk that the name of a recently incorporated company that closely resembles a third party trademark, especially where that trademark is well-known or famous, has been chosen with knowledge of and possibly an intention to take advantage of that trademark.

In the present case, it appears from the investigation carried out by the AMF resulting in the “blacklisting” of the “exmyit” service to which the disputed domain name resolved that the disputed domain name was being used in connection with “fraudulent and unlicensed activities” as alleged by the Complainant targeting those interested in cryptocurrency dealings. Further still, the use of the disputed domain name which is identical to the Complainant’s trademark in connection with purported cryptocurrency exchange services appears calculated to take advantage of the significance of “okx” as the Complainant’s trademark. Use of the disputed domain name to carry out those activities, therefore, cannot qualify as in good faith under the Policy.

Yet still further, the Respondent has given its address as recorded in the Whois record as “Wuhan Singapore”. While Wuhan is a large city in the Hubei province of China, so far as the Panel can ascertain it is not also the name of a place in Singapore. The telephone number given in the Whois record starts “+86” which is the international dialling code for China. Thus, it appears that the Respondent has given false details in registering the disputed domain name.

As the Respondent has not sought to rebut the Complainant’s prima facie case or advance any claimed entitlement, therefore, the Panel finds the Complainant has established the second requirement under the Policy also.

C. Registered and Used in Bad Faith

Under the third requirement of the Policy, the Complainant must establish that the disputed domain name has been both registered and used in bad faith by the Respondent. These are conjunctive requirements; both must be satisfied for a successful complaint: see e.g., *Group One Holdings Pte Ltd v. Steven Hafto* WIPO Case No. [D2017-0183](#).

The reasons leading to the finding that the Respondent does not have rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name also lead to the conclusion that the disputed domain name was registered and then used in bad faith. On the information before the Panel, it appears that the Respondent adopted the disputed domain name because it was identical to the Complainant’s trademark with the intention of misleading people into thinking they were dealing with the Complainant and, given the number of users and volume of use, what appears to be its well-known service. Even if the Respondent were operating a genuine cryptocurrency business that would not qualify as registration and use in good faith under the Policy. In the present case, however, the Respondent’s service has been blacklisted by the AMF apparently because of concerns about fraudulent activity.

Accordingly, the Complainant has established all three requirements under the Policy.

6. 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 <okx.site> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Warwick A. Rothnie/

Warwick A. Rothnie

Sole Panelist

Date: January 7, 2026