

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

Netflix Studios, LLC v. Jason King
Case No. D2026-0113

1. The Parties

The Complainant is Netflix Studios, LLC, United States of America (“United States”), represented by Coates IP LLP, United States.

The Respondent is Jason King, China.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <kpopdemonhuntersdoll.com> is registered with NameCheap, Inc. (the “Registrar”).

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the “Center”) on January 12, 2026. On January 13, 2026, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On the same day, 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 (UNKNOWN RESPONDENT / Privacy Service Provided by Withheld for Privacy ehf) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on January 14, 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 19, 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 20, 2026. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was February 9, 2026. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent’s default on February 11, 2026.

The Center appointed Willem J. H. Leppink as the sole panelist in this matter on February 24, 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 following facts are undisputed.

The Complainant is a company founded in 1997, based in California, United States. Its streaming service was launched in 2007, and it is now one of the world's leading entertainment services with over 302 million paid memberships in over 190 countries, accessing television series, films and games across a wide variety of genres and languages.

In March 2021, the Complainant announced the production of its "KPop Demon Hunters" film. The film was released on June 20, 2025. On August 12, 2025, it was reported that the film was being viewed 184.6 million times in the eight weeks following its premiere. The Complainant has launched an online KPOP DEMON HUNTERS store, offering a variety of merchandise and clothing at "www.netflix.shop/collections/kpop-demon-hunters".

The Complainant has filed a number of applications for registered trademarks for KPOP DEMON HUNTERS in several territories, including the United Kingdom and the European Union. These include, inter alia:

- European Union trademark registration KPOP DEMON HUNTERS (word mark), with registration number 019226334 applied for on July 31, 2025 and registered on December 20, 2025 for goods in classes 25 and 28; and
- The United Kingdom trademark registration KPOP DEMON HUNTERS (word mark), with registration number UK00004282767 applied for on October 23, 2025 and registered on January 9, 2026, for goods and services in classes 9, 16, 25, 28 and 41.

The above trademarks are hereinafter, also in singular, referred to as the "KPOP DEMON HUNTERS Mark".

The disputed domain name was registered on June 27, 2025.

At the time of filing the Complaint the disputed domain name resolved to an online retail store offering a range of what purport to be KPOP DEMON HUNTERS merchandise using the KPOP DEMON HUNTERS brand. The banner of the home page carries a stylized KPOP DEMON HUNTERS logo. The merchandise offered for sale includes a "Kpop Demon Hunters Doll" and a "Kpop Demon Hunters Bird doll" which is substantially identical to those sold by the Complainant. In addition, it states in the footer of the home page: "Welcome to Officially Licensed Kpop Demon Hunters Doll Store" (sic).

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 the following.

The Complainant has filed numerous applications for the KPOP DEMON HUNTERS Mark and obtained common law rights in the KPOP DEMON HUNTERS Mark around the world prior to the Respondent's registration of the disputed domain name. The Complainant adopted the KPOP DEMON HUNTERS Mark in

March 2021 and began use at least as early as June 20, 2025. The Complainant notes that the common law rights in the KPOP DEMON HUNTERS Mark are sufficient to form the basis of this Complaint. The KPOP DEMON HUNTERS film and merchandise has become immensely popular in a very short period of time since its launch on June 20, 2025. On July 29, 2025, the Complainant announced that KPOP DEMON HUNTERS had become the platform's "most watched original animated film of all time".

The disputed domain name completely subsumes the Complainant's KPOP DEMON HUNTERS Mark. The disputed domain name is therefore confusingly similar in appearance, pronunciation, meaning and overall commercial impression to the KPOP DEMON HUNTERS Mark. There is no issue with priority of rights, as the Complainant announced the release of its KPOP DEMON HUNTERS film at least as early as March 2021 and established rights in the KPOP DEMON HUNTERS Mark at least as early as June 20, 2025, prior to the registration date of the disputed domain name.

The Respondent has no rights in the Complainant's KPOP DEMON HUNTERS Mark, prior or subsequent, and does not have a license to offer merchandise under the Complainant's KPOP DEMON HUNTERS Mark or featuring the Complainant's copyrighted content. The Respondent provides no bona fide goods or services under the Complainant's trademarks in commerce and is not making any legitimate noncommercial or fair use of the disputed domain name. The KPOP DEMON HUNTERS Mark is a coined phrase, with no meaning in any language. It is solely related to the KPOP DEMON HUNTERS film and merchandise. The Respondent is not commonly known by the disputed domain name and has acquired no trademark or service mark rights in the KPOP DEMON HUNTERS Mark.

The disputed domain name was registered to offer counterfeit merchandise related to the Complainant's KPOP DEMON HUNTERS Mark and appears to impersonate or pass itself off as being the Complainant. Therefore, the disputed domain name has not been used in connection with bona fide offerings of goods or services. Further, the disputed domain name has been registered to exploit the fame of the KPOP DEMON HUNTERS Mark in a bid to attract Internet users to the Respondent's website or provide its email legitimacy.

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 Policy required that rights must be in existence at the time the complaint is filed. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.1.3. Although the registration of the disputed domain name preceded the filing and registration of the KPOP DEMON HUNTERS Mark, the filing/priority date, date of registration, and date of claimed first use are not considered relevant to the first element test, although this may be relevant for the assessment of the second and third elements. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.1.2.

The Panel finds the mark is recognizable 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 here, "doll", 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 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 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 Complainant has contended that the products offered on the website to which the disputed domain name resolves are counterfeit and that the website is not the official website in any way affiliated with the Complainant. The Respondent has not rebutted this.

Panels have held that the use of a domain name for illegitimate activity here, the sale of counterfeit goods and passing off, can never confer rights or legitimate interests on a respondent. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 2.13.1.

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 has clearly targeted the Complainant and thus intentionally attempted to attract, for commercial gain, Internet users by creating a likelihood of confusion with the Complainant’s mark. The Panel finds that the Respondent registered and used the disputed domain name in bad faith.

Typically where a respondent registers a domain name before the complainant’s trademark rights accrue, panels will not normally find bad faith on the part of the respondent. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 3.8.1.

However, as an exception, in certain limited circumstances where the facts of the case establish that the respondent’s intent in registering the domain name was to unfairly capitalize on the complainant’s nascent (typically as yet unregistered) trademark rights, panels have been prepared to find that the respondent has acted in bad faith. Such scenarios include significant media attention (e.g., in connection with a product launch or prominent event). See [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 3.8.2.

The Panel finds that this exception here applies. The Complainant contended that in March 2021, the Complainant announced the production of its KPOP DEMON HUNTERS film and that this film was released on June 20, 2025, before the disputed domain name was registered. This has not been rebutted by the Respondent.

Panels have held that the use of a domain name for illegitimate activity here, the sale of counterfeit goods and passing off, as alleged by the Complainant, constitutes bad faith. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), 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 <kpopdemonhuntersdoll.com> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Willem J. H. Leppink/

Willem J. H. Leppink

Sole Panelist

Date: March 4, 2026