

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

Kingspan Holdings (IRL) Limited v. Naveen Mohamed, innovacao
Case No. D2026-0328

1. The Parties

The Complainant is Kingspan Holdings (IRL) Limited, Ireland, represented by Tomkins & Co., Ireland.

The Respondent is Naveen Mohamed, innovacao, India.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <kingspaninsulations.com> 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 January 27, 2026. On January 27, 2026, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On January 27, 2026, 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 January 30, 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 February 3, 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 February 4, 2026. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was February 24, 2026. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent's default on February 25, 2026.

The Center appointed Edoardo Fano as the sole panelist in this matter on March 4, 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.

The Panel has not received any requests from the Complainant or the Respondent regarding further submissions, waivers, or extensions of deadlines, and the Panel has not found it necessary to request any further information from the Parties.

Having reviewed the communication records in the case file provided by the Center, the Panel finds that the Center has discharged its responsibility under the Rules, paragraph 2(a), "to employ reasonably available means calculated to achieve actual notice to [the] Respondent". Therefore, the Panel shall issue its Decision based upon the Complaint, the Policy, the Rules, and the Supplemental Rules and without the benefit of a response from the Respondent.

The language of the proceeding is English, being the language of the Registration Agreement, as per paragraph 11(a) of the Rules.

4. Factual Background

The Complainant is Kingspan Holdings (IRL) Limited, an Irish company forming part of the Kingspan Group, founded in 1966, operating in the building materials field and owning several trademark registrations worldwide for KINGSPAN, among which:

- Irish Trademark Registration No. 244278 KINGSPAN, registered on May 21, 2010;
- International Trademark Registration No. 1055716 KINGSPAN, registered on June 11, 2010;
- United Arab Emirates ("UAE") Trademark Registration No. 184100 KINGSPAN, registered on June 15, 2015;
- United States of America Trademark Registration No. 6760583 KINGSPAN, registered on June 14, 2022.

The Complainant also operates on the Internet, its main website being "www.kingspan.com".

The Complainant provided evidence in support of the above.

According to the Whois records, the disputed domain name was registered on May 18, 2025, and it resolves to an "under construction" holding page. However, before the Complaint was filed, the disputed domain name resolved to a website addressed to Dubai, UAE, in which the Complainant's trademark and logo were reproduced, being a copy of the Complainant's legitimate UAE regional websites.

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 states that the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to its trademark KINGSPAN, as the disputed domain name wholly incorporates the Complainant's trademark.

Moreover, the Complainant asserts that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the disputed domain name since it has not been authorized by the Complainant to register the disputed domain name or to use its trademark within the disputed domain name, it is not commonly known by the disputed domain name, and it is not making either a bona fide offering of goods or services or a legitimate

noncommercial or fair use of the disputed domain name. The disputed domain name resolved to a website addressed to Dubai, UAE, in which the Complainant's trademark and logo were reproduced, being a copycat of the Complainant's legitimate UAE regional websites.

The Complainant submits that the Respondent has registered the disputed domain name in bad faith, since the Complainant's trademark KINGSPAN is well-known in the building materials field. Therefore, the Respondent targeted the Complainant's trademark at the time of registration of the disputed domain name and the Complainant contends that the use of the disputed domain name to impersonate the Complainant and thereby fraudulently deceiving consumers into believing that the companies are the same or are connected in some legitimate way, and attempting to create a likelihood of confusion with the Complainant's trademark, qualifies as bad faith registration and use.

B. Respondent

The Respondent has made no reply to the Complainant's contentions and is in default. In reference to paragraphs 5(f) and 14 of the Rules, no exceptional circumstances explaining the default have been put forward or are apparent from the record.

A respondent is not obliged to participate in a proceeding under the Policy, but if it fails to do so, reasonable facts asserted by a complainant may be taken as true, and appropriate inferences, in accordance with paragraph 14(b) of the Rules, may be drawn. WIPO Overview of WIPO Panel Views on Select UDRP Questions ("[WIPO Overview 3.1](#)") section 4.3.

6. Discussion and Findings

Paragraph 4(a) of the Policy lists three elements, which the Complainant must satisfy in order to succeed:

- (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

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 3.1](#), section 1.7.

Based on the available record, the Panel finds 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 entirety of the mark is reproduced 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.

While the addition of other terms, here "insulations", 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 Complainant's trademark for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.8.

It is also well-accepted that a generic Top-Level Domain (“gTLD”), in this case “.com”, is typically ignored when assessing the similarity between a trademark and a domain name. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.11.1.

Based on the available record, 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.

While 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 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 3.1](#), section 2.1.

The Complainant in its Complaint, and as set out above, has established a prima facie case that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name. It asserts that the Respondent, who is not currently associated with the Complainant in any way, is not using the disputed domain name for a legitimate noncommercial or fair use or in connection with a bona fide offering of goods or services.

The prima facie case presented by the Complainant is enough to shift the burden of production to the Respondent to demonstrate that it has rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name. However, the Respondent has not presented any evidence of any rights or legitimate interests it may have in the disputed domain name. The disputed domain name, before resolving to an “under construction” holding page, resolved to a website addressed to Dubai, UAE, in which the Complainant’s trademark and logo were reproduced, being a copy of the Complainant’s legitimate UAE regional websites. Panels have held that the use of a domain name for illegal activity, here impersonation/passing off/copycat site, can never confer rights or legitimate interests on a respondent. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 2.13.1.

The Panel therefore concludes that the disputed domain name is not being used in connection with a bona fide offering of goods or services.

Finally, the Panel finds that the composition of the disputed domain name (incorporating the Complainant’s trademark in its entirety with the addition of the term “insulations”, connected to the Complainant’s field of activity) carries a risk of implied affiliation as it effectively impersonates or suggests sponsorship or endorsement by the Complainant. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 2.5.1.

Based on the available record, 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, regarding the registration in bad faith of the disputed domain name, the reputation of the Complainant’s trademark KINGSPAN in the building materials field is clearly established, and the Panel finds that the Respondent must have known of the Complainant, and deliberately registered the disputed domain name in bad faith, especially because the disputed domain name resolved to a website addressed to Dubai,

UAE, in which the Complainant's trademark and logo were reproduced, being a copy of the Complainant's legitimate UAE regional websites.

As regards the use in bad faith of the disputed domain name, the Panel notes that the Respondent was trying to attract Internet users to its website by creating likelihood of confusion with the Complainant's trademark as to the disputed domain name's source, sponsorship, affiliation or endorsement, an activity clearly detrimental to the Complainant's business.

Panels have held that the use of a domain name for illegal activity, here impersonation/passing off/copycat site, 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 above suggests to the Panel that the Respondent intentionally registered and was using the disputed domain name in order both to disrupt the Complainant's business, in accordance with paragraph 4(b)(iii) of the Policy, and to attract, for commercial gain, Internet users to its website in accordance with paragraph 4(b)(iv) of the Policy.

As regards the current use of the disputed domain name, resolving to an "under construction" holding page, panels have found that the non-use of a domain name (including a blank or "coming soon" page) would not prevent a finding of bad faith under the doctrine of passive holding. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 3.3. Having reviewed the record, the Panel notes the reputation of the Complainant's trademarks in the building materials field, the nature of the disputed domain name (wholly incorporating the Complainant's trademark, entirety with the addition of the term "insulations", connected to the Complainant's field of activity), the prior use of the disputed domain name, and the failure of the Respondent to submit a response, and finds that in the circumstances of this case, the passive holding of the disputed domain name does not prevent a finding of bad faith under the Policy.

Furthermore, the Panel considers that the nature of the inherently misleading disputed domain name, which incorporates the Complainant's trademark in its entirety with the addition of the term "insulations", connected to the Complainant's field of activity, further supports a finding of bad faith. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 3.2.1.

Based on the available record, the Panel finds the third element of the Policy has been established.

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, <kingspaninsulations.com>, be transferred to the Complainant.

/Edoardo Fano/

Edoardo Fano

Sole Panelist

Date: March 11, 2026