

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

Forbes LLC v. Nitin Kumawat
Case No. D2026-0493

1. The Parties

The Complainant is Forbes LLC, United States of America (“United States”), represented by Riker Danzig LLP, United States.

The Respondent is Nitin Kumawat, India.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <forbesfounder.com> is registered with PDR Ltd. d/b/a PublicDomainRegistry.com (the “Registrar”).

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the “Center”) on February 5, 2026. On February 5, 2026, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On February 6, 2026, the Registrar transmitted by email to the Center its verification response confirming that the Respondent is listed as the registrant and providing the contact details.

The Center verified that 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 the Respondent of the Complaint, and the proceedings commenced on February 9, 2026. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was March 1, 2026. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent’s default on March 11, 2026.

The Center appointed Miguel B. O’Farrell as the sole panelist in this matter on March 16, 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 Complainant Forbes LLC, a limited liability company organized under the laws of the State of Delaware, United States, is the successor-in-interest to Forbes Inc., a corporation organized under the laws of the State of New York, United States. The Complainant and its affiliates are internationally known companies that participate in a broad range of businesses in the publishing, investment, financial and business fields, among others, using a family of registered and common law trademarks and service marks.

Since 1917, the Complainant has published FORBES magazine, a bi-monthly business magazine that has an extensive United States and worldwide circulation. Since long prior to 2002, the Complainant has also published and continues to publish a number of other print magazines containing the Forbes name, including FORBES MEXICO and other titles.

The Complainant is the owner of numerous trademark registrations for FORBES in many jurisdictions, including the following.

United States Trademark Registration No. 1.141.299 FORBES, registered on November 11, 1980, in class 16;

United States Trademark Registration No. 1.919.483 FORBES, registered on September 19, 1995, in class 35; and

United States Trademark Registration No. 3.776.895 FORBES, registered on April 20, 2010, in class 41.

The Complaint includes full listings of FORBES marks registered in jurisdictions around the world for similar goods and services.

The disputed domain name was registered on February 28, 2024 and resolves to a website offering content similar to the Complainant's website at "www.forbes.com", such as blog and news articles relating to business, technology, real estate, the economy, investments, lifestyle, and general news.

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 Respondent is using the disputed domain name to deceive Internet users into believing that the webpage to which the disputed domain name resolves is associated with the Complainant. This use, and the disputed domain name's inclusion of the famous FORBES mark, is an infringement of the Complainant's FORBES registered trademarks, constitutes unfair competition, and is a fraud on the public.

The Complainant requests the Panel to order the transfer of the disputed domain name to the Complainant.

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 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.

Although the addition of other terms here, "founder" 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 generic Top-Level domain (gTLD) ".com" will be disregarded by the Panel in the confusing similarity test. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), 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 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 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.

The Panel is satisfied that the Respondent must have been aware of the Complainant's trademark FORBES when it registered the disputed domain name on February 28, 2024.

In accordance with section 3.1.4 of the [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), the Panel considers that the inclusion of the Complainant's widely known FORBES trademark in the disputed domain name, by the Respondent who has no relationship with the Complainant, creates a presumption of bad faith registration. The Respondent, when registering the disputed domain name, targeted the Complainant's business and its trademark FORBES, with the intention to confuse Internet users and capitalize on the fame of the Complainant's trademark for its own benefit.

The fact that there is an absence of rights or legitimate interests coupled with no credible explanation for the Respondent's choice of the disputed domain name is also a significant factor that contributes to the finding that the disputed domain name was registered in bad faith (as stated in section 3.2.1 of the [WIPO Overview 3.1](#)).

The disputed domain name resolves to a webpage offering goods and services similar to those offered in the Complainant's official website at "www.forbes.com", which is evidence that the disputed domain name is also being used in bad faith.

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 <forbesfounder.com> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Miguel B. O'Farrell/

Miguel B. O'Farrell

Sole Panelist

Date: March 27, 2026