

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

Finextra Research Limited v. Ka Buda

Case No. D2026-0597

1. The Parties

The Complainant is Finextra Research Limited, United Kingdom, represented by Osborne Clarke, United Kingdom.

The Respondent is Ka Buda, United States of America (the “United States”).

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

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

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the “Center”) on February 10, 2026. On February 12, 2026, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On February 12, 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 20, 2026. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was March 12, 2026. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent’s default on March 19, 2026.

The Center appointed Taras Kyslyy as the sole panelist in this matter on March 27, 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 is a worldwide independent newswire and information source in financial technology, operating under the name FINEXTRA. The Complainant publishes online news, research articles, white papers and case studies, covering all significant technology in both wholesale and retail banking, capital markets and insurance areas. Established twenty years ago, FINEXTRA hosts over 150,000 unique items of content on these topics. This has built the Complainant's online reputation as an authority on these topics, both among the audience in these markets and with search engines serving content. As a result, the Complainant's website at "www.finextra.com" is visited by some 425,000 professionals operating in the financial technology arena each month. FINEXTRA TV is viewed by 25,000 individuals each month, consuming 11,000 minutes of content. The Complainant organizes numerous online webinars which are transmitted worldwide and also hosts sponsored events in the United Kingdom, Europe and United States. The large annual events draw in over a thousand attendees at a time and are sponsored by many global banks such as Deutsche Bank, RBS and J.P.Morgan, and IT giants such as IBM, Dell and Microsoft, among others. The Complainant also hosts an online blogging service with 40,901 members worldwide, allowing financial technology professionals and subject matter experts to publish and share their own related content.

The Complainant is the proprietor of a number of trademarks for FINEXTRA, including for instance the United States trademark registration No. 5672628, registered on February 12, 2019.

The disputed domain name was registered on August 3, 2025, and resolved to a website identical to the Complainant's website. At the time of the Decision, the disputed domain name does not resolve to any active website.

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 the Complainant's trademark since it fully incorporates the Complainant's trademark.

The Complainant also contends that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name. There is no evidence to suggest that the disputed domain name is being used in connection with a bona fide offer of financial services. At the time of the filing of the Complaint, the disputed domain name used to resolve to an identical copy of the Complainant's website and posed a potential security risk to users, as it included data capture pages such as login pages and password recovery pages. The Respondent has no genuine actual or legitimate business which uses the mark FINEXTRA. Therefore, the Respondent has no genuine business relating to the disputed domain name, makes no fair use of the disputed domain name and has no legitimate basis for its retention.

Finally, the Complainant contends that the disputed domain name was registered and is being used in bad faith. The Complainant argues that it was registered and used to misrepresent the true nature of the associated business and to exploit the Complainant's name and trademark in order to attract users, for commercial gain, by creating a false impression of affiliation with 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 identical to the mark for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.7.

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.

There is nothing in the record that suggests that the Respondent is commonly known by the disputed domain name, which could support a finding of rights or legitimate interests (see, e.g., *World Natural Bodybuilding Federation, Inc. v. Daniel Jones, TheDotCafe*, WIPO Case No. [D2008-0642](#)).

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

Noting the high risk of implied affiliation between the disputed domain name and the widely known trademark of the Complainant, the Panel finds that there is no plausible fair use to which the disputed domain name could be put without suggesting some form of connection with the Complainant to the Complainant (see, e.g., *Instagram, LLC v. Super Privacy Service LTD c/o Dynadot / Zayed*, WIPO Case No. [D2019-2897](#)).

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 registered the disputed domain name, which is identical to the Complainant's widely known trademark, and used it for a website copying the Complainant's original website. The Panel finds that this confirms that, at the time of registration of the disputed domain name, the Respondent was aware and targeted the Complainant and its trademark, which constitutes bad faith.

The mere registration of a domain name that is identical or confusingly similar to a famous or widely known trademark by an unaffiliated entity may by itself create a presumption of bad faith. The Panel is convinced that the Complainant's trademark is well established through long and widespread use and the Complainant has acquired a significant reputation and level of goodwill in its trademark internationally. Thus, the Panel finds that the disputed domain name identical to the Complainant's trademark, was registered in bad faith. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 3.1.4.

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 3.1](#), section 3.2.1.

According to paragraph 4(b)(iv) of the Policy the following circumstances, in particular but without limitation, if found by the Panel to be present, shall be evidence of the registration and use of a domain name in bad faith: by using the domain name, you have intentionally attempted to attract, for commercial gain, Internet users to your website or other online location, by creating a likelihood of confusion with the Complainant's mark as to the source, sponsorship, affiliation, or endorsement of your website or location or of a product or service on your website or location. In this case, the disputed domain name was resolving to a website copying the Complainant's official website and falsely pretended to be of the Complainant to intentionally attract Internet users by creating likelihood of confusion with the Complainant's trademark as to the source of the website and its products. The Panel finds the above confirms the disputed domain name was registered and used in bad faith.

Panels have held that the use of a domain name for illegitimate activity here, claimed, impersonation / passing off, 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.

Although at the time of this Decision the disputed domain name resolves to inactive webpage, its previous bad faith use and lack of explanation of possible good faith use from the Respondent makes any good faith use of the disputed domain name implausible. Thus, the current passive holding of the disputed domain name does not prevent a finding of bad faith. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 3.3.

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 <finextra.org> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Taras Kyslyy/

Taras Kyslyy

Sole Panelist

Date: April 10, 2026