

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

Keeta, Inc. v. li jun
Case No. D2026-0670

1. The Parties

The Complainant is Keeta, Inc., United States of America (“United States”), represented by Envision IP LLC, United States.

The Respondent is li jun, Hong Kong, China.

2. The Domain Names and Registrar

The disputed domain names <keeta.fund> and <keeta.investments> are registered with Gname.com Pte. Ltd. (the “Registrar”).

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the “Center”) on February 17, 2026. On February 17, 2026, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain names. On February 18, 2026, the Registrar transmitted by email to the Center its verification response, disclosing registrant and contact information for the disputed domain names which differed from the named Respondent (Redacted for Privacy) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on the same day, 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 20, 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 23, 2026. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was March 15, 2026. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent’s default on March 20, 2026.

The Center appointed William A. Van Caenegem as the sole panelist in this matter on March 25, 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 fintech company focusing on cross-border payments. The Complainant is headquartered in Santa Monica, California, United States, and maintains the “Keeta Token” as a blockchain governance token used for transaction fees, staking, governance, and enabling on-chain compliance features.

The Complainant owns the following registrations for the word mark KEETA: United Kingdom Trademark Registration Number 3932009 in relation to classes 9, 36, 42 and registered on January 24, 2025; European Union Trademark Registration Number 018899178 in relation to classes 36 and 42 registered on February 10, 2024; International Trademark Registration Number 1738181 in relation to class 36 registered on June 7, 2023; and International Trademark Registration Number 1738182 in relation to class 9 and registered on June 8, 2023.

The Complainant, for whom the Internet is the principal marketing channel, also maintains a web presence *inter alia* by way of its website at “www.keeta.com”.

The disputed domain names were registered on July 11, 2025. The disputed domain names resolve to identical websites that display the KEETA trademark of the Complainant in connection with financial and digital asset services and promote blockchain and Web3-related infrastructure. They also expressly reference the Complainant’s company and list the Complainant’s CEO among “founding members” of a company allegedly operating the 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 names.

Notably, the Complainant contends that the disputed domain names are confusingly similar to the KEETA trademark of the Complainant. The generic Top-Level Domains (“gTLDs”) “fund” and “investments” are to be disregarded for the purpose of comparison, the Complainant says. In any case, those terms are descriptive of the Complainant’s services and therefore do not operate to distinguish the disputed domain names from the Complainant’s mark. The Complainant adds that the Respondent’s use of the KEETA trademark for investment and digital asset-related services makes clear that the mark remains immediately recognizable in the disputed domain names.

The Complainant goes on to assert that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain names. The Complainant says that it has not licensed, authorized, or otherwise permitted the Respondent to use the KEETA trademark in a domain name or in any other manner, and adds that there is no evidence that the Respondent is commonly known by the name “Keeta” within the meaning of paragraph 4(c)(ii) of the Policy. The Complainant points out that not only does the Respondent copy its trademark on the websites to which the domain names resolve, the latter also refer to the CEO of the Complainant as the CEO of the Respondent. Such a false representation cannot constitute rights or legitimate interests, the Complainant asserts. The Complainant also points out that the relevant Respondent’s websites list as “co-founders” individuals associated with investment firms that have invested in the Complainant. The Complainant says that these individuals are publicly known for their roles at

investment firms that provided funding to the Complainant, and that by presenting such individuals as “co-founders” of the Respondent, the latter’s websites falsely suggest that the Respondent is backed by the same investors and leadership as the Complainant. By so doing the Respondent intends to mislead users into believing the Respondent’s websites are the Complainant’s official platform, a deliberate misrepresentation that cannot constitute a bona fide offering of goods or services under paragraph 4(c)(i), the Complainant says. The Complainant adds that the Respondent in fact is attempting to appropriate the Complainant’s corporate identity by copying the Complainant’s KEETA trademark on its websites. The Complainant adds that the Respondent’s use of the disputed domain names is solely and clearly for commercial purposes.

The Complainant also says that the Respondent has demonstrated bad faith in different forms. The Respondent registered the disputed domain names which incorporate the Complainant’s distinctive KEETA trademark in its entirety and combine it with descriptive financial gTLDs directly associated with investment services and is using both disputed domain names to resolve to the same website prominently branded as “Keeta,” offering trading and investment services in forex and cryptocurrencies, the Complainant points out. It also falsely lists the Complainant’s CEO as the CEO of the Respondent, a deliberate impersonation which the Complainant says underscores the fact that the Respondent was plainly aware of the Complainant and its KEETA trademark at the time of registration and registered the disputed domain names specifically to pass itself off as the Complainant. The Complainant underscores the fact that panels have consistently held that the use of a domain name for impersonation, passing off, or other deceptive conduct constitutes compelling evidence of bad faith registration and use.

Given the inclusion of the KEETA trademark in the impugned websites and the use of the disputed domain names in relation to a financial services platform, the Complainant says that the Respondent must clearly have been aware of the Complainant and its rights in the KEETA trademark at the time of registration of the disputed domain names. The Complainant reiterates that by misappropriating the Complainant’s trademark and falsely identifying the Complainant’s CEO as its own CEO, the Respondent is deliberately impersonating the Complainant and attempting to pass itself off as an official investment service affiliated with the Complainant, conduct which squarely falls within paragraph 4(b)(iv) of the Policy. The Complainant further asserts that there is no conceivable good-faith explanation for registering the disputed domain names and populating the associated websites with the names of the Complainant’s CEO and individuals associated with firms which have invested with the Complainant.

The Complainant concludes by saying that the Respondent’s false presentation of itself as “Keeta,” combined with the use of the Complainant’s executive identity, demonstrates an intent to mislead users and potentially facilitate fraud, a form of illegal activity that strongly supports a finding of bad faith.

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 names. 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 KEETA is reproduced within the disputed domain names. Accordingly, the disputed domain names are identical to the mark for the purposes of the Policy.

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 names. 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 names such as those enumerated in the Policy or otherwise.

Panels have held that the use of a domain name for illegitimate activity, here claimed passing off, can never confer rights or legitimate interests on a respondent.

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 registered two domain names that each contains the distinctive mark of the Complainant under the gTLDs corresponding to the kind of services in the financial sphere that the Complainant offers under its KEETA mark. The registration of the disputed domain names also postdates the registrations of the KEETA mark by the Complainant. The inescapable inference is that the Respondent was well aware of the Complainant and its rights at the time of registration of the disputed domain names and therefore acted in bad faith at that time. The establishment of websites to which the disputed domain names resolve that not only offer very similar financial services, but also display the Complainant’s trademark, reference the Complainant’s company name and list the Complainant’s CEO among its own founding members, clearly demonstrates not only registration but also use in bad faith. Passing off and impersonation cannot amount to good faith use.

Having reviewed the record, the Panel thus finds the Respondent’s registration and use of the disputed domain names 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 names <keeta.fund> and <keeta.investments> be transferred to the Complainant.

/William A. Van Caenegem/

William A. Van Caenegem

Sole Panelist

Date: April 11, 2026