

## **ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION**

Kion Group AG v. Dana Brems  
Case No. D2026-0891

### **1. The Parties**

The Complainant is Kion Group AG, Germany, represented by Bettinger Rechtsanwälte Partnerschaft mbB, Germany.

The Respondent is Dana Brems, United Kingdom.

### **2. The Domain Name and Registrar**

The disputed domain name <kiongoup.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 February 28, 2026. On March 2, 2026, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On March 3, 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 (Redacted for Privacy, Privacy service provided by Withheld for Privacy ehf) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on March 3, 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 March 6, 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 March 10, 2026. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was March 30, 2026. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent’s default on March 31, 2026.

The Center appointed Mladen Vukmir as the sole panelist in this matter on April 14, 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 multinational engineering and logistics technology company headquartered in Frankfurt, Germany, founded in 2006. The Complainant is a global provider of industrial trucks, warehouse equipment, intralogistics, and supply chain automation solutions, with extensive operations and sales/service locations in over 100 countries.

The Complainant holds numerous registered trademarks across various jurisdictions, including: International Registration No. 1693404 for the word mark KION, registered April 22, 2022, covering goods and services in Classes 7, 9, 12, 35, 36, 37, 39, 41, and 42; International Trade Mark Registration No. 1134792 for the figurative mark KION, registered May 8, 2012, covering goods and services in Classes 7, 9, 12, 20, 36, and 39; and International Registration No. 1134793 for the word mark KION GROUP, registered May 8, 2012, covering goods and services in Classes 7, 9, 12, 20, 36, and 39 (the "KION GROUP trademarks").

The Complainant promotes its products and services globally through its main website at "www.kion.com". In addition, the Complainant owns a portfolio of domain names reflecting its KION GROUP trademarks, including domain names such as <kion.com>, <kion.de>, <kiongroup.com> and <kion.group>, as well as a number of domain names combining its marks with descriptive or additional terms, including <kion.industries>, <kioninformationmanagement.com>, <kion-informationmanagement.com>, <kion-material-handling.com>, <kion-information-management.com>, <kion-materialhandling.com>, <kion-baoli.com>, <kion-mh.com>, and <kion-invest.com>.

The disputed domain name was registered on February 25, 2026. According to the evidence submitted by the Complainant, the disputed domain name previously redirected to a third party page displaying sponsored pay-per-click ("PPC") links relating to supply chain and logistics topics. At the time of this Decision, the disputed domain name does not resolve to an 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:

i) the Complainant is the owner of the well-known and globally recognized KION GROUP registered trademarks and brand. Since its founding in 2006, the Complainant has become a globally recognized provider of industrial trucks and supply chain solutions, which are registered for various products and services.

(ii) the disputed domain name fully integrates the Complainant's KION GROUP trademark and constitutes an obvious misspelling of the Complainant's KION GROUP trademark, specifically by omitting the letter "r" from "group". This represents a classic case of typosquatting, where the disputed domain name is deliberately designed to capture Internet users who inadvertently mistype the Complainant's mark. The generic Top-Level Domain ("gTLD") (".com") is irrelevant for the purpose of assessing confusing similarity.

(iii) the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name. The Complainant has not licensed, authorized, or otherwise permitted the Respondent to use its KION GROUP trademarks. The Respondent is using the disputed domain name for a PPC parking page, generating commercial gain by diverting Internet users seeking the Complainant. Such use does not constitute a bona fide offering of goods or services or a legitimate noncommercial or fair use under the Policy.

(iv) the Respondent registered and is using the disputed domain name in bad faith. The globally recognized KION GROUP trademarks make it highly likely that the Respondent was aware of them when registering the disputed domain name. The deliberate typographical variation (typosquatting) evidences knowledge of the Complainant's mark and an intent to target it. The use of the disputed domain name to resolve to a PPC parking page with links directly related to the Complainant's field of activity demonstrates an intentional attempt to attract Internet users for commercial gain by creating a likelihood of confusion with the Complainant's mark.

## **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 Complainant holds numerous registered trademarks for KION and KION GROUP.

The Panel finds the Complainant's KION GROUP trademarks are recognizable within the disputed domain name. In particular, the disputed domain name incorporates the dominant part of the Complainant's KION GROUP mark, with the omission of the letter "r" from "group". This constitutes a clear misspelling, commonly referred to as typosquatting. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.9, states that a domain name which consists of a common, obvious, or intentional misspelling of a trademark should be considered confusingly similar to the relevant mark for purposes of the first element. The gTLD ".com" is disregarded for the purpose of assessing confusing similarity. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.11.

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 not licensed, authorized, or otherwise permitted the Respondent to use its KION GROUP trademarks. There is no evidence that the Respondent has been commonly known by the disputed domain name. The Respondent's use of the disputed domain name to redirect, according to the evidence submitted by the Complainant, to a PPC parking page displaying commercial links related to logistics and supply chain services does not amount to a bona fide offering of goods or services within the meaning of paragraph 4(c)(i) of the Policy. Panels consistently hold that the use of a domain name for PPC parking pages, especially where such PPC links capitalize on the reputation and goodwill of the complainant's trademark, does not give rise to rights or legitimate interests. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 2.9. Furthermore, such commercial use, insofar as it is intended to capitalize on Internet user confusion, is not considered a legitimate noncommercial or fair use under paragraph 4(c)(iii) of the Policy.

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 finds that the Respondent has intentionally attempted to attract, for commercial gain, Internet users to its website by creating a likelihood of confusion with the Complainant's mark within the meaning of paragraph 4(b)(iv) of the Policy. The disputed domain name constitutes a clear misspelling of the Complainant's KION GROUP trademark, differing only by the omission of the letter "r" in the word "group". The Panel considers that such an intentional typographical variation is indicative of typosquatting and demonstrates that the Respondent was aware of and targeted the Complainant's mark at the time of registration.

The Panel further notes that the Complainant has provided evidence that the disputed domain name previously redirected to a PPC parking page displaying links related to supply chain and logistics services, corresponding to the Complainant's field of activity. The Panel considers that such use is indicative of an attempt to attract Internet users for commercial gain by creating a likelihood of confusion with the Complainant's mark, within the meaning of paragraph 4(b)(iv) of the Policy (see [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 3.5). The Panel further observes that the disputed domain name constitutes an apparent misspelling of the Complainant's mark, which lends additional support to a finding of bad faith.

The Panel observes that the disputed domain name does not currently resolve to an active website. However, panels have consistently found that the non-use of a domain name does not as such prevent a finding of bad faith. In the circumstances of this case, including the distinctiveness or reputation of the Complainant's mark, the typosquatting nature of the disputed domain name, its prior use, and the absence of any response or evidence of good faith use, the Panel finds that the current inactive status of the disputed domain name does not prevent a finding of bad faith (see [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 3.3; *Telstra Corporation Limited v. Nuclear Marshmallows*, WIPO Case No. [D2000-0003](#)).

In light of the above, the Panel concludes that the disputed domain name was registered and is being used in bad faith within the meaning of paragraph 4(a)(iii) of 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 <kiongoup.com> be transferred to the Complainant.

*/Mladen Vukmir/*

**Mladen Vukmir**

Sole Panelist

Date: April 28, 2026