

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

Kite Pharma, Inc. v. Chirag Mittal, Mastec
Case No. D2026-1485

1. The Parties

The Complainant is Kite Pharma, Inc., United States of America (“United States”), represented by Gilead Sciences, Inc., United States.

The Respondent is Chirag Mittal, Mastec, India.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <kite-pharma.org> 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 April 7, 2026. On April 8, 2026, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On the same date, 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 April 10, 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 amendment to the Complaint on April 13, 2026.

The Center verified that the Complaint together with the amendment to 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 April 16, 2026. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was May 6, 2026. The Respondent sent email communications to the Center on April 10, 13, and 16, 2026. The Center notified the Parties of commencement of panel appointment process on May 8, 2026.

The Center appointed Kaya Köklü as the sole panelist in this matter on May 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 biopharmaceutical company that develops cancer immunotherapy products.

The Complainant is the owner of various KITE and KITE PHARMA trademark registrations, including the following:

United States Trademark Registration No. 6108120, registered on July 21, 2020, for KITE, in class 40;
European Union Trade Mark Registration No. 013843206, registered on July 21, 2015, for KITE PHARMA, in classes 5, 40, and 42; and
Indian Trademark Registration No. 3051404, registered on September 9, 2015, for KITE PHARMA, in classes 5, 40, and 42.

The Complainant further operates its official website at <kitepharma.com>.

The Respondent is reportedly located in India.

The disputed domain name was registered on March 25, 2026.

According to un rebutted evidence provided by the Complainant, the disputed domain name resolved to a website in English language, promoting cancer immunotherapy treatments while prominently using the Complainant's KITE and KITE PHARMA trademarks and creating the look and feel of the Complainant's website as if the website under the disputed domain name is operated by the Complainant.

At the time of this Decision, the disputed domain name no longer resolves 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.

B. Respondent

The Respondent did not contest the Complainant's contentions.

Rather, in its email communications to the Center on April 10, and 13, 2026, the Respondent claimed to be a freelancer and have registered the disputed domain name on behalf of a client and further provided in English language its explicit consent to transfer the disputed domain name to the Complainant.

This consent was reiterated in the Respondent's email correspondence to the Center dated April 16, 2026, in which the Respondent expressly stated: "I confirm that I do not intent to contest this matter." Further, the Respondent stated: "I remain willing to cooperate fully and consent to the transfer of the [disputed] domain name to the Complainant."

Despite this consent to transfer, a suspension of the administrative proceeding was refused by the Complainant.

6. Discussion and Findings

According to paragraph 15(a) of the Rules, the Panel shall decide the Complaint in accordance with the Policy, the Rules and any rules and principles of law that it deems applicable.

In accordance with paragraph 4(a) of the Policy, the Complainant must prove that each of the three following elements is satisfied:

the disputed domain name is identical or confusingly similar to a trademark in which the Complainant has rights; and

the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the disputed domain name; and

the disputed domain name has been registered and is being used in bad faith.

It is further noted that the Panel has taken note of the WIPO Overview of WIPO Panel Views on Select UDRP Questions ("[WIPO Overview 3.1](#)") and, where appropriate, will decide consistently with the consensus views captured therein.

A. Consent to Transfer

The Panel notes that even without a formal settlement between the Parties, a consent for the transfer of the disputed domain name by the Respondent can provide sufficient basis for an order for transfer without the need for substantial consideration of the UDRP grounds and the further merits of the case. In view of [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 4.10, a panel may "order the requested remedy solely on the basis of such consent".

In its email communications to the Center of April 10, 13, and 16, 2026, the Respondent unambiguously and repeatedly expressed its willingness and consent to unconditionally transfer the disputed domain name to the Complainant, particularly stating "I remain willing to cooperate fully and consent to the transfer of the domain name to the Complainant".

The fact that no settlement has been concluded between the Parties does, in view of the Panel, not affect the effectiveness of the Respondent's unilateral consent to the transfer of the disputed domain name.

B. Conclusion

The Panel notes that despite the willingness of the Respondent to transfer the disputed domain name, the Complainant did not request a suspension of the proceedings.

As a consequence, the Panel orders the transfer of the disputed domain name based on the Respondent's consent to transfer and exceptionally renders its Decision in summary form.

Nevertheless, the Panel notes that in one of its email communications the Respondent claimed that the Respondent is "a freelancer and had registered this domain on behalf of a client". There is no evidence on the existence of the relation between the Respondent and the alleged beneficial holder as it did not disclose the identity of the beneficial holder, nor provide any evidence to support such claim. In the light of the above, the Panel considers it appropriate to find that the Registrar-confirmed registrant "Chirag Mittal" is the sole Respondent in this proceeding. The Panel further notes that references to the Respondent's lack of rights or legitimate interests, and the registration and use by the Respondent, shall be construed to include the final holder of the disputed domain name (if there is any different to the Respondent). *CHRISTUS HEALTH v. Jessica Nelson*, WIPO Case No. [D2025-2805](#), and *VDA Verband der Automobilindustrie e.V. v. iasoft group*, WIPO Case No. [D2024-2619](#).

Even if the Respondent would not have provided its consent to transfer the disputed domain name, the Panel finds that (without the need to go into details) the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to the Complainant's KITE and KITE PHARMA trademarks, the Respondent does not have rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name, and the disputed domain name was registered and is being used in bad faith. The disputed domain name resolved to a website promoting cancer immunotherapy treatments while prominently using the Complainant's KITE and KITE PHARMA trademarks and creating the look and feel of the Complainant's website giving the impression that the associated website is operated by the Complainant. Noting the composition of the disputed domain name and its use, such disputed domain name cannot give rise to rights or legitimate interests, and leads to a finding of registration and use in bad faith.

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 <kite-pharma.org> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Kaya Köklü/

Kaya Köklü

Sole Panelist

Date: May 22, 2026