

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

The Knowledge Academy Holdings Limited v. Vu Binh Minh, Web Agency Fortune

Case No. D2026-1501

1. The Parties

The Complainant is The Knowledge Academy Holdings Limited, United Kingdom, represented by Michelmores LLP, United Kingdom.

The Respondent is Vu Binh Minh, Web Agency Fortune, Viet Nam.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <thedigitalknowledgeacademy.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 April 9, 2026. On April 9, 2026, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On April 10, 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 (Privacy service provided by Withheld for Privacy ehf) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on April 14, 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 April 14, 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 April 21, 2026. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was May 11, 2026. The Respondent sent email communications to the Center on April 21 and 22, 2026, confirming that it has decided not to contest the Complaint and it will not be submitting a Response. On April 23, 2026, the Center notified the Parties that it would proceed to appoint the Administrative Panel.

The Center appointed Willem J. H. Leppink as the sole panelist in this matter on May 4, 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 following facts are undisputed.

The Complainant is a company registered in England and Wales, United Kingdom, incorporated on July 4, 2013. The Complainant is the holding company of The Knowledge Academy Limited, incorporated on April 1, 2009. The Knowledge Academy Limited is a global business and IT training company providing training solutions to corporate, public and private sector clients, as well as individuals. The Complainant provides training courses globally, with the capability to deliver over 30,000 courses in over 1,000 locations across 190 countries. To date, the Complainant has trained over 1 million delegates.

The Complainant owns various trademark registrations worldwide in relation to THE KNOWLEDGE ACADEMY, including the International registration THE KNOWLEDGE ACADEMY (word mark) with registration number 1269174, registered on April 22, 2015 for goods and services in classes 9, 16, 35 and 41 designating a wide variety of jurisdictions and the European Union Trade Mark for THE KNOWLEDGE ACADEMY (word mark) with registration number 018157130, registered on May 22, 2020 for goods and services in classes 9, 16, 35 and 41.

The Complainant is the registrant of inter alia the domain name <theknowledgeacademy.com> which was registered on March 9, 2009.

The disputed domain name was registered on February 16, 2026. At the time of filing the Complaint and at the time of rendering this Decision, the website to which the disputed domain name resolves displays a website under the heading “Digiacademy” and prominently displaying the sentence “Welcome to Digital Knowledge Academy”. The website mentions the following “We are building a digital knowledge hub designed for long term learning and real application. Our platform delivers purpose driven digital education through a curated library of practical courses and ebooks. Whether you are a business owner looking to scale or an individual ready to learn, we have the practical resources you need to succeed.”

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 the following.

The Complainant is one of the world’s largest and most established providers of training courses, selecting subject matter experts with extensive industry knowledge to deliver its educational programs. The quality of the Complainant’s teaching and course material is evidenced by the broad range of professional accreditations it holds, including from Axelos, APMG, The Open Group, PMI, APM, and Microsoft.

Such services are offered by reference to the Complainant’s trademarks, which have been used extensively in connection with a range of education-related goods and services since 2009. The Complainant has promoted its goods and services bearing these trademarks both online, through its websites, and offline, through a variety of publications. As a result, the Complainant has built up substantial goodwill and a valuable reputation in its trademarks in relation to the goods and services for which they are registered, with which the Complainant alone is associated. The goodwill associated with the Complainant’s trademarks is the property of the Complainant and cannot pass to any third party without a formal assignment.

The disputed domain name is identical or confusingly similar to the Complainant's trademarks and to the Complainant's business and trading name. The word elements of the Complainant's marks and the disputed domain name differ only in the addition of the word "digital" after "the". The dominant and distinctive element of both the Complainant's marks and the disputed domain name is KNOWLEDGE ACADEMY. The addition of "digital" does not lend any distinctiveness to the disputed domain name and is, if anything, likely to increase the risk of confusion, given the nature of the Complainant's business and services. As set out above, the Complainant delivers its training courses both in person and remotely through digital means. Accordingly, there is a high likelihood that the use of "digital" will cause Internet users to associate the disputed domain name with the Complainant's business. The widespread recognition of the Complainant's trademarks contributes to strong brand association and recall. Given that the Complainant operates as a global commercial enterprise with an established brand identity and reputation, there is a significant risk that consumers will confuse the disputed domain name with the Complainant when conducting searches online.

The Respondent is not using the disputed domain name in connection with any offering of goods or services prior to its registration. Moreover, the Respondent is not commonly known by the disputed domain name. Given the Complainant's reputation, it is reasonable to conclude that the Respondent registered the disputed domain name with full knowledge of the Complainant's trademarks and reputation, with the intention of attracting the Internet's users searching for the Complainant and capitalizing on the goodwill associated with the Complainant. The Respondent has not acquired, and could not have acquired, any legitimate rights to use the disputed domain name, either before or since its registration.

The disputed domain name was registered and is being used in bad faith. It is reasonable to conclude that the Respondent registered the disputed domain name with the intention of infringing the Complainant's trademarks, deceiving the Internet's users into believing that the goods and services offered by the Respondent are connected to the Complainant, and creating the false impression that the Respondent and the Complainant are associated.

The website to which the disputed domain names resolves offers courses in areas identical to those of the Complainant, creating a clear risk of consumer confusion. Moreover, the website to which the disputed domain names resolves displays numerous hallmarks of an illegitimate operation: users are required to register an account before adding items to their cart, apparently to harvest personal data, yet no verification email is sent upon registration. The "About" page contains only a generic placeholder email address, and neither the Terms and Conditions nor the Privacy Policy identify any responsible legal entity. Although the website displays payment buttons for Visa, Mastercard, PayPal, and Google Pay, none are functional; payment is offered only by bank transfer or cheque, with the cheque details consisting of placeholder text. Social media buttons do not link to external platforms but loop back to the same page, and blog content appears to have been AI-generated. Taken together, these features are strongly indicative of a website designed to deceive consumers and collect personal and financial data, confirming bad faith registration and use. Furthermore, the website to which the disputed domain name resolves states that the courses delivered are "Trusted by Business Owners and Marketers" without providing details of a legal entity or individual. Moreover, it refers to 5-star reviews which appear to have been produced using generative AI.

B. Respondent

The Respondent replied to the Complaint by email, informing the Center that the disputed domain name was registered on behalf of a customer in the course of web design work, based on the customer's suggested name. The Respondent further stated that the website to which the disputed domain name resolves is newly established and that there was no intention to compete with the Complainant or to create any conflict.

Following a review of the situation, the Respondent informed the Center that it had decided not to contest the Complaint and would not be submitting any further substantive Response, leaving the matter to proceed in accordance with the UDRP process.

6. Discussion and Findings

A. Consent to Remedy

The Complainant has put forward evidence of trademark rights in the mark THE KNOWLEDGE ACADEMY, as well as a prima facie case that the Respondent does not have rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name that was not rebutted by the Respondent. However, the Respondent contends that it was not in bad faith when registering or using the disputed domain name, but has also specifically stated in its informal Response that it has decided not to contest the Complaint. The Panel considers that the communication by the Respondent can be seen as an informal consent to transfer the disputed domain name to the Complainant.

The Panel does not find it appropriate in this case to proceed with a substantive decision on the merits of the case. In this regard, the Panel notes that the Respondent does not appear to have been involved in any other disputes under the Policy, and without making a specific determination notes that there is no evidence of egregious bad faith demanding recognition in the record of this proceeding.

In line with WIPO Overview of WIPO Panel Views on Select UDRP Questions (“[WIPO Overview 3.1](#)”), the Panel will order the requested remedy, solely on the basis of this consent.

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 <thedigitalknowledgeacademy.com> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Willem J. H. Leppink/

Willem J. H. Leppink

Sole Panelist

Date: May 18, 2026