ARBITRATION
AND
MEDIATION CENTER

WIPO
WORLD
INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY
ORGANIZATION

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

Stripe, LLC v. Scott Kennedy, Replit
Case No. D2026-1628

1. The Parties

The Complainant is Stripe, LLC, United States of America ("United States"), represented by Elster & McGrady LLC, United States.

The Respondent is Scott Kennedy, Replit, United States.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <stripecheckout.net> is registered with Name.com, Inc. (the "Registrar").

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the "Center") on April 16, 2026. On April 17, 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 (None listed) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on April 20, 2026, providing the registrant and contact information disclosed by the Registrar, and inviting the Complainant to submit an amendment to the Complaint. On April 24, 2026, the Complainant requested to suspend the proceedings and the proceedings were suspended on April 27, 2026. The Complainant filed an amended Complaint on May 27, 2026, and requested to reinstitute the proceedings on May 28, 2026. The proceedings were reinstituted on May 29, 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 May 29, 2026. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was June 18, 2026. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent's default on June 19, 2026.

The Center appointed Evan D. Brown as the sole panelist in this matter on June 23, 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 in the business of providing software that enables organizations to accept payments and manage their business online. It owns the trademark STRIPE, for which it enjoys the benefits of registration (see United States Reg. No. 4451679, registered on December 17, 2013).

According to the WhoIs records, the disputed domain name was registered on September 5, 2025. According to the Complaint, the Respondent has used the STRIPE mark in the disputed domain name to create a website that includes the Complainant's distinctive font and color scheme. The Complainant further contends that the content on the website at the disputed domain name was removed after the Complainant sent a takedown request to the Respondent.

5. Parties' Contentions

A. Complainant

The Complainant contends that the disputed domain name is identical or confusingly similar to the Complainant's trademark; that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the disputed domain name; and that the disputed domain name was registered and is being used in bad faith.

B. Respondent

The Respondent did not respond to the Complainant's contentions.

6. Discussion and Findings

To succeed, the Complainant must demonstrate that all of the elements listed in paragraph 4(a) of the Policy have been satisfied: (i) the disputed domain name is identical or confusingly similar to a trademark or service mark in which the Complainant has rights, (ii) the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the disputed domain name, and (iii) the disputed domain name has been registered and is being used in bad faith. The Panel finds that all three of these elements have been met in this case.

A. Identical or Confusingly Similar

This first element functions primarily as a standing requirement. WIPO Overview of WIPO Panel Views on Select UDRP Questions ("WIPO Overview 3.1"), section 1.7. 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. This element requires the Panel to consider two issues: first, whether the Complainant has rights in a relevant mark; and second, whether the disputed domain name is identical or confusingly similar to that mark.

A registered trademark provides a clear indication that the rights in the mark belong to its respective owner. The Complainant has demonstrated its rights in the STRIPE mark by providing evidence of its trademark registration. See WIPO Overview 3.1, section 1.2.1.

The disputed domain name incorporates the STRIPE mark in its entirety with the term "checkout," which does not prevent a finding of confusing similarity between the disputed domain name and the Complainant's STRIPE mark. See WIPO Overview 3.1, section 1.8. The STRIPE mark remains recognizable for a showing of confusing similarity under the Policy.

It is standard practice when comparing a disputed domain name to a complainant's trademarks to not take the extension into account. See WIPO Overview 3.1, section 1.11.1 ("The applicable Top Level Domain ('TLD') in a domain name (e.g., '.com', '.club', '.nyc') is viewed as a standard registration requirement and as such is disregarded under the first element confusing similarity test.").

The Panel finds that the Complainant has established this first element under the Policy.

B. Rights or Legitimate Interests

The Panel evaluates this element of the Policy by first looking to see whether the Complainant has made a prima facie showing that the Respondent lacks rights or legitimate interests in respect of the disputed domain name. If the Complainant makes that showing, the burden of production of demonstrating rights or legitimate interests shifts to the Respondent (with the burden of proof always remaining with the Complainant). See WIPO Overview 3.1, section 2.1; *AXA SA v. Huade Wang*, WIPO Case No. D2022-1289.

On this point, the Complainant asserts, among other things, that: (1) there is no evidence that the Respondent, before any notice of the dispute, used or prepared to use the disputed domain name in connection with a bona fide offering of goods or services; (2) instead, the Respondent intentionally misled Internet users into believing the disputed domain name is authorized by or associated with the Complainant by using the STRIPE mark in the disputed domain name and the Complainant's distinctive branding, including its font and color scheme, on its webpage; and (3) the Respondent further sought to offer its own commercial services at the webpage associated with the disputed domain name, trading on the Complainant's reputation and goodwill.

The Panel finds that the Complainant has made the required prima facie showing. The Respondent has not presented evidence to overcome this prima facie showing. And nothing in the record otherwise tilts the balance in the Respondent's favor. Further, the Panel notes the nature of the disputed domain name consisting of the Complainant's STRIPE mark with the additional term "checkout", which is associated with the Complainant's core business function, cannot constitute fair use as it effectively impersonates or suggests sponsorship or endorsement by the Complainant. WIPO Overview 3.1, section 2.5.1.

Accordingly, the Panel finds that the Complainant has established this second element under the Policy.

C. Registered and Used in Bad Faith

The Policy requires a complainant to establish that a disputed domain name was registered and is being used in bad faith.

The record demonstrates multiple indicators of bad faith registration and use. First, the Respondent targeted the Complainant directly by deliberately selecting a domain name incorporating the Complainant's well-known STRIPE trademark in connection with "checkout," a term associated with the Complainant's core business function.

Most significantly, the record shows that the Respondent intentionally attempted to attract, for commercial gain, Internet users to its website by creating a likelihood of confusion with the Complainant's STRIPE mark as to the source, sponsorship, affiliation, and endorsement of the website and the services offered thereon. The Respondent's deliberate use of the STRIPE mark in the disputed domain name, its use of the Complainant's distinctive font and color scheme on the website at the disputed domain name, and its offer of commercial services in direct competition with that of the Complainant all constitute evidence that the Respondent sought to exploit the Complainant's reputation and goodwill for its own commercial benefit. This is precisely the type of opportunistic conduct that the UDRP was designed to address. Removal of the content on the website at the disputed domain name after the Complainant's takedown request does not alter this finding, but rather further supports a finding of bad faith.

The Panel finds that the Complainant has established this third element under the Policy. The disputed domain name was registered and is being used 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 <stripecheckout.net> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Evan D. Brown/
Evan D. Brown
Sole Panelist
Date: July 6, 2026