

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

Kyndryl, Inc. v. Enrich Labs, Enrich Labs
Case No. D2026-1713

1. The Parties

The Complainant is Kyndryl, Inc., United States of America ("United States"), represented by Com Laude Limited, United Kingdom.

The Respondent is Enrich Labs, Enrich Labs, United Arab Emirates.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain names <connectkyndryl.com>, <gokyndryl.com>, <hellokyndryl.com>, <hikyndryl.com>, <joinkyndryl.com>, <startkyndryl.com> are registered with Realtime Register B.V. (the "Registrar").

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was initially filed for ten domain names with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the "Center") on April 22, 2026. On April 23, 2026, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On April 23, 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) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on April 28, 2026, providing the registrant and contact information disclosed by the Registrar, and inviting the Complainant to submit an amendment to the Complaint. The proceedings were suspended on May 6, 2026, upon the request of the Complainant, and were reinstituted on June 10, 2026. On June 2, 2026, the Complainant confirmed that four domain names had been transferred to the Complainant via settlement. The Complainant filed an amended Complaint for six disputed domain names on June 3, 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 June 10, 2026. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5,

the due date for Response was June 30, 2026. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent's default on July 3, 2026.

The Center appointed Daniel Peña as the sole panelist in this matter on July 8, 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 company incorporated in the United States of America and forms part of the group operating under the name Kyndryl Holdings, Inc.

The Complainant designs, builds, manages, and modernizes complex, mission-critical information systems. It was formerly IBM's Global Technology Services infrastructure services business, comprising more than a quarter of IBM's employees and serving over 4,000 clients. Seventy-five percent of Fortune 100 companies are among the Complainant's clients. In the fiscal year 2023, the Complainant generated revenues of approximately USD 17 billion. It is currently one of the largest IT service providers in the world, employing more than 90,000 people and operating in over 60 countries.

The name "Kyndryl" was announced on April 12, 2021, and is derived from the words "kin" and "tendrils," symbolizing growing collaboration to foster human progress.

The Complainant owns a large global portfolio of registered trademarks for the term KYNDRYL. By way of example, the Complainant holds the following registrations: Trademark No. 30047/2021 for KYNDRYL in Mauritius, registered on March 1, 2021, in classes 09, 35, 37, 38, 41, and 42; Trademark No. 4754262 for KYNDRYL in France, registered on April 12, 2021, in classes 09, 35, 37, 38, 41, and 42; International Registration No. 1628208 for KYNDRYL, registered on June 14, 2021, in classes 09, 35, 37, 38, 41, and 42; and United States Registration No. 7537618 for KYNDRYL, registered on October 15, 2024, in class 16. Extracts from the relevant trademark databases have been exhibited in the record.

The disputed domain names were registered on March 13, 2026, and resolve to inactive websites that display the message "Connection timed out".

5. Parties' Contentions

A. Complainant

The Complainant contends that it has satisfied each of the elements required under the Policy for transfer of the disputed domain names. Its KYNDRYL mark is highly distinctive and predates the registrations by more than five years. The disputed domain names incorporate the mark in its entirety, combined with descriptive terms such as "go", "hi", "hello", "start", "join," and "connect," which do not prevent a finding of confusing similarity under Section 1.8 of the WIPO Overview of WIPO Panel Views on Select UDRP Questions ("[WIPO Overview 3.1](#)"). The Complainant submits that the mark remains the dominant element and that the ".com" suffix is irrelevant, satisfying paragraph 4(a)(i).

Regarding rights or legitimate interests, the Complainant asserts that the Respondent is neither commonly known by KYNDRYL nor authorized to use the mark, and has shown no evidence of bona fide or fair use. Passive holding of the disputed domain names does not confer legitimacy, as confirmed in prior UDRP cases. Accordingly, paragraph 4(a)(ii) is met.

Finally, the Complainant contends that the domain names were registered and used in bad faith. Passive holding in light of the mark's reputation, concealment of identity, and configuration of MX/SPF records enabling deceptive email use all support a finding of bad faith under paragraph 4(a)(iii), consistent with

Sections 3.1.4 and 3.3 of the [WIPO Overview 3.1](#).

B. Respondent

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

6. Discussion and Findings

A. Identical or Confusingly Similar

The Panel notes that the Complainant owns a substantial portfolio of trademark registrations KYNDRYL. The earliest of these registrations predates the registration of the disputed domain names by more than five years.

Each disputed domain name incorporates the KYNDRYL mark in its entirety, together with descriptive terms such as "go", "hi", "hello", "start", "join," and "connect, ". In accordance with section 1.8 of the [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), the addition of such terms does not prevent a finding of confusing similarity where the trademark remains clearly recognizable. The Panel further disregards the ".com" suffix as a technical requirement.

Accordingly, the Panel concludes that the disputed domain names are confusingly similar to the trademark in which the Complainant has rights, and that the requirement under paragraph 4(a)(i) of the Policy is satisfied.

B. Rights or Legitimate Interests

The Panel notes that the Respondent has not been shown to be commonly known by the disputed domain names, with or without the added terms. There is no evidence that the Respondent has acquired any trademark rights in KYNDRYL, nor that it has ever traded legitimately under that name. The Respondent is not a licensee of the Complainant and has received no authorization to use the Complainant's marks.

The Panel further finds no evidence of use of the disputed domain names in connection with a bona fide offering of goods or services, nor of any legitimate noncommercial or fair use. On the contrary, the incorporation of the Complainant's distinctive mark creates a false impression of affiliation. As noted in section 2.5.1 of the [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), the composition of the disputed domain names – incorporating the Complainant's trademark in its entirety together with the terms "go", "hi", "hello", "start", "join," and "connect," carries a risk of implied sponsorship and cannot constitute fair use.

The Panel also observes that the disputed domain names are passively held. The disputed domain names are further configured for email services, which potentially increases the risk of misleading communications impersonating the Complainant.

These circumstances establish a prima facie case that the Respondent lacks rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain names. The Respondent has not rebutted this case.

Accordingly, the Panel considers that the requirement under paragraph 4(a)(ii) of the Policy is satisfied.

C. Registered and Used in Bad Faith

The Panel must determine whether the disputed domain names were registered and are being used in bad faith in accordance with paragraph 4(a)(iii) of the Policy. Paragraph 4(b) provides a non-exhaustive list of circumstances which, if present, constitute evidence of bad faith.

The Panel notes that the disputed domain names wholly incorporate the Complainant's distinctive and fanciful KYNDRYL mark. As stated in section 3.1.4 of the [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), panels have consistently

found that the mere registration of a domain name confusingly similar to a well-known trademark, particularly a coined term, can by itself create a presumption of bad faith. The Panel finds that Internet users encountering the disputed domain names would reasonably assume affiliation with the Complainant.

The Panel also notes that the disputed domain names are passively held. Section 3.3 of the [WIPO Overview 3.1](#) confirms that passive holding may constitute bad faith where the complainant's mark is distinctive or reputed, the respondent has failed to submit a response or provide any evidence of actual or contemplated good-faith use, the respondent has concealed its identity or the use of false or inaccurate contact details (noted to be in breach of the respondent's registration agreement). These factors are present in this case, and no overall plausible good-faith use exists.

In addition, the disputed domain names are configured with MX and SPF records, enabling email communication. Prior UDRP panels, including *Arnold Clark Automobiles Limited v. Registration Private, Domains By Proxy, LLC / Carolina Rodrigues, Fundacion Comercio Electronico* (WIPO Case No. [D2021-3924](#)), have held that such configuration represents a risk of phishing. Given the confusing similarity of the disputed domain names to the Complainant's mark, any email originating from them would likely mislead recipients into believing it was sent by the Complainant.

The Panel asserts that the Respondent registered and is using the disputed domain names in bad faith. The requirement under paragraph 4(a)(iii) of the Policy is therefore satisfied.

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 <connectkyndryl.com>, <gokyndryl.com>, <hellokyndryl.com>, <hikyndryl.com>, <joinkyndryl.com> and <startkyndryl.com> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Daniel Peña/

Daniel Peña

Sole Panelist

Date: July 22, 2026