

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

The Knowledge Academy Holdings Limited v. Abhinav Rai, Knowledge Academy

Case No. D2026-1731

1. The Parties

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

The Respondent is Abhinav Rai, Knowledge Academy, India.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <knowledgeacademyko.org> is registered with Hostinger Operations, UAB (the "Registrar").

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the "Center") on April 23, 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 24, 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 28, 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 30, 2026. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was May 20, 2026. The Respondent sent email communications to the Center on April 30, 2026, and May 26, 2026.

The Center appointed W. Scott Blackmer as the sole panelist in this matter on June 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 Complainant is a company registered in England and Wales and incorporated on July 4, 2013. The Complainant is the holding company of The Knowledge Academy Limited, incorporated on April 1, 2009, and registered in England and Wales. The Panel refers hereafter to the two companies collectively as the “Complainant” unless otherwise indicated, as they share common ownership and interests in the relevant trademarks. The Complainant is a business and information technology (“IT”) training company that operates globally, providing training solutions to corporate, public sector, multinational organizations, and individuals. The Complainant operates a website at “www.theknowledgeacademy.com” describing and promoting its service offerings. According to the Complaint, “The Complainant is the world’s largest and most established provider of 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 successfully trained over 1 million delegates.”

The Complainant holds the following relevant trademark registrations, among others, for the word mark THE KNOWLEDGE ACADEMY; the Complainant’s subsidiary The Knowledge Academy Limited holds the Indian trademark registration listed below for the word mark THE KNOWLEDGE ACADEMY – EMPOWERING THE ADVANCEMENT OF KNOWLEDGE:

Mark	Jurisdiction	Reg. Number	Reg. Date	International Classes
THE KNOWLEDGE ACADEMY (word)	International Trademark (multiple designations)	1269174	April 22, 2015	9, 16, 35, 41
THE KNOWLEDGE ACADEMY (word)	United Kingdom	UK00003104125	July 17, 2015	9, 16, 35, 41
THE KNOWLEDGE ACADEMY (word)	European Union	018157130	May 22, 2020	9, 16, 35, 41
THE KNOWLEDGE ACADEMY – EMPOWERING THE ADVANCEMENT OF KNOWLEDGE (word)	India	5248866	December 16, 2021	9

The disputed domain name was registered on December 6, 2025, to the Respondent Abhinav Rai of the organization Knowledge Academy, listing a postal address in Lucknow, Uttar Pradesh, India and a Gmail contact email address.

At the time of this Decision, the disputed domain name resolves to a landing page hosted by the Registrar, advertising the Registrar’s services. However, the Complainant attaches a screenshot of the English-language website to which the disputed domain name resolved in January 2026 (the “Respondent’s former website”). This multipage website was headed with a logo for “Knowledge Academy Lucknow” and described the activities of Knowledge Academy, a non-governmental organization (“NGO”) “working to bring

about a positive change in the lives of the underprivileged and needy section of the society through education and health". The site included descriptions of activities, photos of events, information on key personnel, a Contact page allowing visitors to furnish their contact details and giving the organization's postal address and telephone number in Lucknow, Uttar Pradesh, India. A "Donations" page provided a scannable QR code for those wishing to make donations to the organization, as well as displaying a copy of the Respondent's digitally signed company registration certificate (in Hindi) showing that the Respondent organization was registered as a company in Lucknow on December 27, 2021.

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 the disputed domain name is "identical or nearly identical" to the Complainant's marks and argues that "[g]iven the international presence and associated reputation of the Complainant's name, THE KNOWLEDGE ACADEMY, no party would choose the Domain Name unless with the intention to create a false impression of association with the Complainant in order to attract business from the Complainant or misleadingly to divert the public from the Complainant to the Respondent". The Complainant "considers it reasonable to conclude that the Respondent registered the Domain Name in the full knowledge of" the Complainant's reputation and "also considers that it is not possible for the Respondent to have acquired any legitimate right to use the Domain Name since its registration or before".

The Complainant presumes the Respondent's bad faith and prior awareness based on the "widespread use and reputation of the Complainant's Marks". The Complainant argues that the invitations on the Respondent's former website to "Get a membership" or "Donate" demonstrate an intent to profit from confusing Internet users by a false association with the Complainant's marks. The Complainant argues further that the Respondent's website lacks links to an official charity register or other independent indication of legitimacy and contains instances of grammatical errors and unattributed images that suggest deception rather than legitimacy.

B. Respondent

The Respondent did not submit a formal Response. The Center received an email on April 30, 2026, advising the Center of a corrected email address for the Respondent Abhinav Rai "the owner of the NGO" and stating that "[t]he website has been deleted after your email". A further email from the same person on the same date attached a copy of the Knowledge Academy's current business registration certificate from Lucknow (showing that it was first registered December 27, 2021)¹ and said, "I am a developer and created this website for NGO Knowledge academy. After your mail of dispute I have conveyed the same to the owner on call and he replied to delete this website as he was not aware of the trademark issue so I have deleted it. There was no intention to harm and misuse the name of the brand 'The Knowledge Academy'". This was followed within hours by another email to similar effect, referring the Center to the Respondent for further information. The named Respondent sent an email on May 26, 2026, which translated appears to state "I have deleted this website".

¹ The Panel notes that this certificate differs from the one that appeared on the Respondent's former website in that the one attached to the email is for the current year, 2025-2026, whereas the website version was valid for 2021-2022.

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 (the registered word marks THE KNOWLEDGE ACADEMY and THE KNOWLEDGE ACADEMY – EMPOWERING THE ADVANCEMENT OF KNOWLEDGE) for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.2.1.

The majority of the mark THE KNOWLEDGE ACADEMY is reproduced within the disputed domain name, as are the leading elements of the mark THE KNOWLEDGE ACADEMY – EMPOWERING THE ADVANCEMENT OF KNOWLEDGE. Accordingly, the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to the marks for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.7.

Although the addition of other terms (here, the letters "lko" a common geographical abbreviation for the city of Lucknow) may bear on assessment of the second and third elements, the Panel finds the addition of such term does not prevent a finding of confusing similarity between the disputed domain name and the mark for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.8.

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.

Here, the Respondent did not submit a Response, but the Respondent's former website appears to reflect that, before notice to the Respondent of the dispute, the Respondent used the disputed domain name in connection with a bona fide offering of services, consistent with the Policy, paragraph 4(c)(i). [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 2.2. The Respondent's former website provided information about an NGO in the field of education and health in the city of Lucknow, India, and solicited memberships and donations in support of its activities. On its face, this would qualify as an example of a legitimate interest relevant to the disputed domain name, which appears to refer to a "knowledge academy" located geographically in "lko", the abbreviation for Lucknow, where the Respondent is purportedly located according to the contact details provided to the Registrar at the time of registration. It could not be considered a "bona fide" offering, of course, if the evidence pointed toward a deceptive site, as the Complainant claims, rather than a genuine NGO operation. That allegation is discussed further below in connection with the issue of bad faith.

The Panel also finds that the Respondent has been commonly known by a name correspondent to the disputed domain name. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 2.3. One of the screenshots of the “Donate” page of the Respondent’s former website annexed to the Complaint includes an image of the Respondent’s asserted company registration as “Knowledge Academy” in December 2021, and the Center received an email attaching the same image of the Respondent’s company registration. The Panel notes as well that the Respondent is listed in the Indian Ministry of Corporate Affairs (“MCA”) online directory of registered companies as a private limited company.² Again, the Complainant suggests that the only reason for choosing such a name is to exploit the Complainant’s global reputation, which would undermine any potential claim to legitimacy but is an issue addressed in the following section on bad faith.

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. All of these examples of bad faith, including the intentional misdirection of Internet users for commercial gain (paragraph 4(b)(iv)) as alleged by the Complainant, depend on demonstrating the probability that the Respondent was aware of the Complainant’s marks and meant to exploit them.

The Complainant relies on the global fame of its marks to infer this intent, but the Panel is not persuaded that the requisite burden has been met. The Complainant provides evidence of registered trademark rights in India, and further states that it “delivers its training courses worldwide, including and in particular in India where the majority of its workforce is based”. However, it is difficult to find from the record before the Panel that this is conclusive evidence that the Respondent targeted the Complainant and its trademark rights. The cited mark notably includes the definite article “the” making it effectively a possessive cohesive phrase as opposed to a descriptive one capable of use with or without numerous modifiers. In contrast, the relevant terms “knowledge academy” are dictionary words in English that naturally describe teaching, and it is plausible that this combination of words would be used by others engaged in teaching without intent to attack the Complainant’s marks. The WIPO Global Brand Database, for example, has more than 2,200 *pages* of listed trademark registrations that include the words “knowledge academy”. The Complainant does not furnish further evidence indicating that its marks are widely known in India. The United Kingdom-based Complainant, by its own account, specializes in IT and business training, while the Respondent provides local education and health services in Lucknow. In brief, the Complainant does not sufficiently support its conclusory statements that the Complainant “considers it reasonable to conclude that the Respondent registered the Domain Name in the full knowledge” of the Complainant’s reputation and that “no party would choose the Domain Name unless with the intention to create a false impression of association with the Complainant”. The Complainant faults the grammar and completeness of the Respondent’s former website but ignores the facts that the site was new, published in Indian English, and included a copy of a company registration certificate, which could be checked against the national registry. Unlike typical patterns of deceptive websites, the Respondent’s former website identified its operator with contact details and a company registration that appear to be genuine, did not emulate the Complainant, and did not offer services competitive with the Complainant’s.

The evidence in the case file as presented does not indicate that the Respondent’s aim in registering the disputed domain name was to profit from or exploit the Complainant’s trademark. The Panel is mindful of the reputation of the Complainant but also the descriptive prior use by the Respondent, and observes that a finding against the Respondent would require evidence not only of knowledge and targeting but of the Respondent’s former website being set up as a ruse, and this is not present in the record; if subsequent events somehow call this into question, the Complainant may then be in a position to file a separate and specifically-evidenced Complaint.

² Noting the general powers of a panel articulated in paragraphs 10 and 12 of the Rules, it is commonly accepted that a panel may undertake limited factual research into matters of public record, as the Panel has done in these proceedings. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 4.8.

The Panel finds the third element of the Policy has not been established.

On the same factual analysis, the Panel confirms its finding that the second element of the Policy has not been established.

7. Decision

For the foregoing reasons, the Complaint is denied.

/W. Scott Blackmer/

W. Scott Blackmer

Sole Panelist

Date: June 17, 2026