ARBITRATION
AND
MEDIATION CENTER

WIPO
WORLD
INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY
ORGANIZATION

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION
Okta, Inc. v. zhang wei, zhangwei
Case No. D2026-1846

1. The Parties

The Complainant is Okta, Inc., United States of America ("United States"), represented by Verso Law Group LLP, United States.

The Respondent is zhang wei, zhangwei, China.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <wwwokta.com> is registered with Sav.com, LLC (the "Registrar").

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the "Center") on April 29, 2026. On April 30, 2026, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On April 30, 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 (John Doe / Unknown Registrant, Redacted for Privacy) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on May 4, 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 June 5, 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 8, 2026. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was June 28, 2026. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent's default on July 8, 2026.

The Center appointed Harini Narayanswamy as the sole panelist in this matter on July 10, 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 technology company headquartered in San Fransico, United States. The Complainant uses the OKTA trademark for its business of identity and access management and secure authentication solutions. The Complainant operates its website at “www.okta.com”.

The Complainant owns a large portfolio of OKTA and OKTA formative trademark registrations, some of which are:
United States trademark registration No.4000741 for OKTA (word mark), date of first use April 12, 2010 and registered on July 26, 2011 in classes 42 and 45.
United States trademark registration No.4046232 for OKTA (word mark), date of first use July 1, 2010 and registered on October 25, 2011 in class 9.
United States trademark registration No.6682165 for OKTA (word mark), date of first use April 12, 2010 and registered on March 29, 2022 in classes 9 and 42.

The Respondent is located in China and registered the disputed domain name on August 9, 2025. The Respondent has been involved in a number of UDRP cases over the years. Some of these cases are: *Hermes International v. Zhangwei*, WIPO Case No. D2011-1942; *Swarovski Aktiengesellschaft v. Zhangwei*, WIPO Case No. D2013-2184; *MAJE S.A.S. v. Zhangwei*, WIPO Case No. D2015-1032; *Pierre Balmain S.A. v. Zhang Wei*, WIPO Case No. D2016-1815; *Natixis v. 张伟 (Zhang Wei)*, WIPO Case No. D2020-2946; and *Muitas Ltd v. 张伟 (zhang wei)*, WIPO Case No. D2022-0053.

At the time of filing the Complaint, the disputed domain name was being used to host a website which appears to be a standard Captcha verification page. Once Internet user clears the Captcha verification and clicks the “Continue” button, the application downloads are initiated. The applications are called “SafeDomain Guardian” and “SecurePass”, which are likely to be malicious ware.

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.

The Complainant states that it is a prior user of the OKTA mark, which it has used for almost 20 years in many jurisdictions world-wide. The Complainant states it has been partnering with businesses to implement customizable technology services that enable secure access, authentication and automation. Services are directly sold to businesses and consumers worldwide and also through its website hosted from the domain name <okta.com>.

The Complainant states that the OKTA trademark is well known in the United States and globally. The Complainant contends that significant investment has been made to build goodwill, popularity and fame of the OKTA trademark in connection with its authentication and access management services.

The Complainant argues that the disputed domain name replicates the trademark, and is preceded by “www” a common abbreviation for the “world wide web” and the abbreviation does not reduce the confusing similarity to its mark. The Complainant states that the disputed domain name is a typo squatting and confusingly similar variant of its mark.

The Complainant argues that the Respondent lacks rights and legitimate interests in the disputed domain name as the Respondent is not commonly known by the disputed domain name and has no license or authorization to use the OKTA mark. The disputed domain name is not being used in connection with a bona fide offering of goods and services or for any legitimate non-commercial fair use purposes

The Complainant argues that the disputed domain name has been registered and is being used in bad faith. The Complainant states that the OKTA marks prior reputation and fame indicate the Respondent ought to have known of its mark. The use of the abbreviation "www" with the mark and the use of the disputed domain name to trigger download of suspicious applications is also indicative of the Respondent's bad faith adds the Complainant.

B. Respondent

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

6. Discussion and Findings

Three elements that need to be established by the Complainant, in order to obtain the remedy of transfer of the disputed domain name under paragraph 4 (a) of the Policy are:

(i) The disputed domain name is identical or confusingly similar to a trademark or service mark in which the Complainant has rights; and
(ii) The Respondent lacks rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name; and
(iii) The disputed domain name was registered and is being used in bad faith by the Respondent.

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 adduced evidence of its trademark registrations for the OKTA mark and has established rights in respect of a trademark or service mark for the purposes of the Policy. WIPO Overview 3.1, section 1.2.1.

The disputed domain name consists of the entire OKTA mark prefixed with the letters "www", an abbreviation for the world-wide web. Although the addition of the letters "www" may bear on assessment of the second and third elements, the Panel finds the addition 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 mark is recognizable in the disputed domain name and the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to the mark for the purposes of the Policy. WIPO Overview 3.1, section 1.7. The first element of the Policy has been established by the Complainant.

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.

Having reviewed the available record, the Panel finds the Respondent is not commonly known by the disputed domain name and the evidence on record does not show the Respondent has a business name that corresponds to the disputed domain name. The Panel finds the Respondent does not have authorization or license to use the OKTA mark, but uses the Complainant's reputed mark in the disputed domain name, which creates a risk of implied affiliation with the mark and is likely to mislead Internet users as to source, origin or affiliation of the disputed domain name.

The Complainant has adduced evidence showing that the website to which the disputed domain name resolves, triggers download of applications called "SafeDomain Guardian" and "SecurePass" and has submitted that these applications are likely to be malware or malicious ware. The Complainant adds the choice of names for the applications is also likely to cause harm to the Complainant's business, which is a provider of secure access services, and it poses a risk to users who will be misled and are vulnerable to the harm it would cause. Based on the Complainant's submissions, that are supported with evidence, the Panel finds the circumstances described here show that the disputed domain name is clearly not being used in connection with a bona fide offering of goods and services or for any legitimate non-commercial fair use purposes.

The Panel finds that the Respondent's unauthorized use of the Complainant's mark is with an intention to generate Internet traffic by exploiting the goodwill associated with the mark and is using the disputed domain name to distribute applications that is likely to be malicious. Panels have held that the use of a domain name for illegitimate activity such as attempting to distribute malware by attracting Internet users to a respondent's website based on the reputed trademarks of others does not constitute bona fide use. On the contrary, it amounts to a type of fraud that can never confer rights or legitimate interests on a respondent. WIPO Overview 3.1, section 2.13.1.

The Complainant has established a prima facie case that the Respondent lacks rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name. The Respondent has not rebutted the Complainant's prima facie showing and has not come forward with any relevant evidence demonstrating rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name such as those enumerated in the Policy or otherwise.

The Panel finds the second element of the Policy has been established.

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 describes 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.

Paragraph 4(b) of the Policy sets out a list of non-exhaustive circumstances that may indicate that a domain name was registered and used in bad faith, but other circumstances may be relevant in assessing whether a respondent's registration and use of a domain name is in bad faith. WIPO Overview 3.1, section 3.2.1.

The illustrative examples of bad faith enumerated in Paragraph 4(b) of the Policy are: (i) registration to sell the domain name to the complainant at a profit; (ii) preventing the owner of the trademark or service mark from reflecting the mark in a corresponding domain name provided that the respondent has engaged in a pattern of bad faith conduct; (iii) disrupting the business of a competitor; or (iv) intentionally attempted to attract, for commercial gain, Internet users by creating a likelihood of confusion with the complainant's mark.

Having reviewed the available record, the Panel notes the distinctiveness or reputation of the Complainant's trademark, and the composition of the disputed domain name, and finds that the Complainant's trademarks have been registered many years prior to the registration of the disputed domain name. The Complainant has made significant investments to establish reputation and goodwill associated with the OKTA mark. Furthermore, "Okta" has no other meaning than to refer to the Complainant's services. It is therefore unlikely that the Respondent was unaware of the existence of the trademark.

The Panel notes that the use of the abbreviation "www" with the OKTA mark in the disputed domain name misleads online users as the Complainant's website is hosted on the domain name <okta.com>. The combination of the abbreviation "www" along with the trademark also indicates targeting the mark due to the close similarity with the Complainant's official website address. Given the distinctiveness of the Complainant's trademark, the composition of the disputed domain name and the overall circumstances described here, it leads to a finding of bad faith under the Policy.

The Panel also notes that the Respondent has been involved in numerous previous cases which shows that the Respondent has engaged in a pattern of bad faith conduct of registration of domain name targeting well known trademarks. This constitutes bad faith conduct as described under paragraph 4(b)(ii) of the Policy. Panels have also held that the use of a domain name for illegitimate or fraudulent activity such as claimed distribution of malware or other types of fraud constitutes bad faith. WIPO Overview 3.1, section 3.4.

The Panel finds the Respondent is using use of the disputed domain name is to intentionally attract for commercial gain, Internet users to the Respondent's website by creating a likelihood of confusion with the Complainant's mark as to the source, sponsorship, affiliation of endorsement of the Respondent's website. This constitutes bad faith registration and use as described under paragraph 4(b)(iv) of the policy.

The Panel finds, for all the reasons discussed, that the Respondent's registration and use of the disputed domain name constitute bad faith under the Policy. The Complainant has established the third element of the Policy.

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 <wwwokta.com> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Harini Narayanswamy/
Harini Narayanswamy
Sole Panelist
Date: July 24, 2026