

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

The Kraft Heinz Company v. Rambo
Case No. D2026-2317

1. The Parties

Complainant is The Kraft Heinz Company, United States of America (“United States”), represented by CSC Digital Brand Services Group AB, Sweden.

Respondent is Rambo, United States.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <koolaidi.com> is registered with Dynadot Inc (the “Registrar”).

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the “Center”) on May 28, 2026. On May 29, 2026, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On May 29, 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 / Super Privacy Service LTD c/o Dynadot) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to Complainant on June 1, 2026, providing the registrant and contact information disclosed by the Registrar, and inviting the Complainant to submit an amendment to the Complaint. Complainant filed an amended Complaint on June 1, 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 2, 2026. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was June 22, 2026. Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent’s default on June 24, 2026.

The Center appointed Lorelei Ritchie as the sole panelist in this matter on June 30, 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

Complainant (together with its predecessors and affiliates, "Complainant") is a multinational company based in the United States. For nearly a century prior to the registration of the disputed domain name, Complainant has offered flavored drink mixes under the mark KOOL-AID. Complainant owns registrations for the KOOL-AID mark globally. These registrations include, among others, United States Registration No. 317955 (registered October 9, 1934) and European Union trade mark Registration No. 2381614 (registered December 3, 2002). Complainant also owns the registration for the domain name <koolaid.com> (registered April 6, 2000), which Complainant uses to connect with consumers online via its KOOL-AID products.

The disputed domain name was registered on June 10, 2025. Although not active at the time the Complaint was filed, Respondent has used the URL associated with the disputed domain name to resolve to a website that mimics Complainant's website, including prominent display of Complainant's marks without any disclaimer of affiliation. Respondent has no affiliation with Complainant, and no authorization to use Complainant's marks.

5. Parties' Contentions

A. Complainant

Complainant contends that (i) the disputed domain name is identical or confusingly similar to Complainant's trademarks; (ii) Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name; and (iii) Respondent registered and is using the disputed domain name in bad faith.

Specifically, Complainant contends that it owns rights to the KOOL-AID mark which is "well recognized and respected worldwide" as "a favorite beverage of children for generations".

Complainant contends that the disputed domain name clearly references Complainant's KOOL-AID mark, with a "purposeful misspelling" that simply deletes the hyphen in the mark and adds an extra letter "i" in a clear act of "typosquatting". Complainant asserts that Respondent lacks rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name, and rather has registered and is using it in bad faith, presumably for Respondent's own commercial gain, by creating a website aimed at impersonating Complainant's official retail webpage, and with no disclaimer of affiliation.

B. Respondent

Respondent did not reply to Complainant's contentions.

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.

Complainant has shown rights in respect of the KOOL-AID mark, for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.2.1. The Panel finds that despite the misspelling, the KOOL-AID mark is recognizable within the disputed domain name.

The Panel therefore finds that the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to a trademark in which Complainant has rights in accordance with paragraph 4(a)(i) of the Policy.

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 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.

Prior UDRP Panels have indicated that a reseller may be considered to have rights or legitimate interests in a mark, provided certain requirements are met. These generally include that: (i) the site is actually offering the goods at issue; (ii) the site is used only to sell the trademarked goods; (iii) the site accurately and prominently discloses the registrant’s relationship to the mark holder; and (iv) respondent does not try to “corner the market” in domain names that reflect the mark. See [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 2.8; see also *Oki Data Americas, Inc. v. ASD, Inc.*, WIPO Case No. [D2001-0903](#).

The Panel finds that these qualifications are not fulfilled by the previous use associated with the disputed domain name. Rather, to the extent that any legitimate goods or services may be offered via the disputed domain name, the associated website did not include a clear disclaimer of affiliation or endorsement by Complainant, and rather included unauthorized display of Complainant’s marks. Respondent has not put forward any claims or evidence that would suggest rights or legitimate interests for the purposes of the Policy.

The Panel finds that Complainant has provided sufficient evidence of Respondent’s lack of “rights or legitimate interests” in accordance with paragraph 4(a)(ii) of the Policy which Respondent has not rebutted.

Furthermore, the subsequent non-use of the disputed domain name does not change this finding.

C. Registered and Used in Bad Faith

There are several ways that a complainant can demonstrate that a domain name was registered and used in bad faith.

As noted in Section 4 of this Panel’s decision, the record includes evidence that Respondent has used the URL associated with the disputed domain name to resolve to a website that mimics Complainant’s own official website, with prominent display of Complainant’s marks, and with no disclaimer of affiliation.

The Panel thus finds sufficient evidence that Respondent was aware of Complainant’s rights and Complainant’s marks at the time of registering the disputed domain name. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 3.4.

The current non-use of the disputed domain name does not prevent a finding of bad faith under the Policy.

The Panel finds sufficient evidence that Respondent registered and used the disputed domain name in bad faith for purposes of paragraph (4)(a)(iii) 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 <koolaidi.com> be transferred to Complainant.

/Lorelei Ritchie/

Lorelei Ritchie

Sole Panelist

Date: July 6, 2026