

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

Kyndryl, Inc v. Laila
Case No. D2026-2731

1. The Parties

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

The Respondent is Laila, India.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <hrkyndryl.com> is registered with BigRock Solutions Ltd. (the "Registrar").

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the "Center") on June 23, 2026. On June 24, 2026, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On June 25, 2026, the Registrar transmitted by email to the Center its verification response confirming that the Respondent is listed as the registrant and providing the contact details.

The Center verified that the 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 26, 2026. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was July 16, 2026. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent's default on July 20, 2026.

The Center appointed Gilberto Martins de Almeida as the sole panelist in this matter on July 24, 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 Kyndryl, Inc., a Delaware corporation headquartered in New York, United States. The Complainant is one of the world's largest managed infrastructure services providers, formed from the spin-off of IBM's Global Technology Services division in November 2021. The company employs approximately 90,000 people, operates in over 60 countries, and serves roughly 4,000 customers including 75 percent of the Fortune 100 companies. The name "Kyndryl" (a blend of "kinship" and "tendrill") was announced in April 2021. The Complainant holds extensive registered trademark rights in the mark KYNDRYL, including International Registration No. 1628208, registered June 14, 2021, covering Nice classes 9, 35, 37, 38, 41, and 42, and designating multiple jurisdictions including India; French Registration No. 4754262, registered April 12, 2021; and United States Registration No. 7537618, registered October 15, 2024.

According to the information provided by the Registrar, the Respondent is Laila, an individual apparently located in India.

The disputed domain name <hrkyndryl.com> was registered on May 28, 2026. At the time of filing of the Complaint, the disputed domain name was passively held with no active website content. However, Domain Name System (DNS) records confirmed that the disputed domain name was configured with Mail eXchange (MX) and Sender Policy Framework SPF records, indicating it was set up to send and receive emails, creating a risk of phishing or impersonation of the Complainant's human resources department.

The Complainant's investigation has further revealed that the Respondent registered at least three other domain names targeting well-known IT services companies, all on March 25, 2026: <hrlancesoft.com> (targeting LanceSoft), <hrtechmahindra.com> (targeting Tech Mahindra), and <ltmmindtree.com> (targeting LTIMindtree). These domain names share identical registrant contact details with the disputed domain name, resolve to the same IP address, and use the same nameservers and mail server configurations.

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 confusingly similar to its registered trademark KYNDRYL, as the addition of the descriptive term "hr" (commonly understood as "Human Resources") does not prevent a finding of confusing similarity, on the contrary, it suggests an affiliation with the Complainant's human resources department. The Complainant further contends that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name, as the Respondent is not commonly known as "Kyndryl" or "HR Kyndryl," neither has made any demonstrable preparations to use the disputed domain name in services or in offering goods. Finally, the Complainant contends that the disputed domain name was registered and has been used in bad faith, pointing out to: (i) the passive holding of the disputed domain name despite its configuration for email (MX and SPF records), which causes a risk of phishing; (ii) the Respondent's pattern of registering domain names that incorporate the trademarks of well-known IT service companies (LanceSoft, Tech Mahindra, LTIMindtree); and (iii) the likelihood of initial interest confusion and disruption of the Complainant's business.

B. Respondent

The Respondent did not reply to the 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.

The Complainant has shown rights in respect of a trademark or service mark for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.2.1.

The entirety of the mark is reproduced within the disputed domain name. Accordingly, the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to the mark for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.7.

Although the addition of other terms (here, "hr") 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.

Having reviewed the available record, the Panel finds 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 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.

In the present case, the Panel notes that the Respondent registered the disputed domain name incorporating the Complainant's well-known mark KYNDRYL and adding only the term "hr". The Respondent configured the disputed domain name with MX and SPF records, creating a risk of phishing emails impersonating the Complainant, and the Respondent has passively held the disputed domain name. Furthermore, the Respondent registered at least three other domain names targeting well-known IT service companies

(<hrlancesoft.com>, <hrtechmahindra.com>, and <ltmmindtree.com>), evidencing a pattern of illegitimate registration of domain names.

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.

Although the disputed domain name has not been actively used, panels have found that the non-use of a domain name would not by itself prevent a finding of bad faith under the doctrine of passive holding. To the contrary, in looking at the totality of circumstances in each case, panels have found that the registration and non-use of a domain name can still constitute bad faith for purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 3.3. 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 in the circumstances of this case the passive holding of the disputed domain name does not prevent a finding of bad faith under the Policy.

Having reviewed the record, the Panel finds the Respondent's registration and use of the disputed domain name constitutes bad faith under the Policy.

The Panel finds that 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 <hrkyndryl.com> be transferred to the Complainant

/Gilberto Martins de Almeida/
Gilberto Martins de Almeida
Sole Panelist
Date: August 7, 2026