ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

McKinsey & Company, Inc., McKinsey Holdings, Inc v. Alex Kim
Case No. D2026-2825

1. The Parties

The Complainants are McKinsey & Company, Inc. and McKinsey Holdings, Inc, United States of America ("United States"), represented by Fross Zelnick Lehrman & Zissu, PC, United States (collectively: the "Complainant").

The Respondent is Alex Kim, Kazakhstan.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <mckinsey-okta.online> is registered with Dynadot Inc (the "Registrar").

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the "Center") on June 29, 2026. On June 30, 2026, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On July 1, 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 July 1, 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 July 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 July 8, 2026. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was July 28, 2026. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent's default on August 5, 2026.

The Center appointed Áron László as the sole panelist in this matter on August 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 Complainants are McKinsey & Company, Inc. and its subsidiary, McKinsey Holdings, Inc., with global headquarters in New York, United States. McKinsey & Company is a global management consulting firm, serving leading businesses, governments, non-governmental organisations, and not-for-profits. McKinsey & Company has operated under the name McKinsey since at least as early as 1926. The Complainant, by itself and through related companies, currently employs over 30,000 people in over 65 countries.

The Complainant and its related companies own numerous trademark registrations worldwide for the marks MCKINSEY and MCKINSEY & COMPANY (collectively, the "MCKINSEY Marks"), including:

- United States Registration No. 1,965,376 for MCKINSEY, registered on April 2, 1996;
- United States Registration No. 1,966,624 for MCKINSEY & COMPANY, registered on April 9, 1996;
- Kazakhstan Registration No. 83307 for MCKINSEY, registered on April 17, 2023.

The Complainant maintains a prominent Internet presence at the domain name <mckinsey.com>. The Complainant also partners with Okta, Inc., an enterprise identity and access management platform, which operates a dedicated authentication page for the Complainant at <mckinsey.okta.com>.

Prior panels have recognised the reputation of the MCKINSEY Marks. See *McKinsey Holdings, Inc. v. Indidom*, WIPO Case No. D2000-1616; *McKinsey & Company, Inc. & McKinsey Holdings, Inc. v. Jerome Zimmermann*, WIPO Case No. D2001-0009; and *McKinsey & Company, Inc. & McKinsey Holdings, Inc. v. Muller Daniel*, WIPO Case No. D2015-1111.

The disputed domain name <mckinsey-okta.online> was registered on January 9, 2026. In accordance with the information provided by the Registrar the Respondent has an address in Kazakhstan.

At the time of filing the Complaint, the disputed domain name did not resolve to an active website. Currently it resolves to a website with pay-per-click ("PPC") links.

5. Parties' Contentions

A. Complainant

The Complainant contends that all three elements of Paragraph 4(a) of the Policy are satisfied.

The Complainant contends that it has strong rights in the MCKINSEY Marks, which it has used in the United States and elsewhere for decades, and that it has obtained numerous trademark registrations prior to the registration of the disputed domain name. The Complainant submits that the disputed domain name incorporates the Complainant's entire MCKINSEY trademark, adding only the third-party OKTA trademark and the ".online" generic Top-Level Domain ("gTLD"). The Complainant contends that a gTLD indicator such as ".online" is typically viewed as a standard registration requirement and is disregarded under the first element confusing similarity test. The Complainant further contends that the inclusion of a hyphen between "mckinsey" and "okta" does not make a sufficient difference to avoid a finding of confusing similarity. The Complainant submits that it is not necessary for Okta, Inc. to be a party to this proceeding, as the similarity between the MCKINSEY Marks and the disputed domain name is sufficient. Given the reputation of the MCKINSEY Marks and the Complainant's business relationship with Okta, Inc., the Complainant contends that visitors to the disputed domain name will immediately recognise the Complainant's mark and mistakenly assume the disputed domain name is owned, controlled, or endorsed by the Complainant.

The Complainant contends that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name. The Complainant submits that there is no relationship between the parties that would give rise to any licence, permission, or authorisation for the Respondent to use or register the disputed domain name. The Complainant contends that the Respondent is using the disputed domain name only in connection with a parked or inactive website, which is not a bona fide use. The Complainant further submits that, in light of the Respondent's apparent knowledge of the Complainant, including its business relationship with Okta, Inc., the disputed domain name was not registered for any reason other than to trade on the fame and renown of the MCKINSEY Marks, and with the intent to use it for a fraudulent or other inherently misleading purpose.

The Complainant contends that the disputed domain name constitutes typosquatting, as it closely replicates the structure of the Complainant's actual Okta authentication URL, "mckinsey.okta.com", by replacing the dot between "mckinsey" and "okta" with a hyphen. The Complainant submits that the disputed domain name is inherently suited to phishing, credential harvesting, unauthorised account access, impersonation, or other fraudulent misuse, and that such illegal activity can never confer rights or legitimate interests on a respondent.

The Complainant contends that the Respondent registered and is using the disputed domain name in bad faith.

First, the Respondent registered the disputed domain name through a privacy service and, upon information and belief, purposefully concealed its true identity to make it difficult for any interested third party to locate the Respondent. Second, the Respondent's use of false or incomplete contact information is further evidence of bad faith. Third, there is no basis for the Respondent to have chosen the disputed domain name unless it was seeking to create an association with the Complainant; the disputed domain name mimics the Complainant's actual Okta authentication URL, confirming that the Respondent registered and is using the disputed domain name for phishing, credential harvesting, impersonation, or other bad-faith purposes.

The Complainant further contends that the Respondent's passive holding of the disputed domain name does not avoid a finding of bad faith, given that the MCKINSEY Marks are famous, the Respondent used a privacy service to conceal its identity, and the disputed domain name closely mimics the Complainant's actual Okta authentication URL, and the disputed domain name currently resolves only to a parked page. The Complainant submits that because the disputed domain name imitates a corporate authentication endpoint, users may believe they are accessing a McKinsey login environment and may disclose credentials or other sensitive information.

The Complainant contends that the Respondent's activity violates paragraph 4(b)(iv) of the Policy, as the use of the disputed domain name intentionally attempts to attract, for commercial gain, Internet users by creating a likelihood of confusion as to the source, sponsorship, affiliation, or endorsement of the site.

B. Respondent

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

6. Discussion and Findings

Paragraph 15(a) of the Rules instructs this Panel to "decide a complaint on the basis of the statements and documents submitted in accordance with the Policy, these Rules and any rules and principles of law that it deems applicable".

Paragraph 4(a) of the Policy requires that a complainant must prove each of the following three elements to obtain an order that a domain name should be cancelled or transferred:

i. the domain name registered by the respondent is identical or confusingly similar to a trademark or service mark in which the complainant has rights; and
ii. the respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the domain name; and
iii. the domain name has been registered and is being used in bad faith.

In view of the Respondent's failure to submit a Response, the Panel shall decide this dispute on the basis of the Complainant's undisputed representations pursuant to paragraphs 5(f), 14(a) and 15(a) of the Rules and draw such inferences as it considers appropriate pursuant to paragraph 14(b) of the Rules.

The Panel is entitled to accept all reasonable allegations set forth in a complaint. However, the Panel may deny relief where a complaint contains mere conclusory or unsubstantiated arguments. WIPO Overview of WIPO Panel Views on Select UDRP Questions ("WIPO Overview 3.1"), section 4.3.

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 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, the element "-okta" 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.

Here the disputed domain name resolved to an inactive webpage, which does not amount to a bona fide offering of goods or services or a legitimate noncommercial or fair use. Moreover, the nature of the disputed domain name carries a risk of implied affiliation and cannot constitute fair use as it effectively impersonates or suggests sponsorship or endorsement by the Complainant. WIPO Overview 3.1, section 2.5.1.

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 the reputation of the Complainant's trademark, and the composition of the disputed domain name incorporating the Complainant's trademark with the related term "okta". There is no plausible reason for the Respondent to have chosen the disputed domain name unless it was trying to create a connection with the Complainant. The Panel concludes on the balance of probabilities that the Respondent registered the disputed domain name with prior knowledge of the Complainant's trademark and with the intent to target it. The fact that the disputed domain name did not resolve to an active webpage does not prevent a finding of bad faith.

Moreover, the disputed domain name closely replicates the Complainant's actual authentication URL, which suggests that the Respondent has targeted the Complainant and its trademark, potentially for the purpose of fraudulent activity.

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 <mckinsey-okta.online> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Áron László/
Áron László
Sole Panelist
Date: August 20, 2026