

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

IMC B.V. v. tt iger, kim jinrong
Case No. D2026-2888

1. The Parties

The Complainant is IMC B.V., Netherlands (Kingdom of the), represented by DLA Piper LLP (US), United States of America ("United States" or "US").

The Respondent is tt iger, Republic of Korea, and kim jinrong, Republic of Korea.

2. The Domain Names and Registrars

The disputed domain name <imc-funds.com> is registered with eNom, LLC, and the disputed domain name <imcglobalwin.com> is registered with Gname.com Pte. Ltd. Gname.com Pte. Ltd. and eNom, LLC are hereinafter referred to as the "Registrars".

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the "Center") on July 2, 2026.¹ On July 2, 2026, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrars a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain names. On July 2, 2026, and July 3, 2026, the Registrars transmitted by email to the Center their verification responses respectively disclosing registrant and contact information for the disputed domain names 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 3, 2026 with the registrant and contact information of nominally multiple underlying registrants revealed by the Registrars, requesting the Complainant to either file separate complaint(s) for the disputed domain names associated with different underlying registrants or alternatively, demonstrate that the underlying registrants are in fact the same entity and/or that all disputed domain names are under common control. The Complainant filed amended Complaints on July 7, 2026, and August 15, 2026, respectively.

¹ The Complainant was originally filed against the disputed domain names with another domain name which was removed from the current proceedings.

The Center verified that the Complaint together with the amended Complaints 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 August 17, 2026. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was September 6, 2026. The Respondent did not submit any response. The Center notified the Parties of the commencement of Panel appointment process on September 7, 2026.

The Center appointed Jacob Changjie Chen as the sole panelist in this matter on September 11, 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 was founded in 1989 in Amsterdam, Netherlands (Kingdom of the), and has grown on an international basis with offices in the United States, Australia, India, the United Kingdom and Hong Kong, China. The Complainant is a leading global market maker which buys and sells securities in major asset classes on multiple trading venues worldwide. The Complainant trades primarily on the basis of data and algorithms and uses its execution platform to provide liquidity to financial markets globally. For more than 35 years, the Complainant has used the mark and name IMC and variations thereof, in connection with various financial and investment services around the world.

The Complainant also extensively advertises its services and IMC marks online through its website at “www.imc.com”.

The Complainant owns several IMC trademark registrations worldwide, such as the US trademark registration No. 3643617 IMC, registered on June 23, 2009, in class 36; US trademark registration No. 6450807 , registered on August 17, 2021, in class 36; and International trademark registration No. 1758921 , registered on September 13, 2023, in class 36, designating among others the Republic of Korea.

The disputed domain name <imc-funds.com> was registered on June 12, 2026, and the disputed domain name <imcglobalwin.com> was registered on April 26, 2026. At the time of filing the Complaint, both disputed domain names resolved to virtually identical websites in Korean displaying content impersonating the Complainant, including copies of the layout, design, and photos from the Complainant’s website, and prominently displaying the IMC trademark and logo at the top of the webpages. At the time of this Decision, both disputed domain names do not resolve to any active website.

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 names.

Notably, the Complainant contends that the disputed domain names are confusingly similar to the IMC trademark because they fully and exactly incorporate the IMC mark. The addition of the extraneous wording “globalwin” and “funds” does not dispel confusion because the IMC mark is clearly recognizable within the domain names.

The Complainant further contends that the Respondent lacks a right or legitimate interest in the disputed domain names. The Complainant claims there is no indication that the Respondent is making a legitimate noncommercial or fair use of the disputed domain names without intent for commercial gain. Instead, the Respondent deliberately chose the disputed domain names which are confusingly similar to the Complainant's mark, and linked them to a website that replicates the IMC mark and the Complainant's legitimate website. Thus, the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect to the disputed domain names.

The Complainant finally contends that the Respondent registered the disputed domain names in bad faith. Given the Complainant's worldwide reputation, especially in the financial services industry, the Respondent must have been aware of the IMC mark well prior to registering the disputed domain names. The Respondents intentionally created a website that looks almost exactly like a Korean language version of the Complainant's legitimate website, giving the impression it is associated or affiliated with the Complainant when they are not. There is no reasonable explanation for the Respondent's selection of the disputed domain names other than that the Respondent was intentionally attempting to trade off the goodwill that the Complainant has established in its IMC trademark.

B. Respondent

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

6. Discussion and Findings

Consolidation: Multiple Domain Name Registrants

The amended Complaint was filed in relation to nominally different domain name registrants. The Complainant alleges that the domain name registrants are the same entity or mere alter egos of each other, or under common control. The Complainant requests the consolidation of the Complaint against the multiple disputed domain name registrants pursuant to paragraph 10(e) of the Rules.

The disputed domain name registrants did not comment on the Complainant's request.

Paragraph 3(c) of the Rules states that a complaint may relate to more than one domain name, provided that the domain names are registered by the same domain name holder.

In addressing the Complainant's request, the Panel will consider whether (i) the disputed domain names or corresponding websites are subject to common control; and (ii) the consolidation would be fair and equitable to all Parties. See WIPO Overview of WIPO Panel Views on Select UDRP Questions (["WIPO Overview 3.1"](#)), section 4.11.2.

As regards common control, the Panel notes that both disputed domain names were registered within a short period of time and resolved to websites displaying virtually identical content. The Panel thus finds that the Complainant has established that the disputed domain names are subject to common control.

As regards fairness and equity, the Panel sees no reason why consolidation of the disputes would be unfair or inequitable to any Party.

Accordingly, the Panel decides to consolidate the disputes regarding the nominally different disputed domain name registrants (referred to below as "the Respondent") in a single proceeding.

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 names. [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 Panel finds the mark is recognizable within the disputed domain names. Accordingly, the disputed domain names are confusingly similar to the mark for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.7.

Although the addition of other terms ("funds", "global" and "win") may bear on assessment of the second and third elements, the Panel finds the addition of such terms 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 names. 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 names such as those enumerated in the Policy or otherwise.

The virtually identical websites at the disputed domain names were in Korean and prominently displayed the Complainant's IMC trademark and logo, which looked like the local websites of the Complainant, specially developed for the Republic of Korea. Both websites failed to prominently and accurately represent that there was no relationship between the Complainant and the Respondent, thereby creating an undue association with the Complainant and likely confusing Internet users as to the source of services provided through the websites. These facts suggest that the Respondent was using the disputed domain names to confuse and attract Internet visitors. Panels have held that the use of a domain name for illegitimate activity (impersonation/passing off) can never confer rights or legitimate interests on a respondent. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 2.13.1.

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 determines that the Respondent chose the disputed domain names with knowledge of the Complainant, particularly given the display of the IMC trademark and logo and introduction of the Complainant on the websites. It is thus inconceivable that the Respondent could have registered the disputed domain names without knowledge of the Complainant's IMC trademark. Clearly the Respondent intentionally registered the disputed domain names to exploit reputation of the Complainant and its IMC trademark, which indicates registration in bad faith.

By choosing the Complainant's trademark to register the disputed domain names and setting up virtually identical websites to impersonate the Complainant as described in detail under Section 4. above. The Respondent was deliberately attempting to misrepresent itself as being affiliated with the Complainant. Panels have held that the use of a domain name for illegitimate activity (impersonation/passing off) constitutes bad faith. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 3.4.

Having reviewed the record, the Panel finds the Respondent's registration and use of the disputed domain names 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 names <imc-funds.com> and <imcglobalwin.com> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Jacob Changjie Chen/

Jacob Changjie Chen

Sole Panelist

Date: September 25, 2026