

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

SharkNinja Operating LLC v. Rahatul Rahatul, Rshiful Islam, Julian Beatri
Case No. D2026-3757

1. The Parties

The Complainant is SharkNinja Operating LLC, United States of America ("United States"), represented by Day Pitney LLP, United States.

The Respondents are Rahatul Rahatul, Julian Beatri, United States; Rshiful Islam, United Kingdom.

2. The Domain Names and Registrar

The disputed domain names <ninjakitcheninc.com>, <ninjakitchenllc.com>, <ninjakitchenus.com> are registered with CloudFlare, Inc. (the "Registrar").

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the "Center") on August 21, 2026. On August 24, 2026, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain names. On August 24, 2026, the Registrar transmitted by email to the Center its verification response disclosing registrant and contact information for the disputed domain names which differed from the named Respondent (Data Redacted) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on August 24, 2026, with the registrant and contact information of nominally multiple underlying registrants revealed by the Registrar, 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 domain names are under common control. The Complainant filed an amended Complaint on August 24, 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 Respondents of the Complaint, and the proceedings commenced on August 25, 2026. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was September 14, 2026. The Respondents did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondents' default on September 15, 2026.

The Center appointed Knud Wallberg as the sole panelist in this matter on September 15, 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 global household and lifestyle product design and technology company that designs, develops, manufactures, promotes and sells household appliances and related consumer goods under its house marks SHARK and NINJA. The Complainant provides products to consumers in at least 38 geographic markets globally.

The Complainant also owns numerous registrations for the NINJA mark in countries around the world, including, but not limited to the following: United States registration No. 3794590, registered on May 25, 2010, for goods in class 7; United Kingdom registration No. UK00908197667, registered on October 23, 2009, for goods in classes 7 and 11; and China registration No. 7437911, registered on January 14, 2011, for goods in class 11.

The disputed domain names were registered on August 9, 2026. They resolve to websites which, inter alia, by reproducing the Complainant's trademarks and product images, give Internet users the impression that the websites are official websites of the Complainant or its licensee and that the Respondents are authorized resellers of the Complainant's products. The disputed domain names have also been used in connection with email addresses that impersonated a purported employee of the Complainant in communications concerning a fictitious marketing initiative.

The Complainant sent a cease-and-desist letter concerning the disputed domain names to the email addresses used for the impersonation on August 17, 2026, which remained without answer.

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 its NINJA mark. The disputed domain names thus contain the mark in its entirety with the addition of the other terms "kitchen" and "inc", "llc" and "us" respectively.

The Complainant further contends that the Respondents have no rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain names. The Respondents are not commonly known by the disputed domain names, and the Respondents are not making a legitimate noncommercial or fair use of the disputed domain names without intent for commercial gain to mislead or divert consumers or tarnish the NINJA mark.

The Complainant finally contends that the Respondents registered and have been using the disputed domain names in bad faith. With knowledge of the Complainant and its NINJA mark, the Respondents intentionally registered the disputed domain names for the sole purpose of impersonating the Complainant in phishing emails to third parties to discuss a non-existent marketing initiative, presumably for the purpose of obtaining sensitive information and/or funds.

B. Respondent

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

6. Discussion and Findings

According to paragraph 15(a) of the Rules, the Panel shall decide the Complaint in accordance with the Policy, the Rules and any rules and principles of law that it deems applicable.

Paragraph 4(a) of the Policy directs that a complainant must prove each of the following for each disputed domain name:

- (i) that 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) that the respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the domain name; and
- (iii) that the domain name has been registered and is being used in bad faith.

Paragraph 4(a) of the Policy states that the burden of proving that all these elements are present lies with the Complainant. At the same time, in accordance with paragraph 14(b) of the Rules, if a party, in the absence of exceptional circumstances, does not comply with any provision of, or requirement under, the Rules, or any request from the Panel, the Panel shall draw such inferences therefrom as it considers appropriate.

Consolidation: Multiple Respondents

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 are 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) whether 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 the following similarities between the disputed domain names:

- all the disputed domain names follow similar naming conventions which incorporate the NINJA mark in its entirety with the addition of the terms "kitchen" and "inc", "llc" and "us";
- the disputed domain names are being used for identical websites that are near replicas of the official SharkNinja website;

- the disputed domain names have been used to send emails to third parties which purport to have been sent from and on behalf of the Complainant, by impersonating the same Complainant's employee; and
- all the disputed domain names were registered through the same Registrar, namely CloudFlare, Inc., on August 9, 2026, and all used name servers with CloudFlare.

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 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 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 here, "kitchen" and "inc", "llc" and "us" respectively, may bear on the 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 names 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.

Panels have held that the use of a domain name for illegitimate activity here, claimed impersonation, phishing, or other types of fraud, 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.

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.

In the present case, the Panel notes that the Respondent has used the disputed domain names to send emails to targeted individuals while impersonating the Complainant in connection with a fictitious marketing initiative, most likely for the purpose of obtaining sensitive information and/or funds from the recipients. Panels have held that the use of a domain name for this type of illegal activity constitutes bad faith. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 3.4.

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 <ninjakitcheninc.com>, <ninjakitchenllc.com> and <ninjakitchenus.com> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Knud Wallberg/

Knud Wallberg

Sole Panelist

Date: September 15, 2026