ARBITRATION
AND
MEDIATION CENTER

WIPO
WORLD
INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY
ORGANIZATION

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION
KPMG International Cooperative v. Ayush Baldota
Case No. D2026-4213

1. The Parties

The Complainant is KPMG International Cooperative, Netherlands (Kingdom of the), represented by Winston Taylor International LLP, United Kingdom.

The Respondent is Ayush Baldota, United States of America ("United States").

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <kpmg-de.com> (the "Domain Name") is registered with PDR Ltd. d/b/a PublicDomainRegistry.com (the "Registrar").

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the "Center") on September 18, 2026. On September 21, 2026, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the Domain Name. On September 22, 2026, the Registrar transmitted by email to the Center its verification response disclosing registrant and contact information for the Domain Name which differed from the named Respondent (Information Unavailable) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on September 23, 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 September 28, 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 September 29, 2026. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was October 19, 2026. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent's default on October 20, 2026.

The Center appointed Piotr Nowaczyk as the sole panelist in this matter on October 22, 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.

On November 2, 2026, the Respondent sent an email to the Center confirming its willingness to transfer the Domain Name.

4. Factual Background

The Complainant is affiliated with the KPMG network of independent member firms. The KPMG network provides audit, tax, and advisory services under the KPMG trademark. Its member firms operate in approximately 138 countries and territories and have more than 276,000 partners and employees worldwide.

The Complainant is the owner of numerous trademark registrations for KPMG, including:

- the European Union Trade Mark Registration for KPMG (word trademark) No. 001011220, registered on April 25, 2000;
- the European Union Trade Mark Registration for KPMG (figurative trademark) No. 001179662, registered on June 27, 2000; and
- the United Kingdom Trademark Registration for KPMG (word trademark) No. UK00901011220, registered on April 25, 2000.

Moreover, the KPMG network uses for its websites the domain name <kpmg.com>, which incorporates the KPMG trademark.

The Domain Name was registered on August 4, 2026.

According to the evidence submitted by the Complainant, at the time the Complaint was filed, the Domain Name did not resolve to an active website. The Complainant also submitted evidence of an email sent on August 5, 2026, from an email address associated with the Domain Name. The email purported to originate from a KPMG Senior Manager in the audit department and sought the services of a video production company. The Complainant alleges that the email was part of a fraudulent scheme.

As of the date of this Decision, the Domain Name does not resolve to an 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 Domain Name.

First, the Complainant contends that the Domain Name is confusingly similar to the trademark in which the Complainant has rights.

Second, the Complainant argues that the Respondent has neither rights nor legitimate interests in the Domain Name.

Third, the Complainant submits that the Domain Name was registered and is being used in bad faith.

B. Respondent

The Respondent did not submit a formal Response.

However, on November 2, 2026, the Respondent sent an email to the Center stating: "Thank you for the update. We write to confirm that we are agreeable to transferring and handing over the domain name <kpmg-de.com>. Please let us know the necessary steps or instructions to complete the transfer process."

6. Discussion and Findings

The Panel notes that in the present case the Respondent has expressly agreed to the transfer of the Domain Name to the Complainant outside the standard settlement process.

As explained in section 4.10 of the WIPO Overview of WIPO Panel Views on Select UDRP Questions ("WIPO Overview 3.1"), where parties to a UDRP proceeding have not been able to settle their dispute prior to the issuance of a panel decision using the "standard settlement process", but where the respondent has nevertheless given its consent on the record to the transfer (or cancellation) remedy sought by the complainant, many panels will order the requested remedy solely on the basis of such consent. In such cases, the panel gives effect to an understood party agreement as to the disposition of their case (whether by virtue of deemed admission, or on a no-fault basis).

Section 4.10 of the WIPO Overview 3.1 also recognizes that, in some cases, despite such respondent consent, a panel may in its discretion still find it appropriate to proceed to a substantive decision on the merits. Scenarios in which a panel may find it appropriate to do so include (i) where the panel finds a broader interest in recording a substantive decision on the merits – notably recalling UDRP paragraph 4(b)(ii) discussing a pattern of bad faith conduct, (ii) where while consenting to the requested remedy the respondent has expressly disclaimed any bad faith, (iii) where the complainant has not agreed to accept such consent and has expressed a preference for a recorded decision on the merits, (iv) where there is ambiguity as to the scope of the respondent's consent, or (v) where the panel wishes to be certain that the complainant has shown that it possesses relevant trademark rights.

Having considered the circumstances of the present case, the Panel finds it appropriate to order the transfer of the Domain Name on the basis of the Respondent's consent, without proceeding to a substantive examination of the three elements under paragraph 4(a) of the Policy.

First, the Complainant seeks in the present proceedings the transfer of the Domain Name. In its email of November 2, 2026, the Respondent expressly confirmed its agreement to transfer the Domain Name and requested instructions on how to complete the transfer process. The Respondent's communication contains no conditions or qualifications concerning the proposed transfer. The Panel therefore considers that the Respondent has clearly consented to the remedy sought by the Complainant.

Second, the Panel finds no broader interest in rendering a substantive decision on the merits.

In particular, the record does not indicate a pattern of bad faith conduct by the Respondent within the meaning of paragraph 4(b)(ii) of the Policy.

Moreover, the Respondent has not expressly denied acting in bad faith. Its communication is limited to confirming its agreement to transfer the Domain Name and requesting instructions for completing the transfer.

The record also does not indicate that the Complainant has objected to the proposed transfer or expressed a preference for a substantive decision notwithstanding the Respondent's consent.

Furthermore, the Panel finds no ambiguity concerning the scope of the Respondent's consent. The Respondent has clearly agreed to transfer the Domain Name, without imposing any conditions or qualifications. This corresponds to the remedy sought by the Complainant.

Finally, the Panel sees no particular need to undertake a substantive examination for the purpose of verifying the Complainant's trademark rights, in light of the trademark registrations submitted with the Complaint. In these circumstances, the Panel considers that a substantive determination on the merits is unnecessary.

Accordingly, the Panel finds it appropriate to order the transfer of the Domain Name to the Complainant on the basis that the Respondent has unequivocally consented to such transfer.

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 Domain Name <kpmg-de.com> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Piotr Nowaczyk/
Piotr Nowaczyk
Sole Panelist
Date: November 5, 2026