

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

Kinopoisk LLC v. Domain Privacy

Case No. DCC2026-0018

1. The Parties

The Complainant is Kinopoisk LLC, Russian Federation, represented by Brand Monitor LLC, Russian Federation.

The Respondent is Domain Privacy, Cyprus.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <kinopoisk.cc> is registered with Names On The Drop LLC (the “Registrar”).

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the “Center”) on August 19, 2026. On August 20, 2026, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On August 21, 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 (The RDAP server redacted the value) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on August 21, 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 August 25, 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 1, 2026. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was September 21, 2026. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent’s default on September 22, 2026.

The Center appointed Assen Alexiev as the sole panelist in this matter on September 28, 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 Russian-language online service, launched in 2003, dedicated to films and television series. It provides a large database of audiovisual works and operates a subscription-based video streaming service offering licensed films, TV series, and original content under the brand КИНОПОИСК (transliterated as “KINOPOISK”).¹ The Complainant operates its official website at the domain name <kinopoisk.ru>. Similarweb ranks this website at No. 223 globally and at No.17 in the Russian Federation for August 2026.²

The Complainant is the owner of the following trademark registrations for КИНОПОИСК/KINOPOISK (the “KINOPOISK trademark”):

- the Russian Federation trademark КИНОПОИСК (transliterated as “KINOPOISK”) with registration No. 426825, registered on December 28, 2010 for services in International Class 35;
- the Russian Federation trademark KINOPOISK with registration No. 727944, registered on September 16, 2019 for goods and services in International Classes 9, 35, 38, 41, and 42; and
- the International trademark KINOPOISK with registration No. 1548661, registered on July 8, 2020 for goods and services in International Classes 9, 35, 38, 41, and 42.

The disputed domain name was registered on December 2, 2022. It is currently inactive. At the time of filing of the Complaint, the disputed domain name resolved to a parking webpage containing pay-per-click (“PPC”) links related to movies.

5. Parties’ Contentions

A. Complainant

The Complainant states that the disputed domain name is identical to its KINOPOISK trademark, because it incorporates the entire trademark.

According to the Complainant, the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the disputed domain name, because it has no connection or affiliation with the Complainant and has not received any authorization to use the KINOPOISK trademark in the disputed domain name or in any other manner.

The Complainant notes that it uses its KINOPOISK trademark in connection with the online entertainment platform available at the domain name <kinopoisk.ru>, and maintains that its trademark has acquired substantial reputation in the Russian-speaking Internet. The Complainant submits that the term “kinopoisk” is a coined and distinctive designation created by the Complainant in 2003, and not a dictionary word, and an unaffiliated party would have no legitimate basis to register it as a domain name without authorisation from the Complainant. According to the Complainant, the Respondent had no objective reason to choose

¹ In Russian, “Кинопоиск” is a portmanteau of the words “кино” (“cinema”) and “поиск” (“search”).

² “<https://www.similarweb.com/website/kinopoisk.ru/#overview>”. Noting in particular the general powers of a panel articulated inter alia in paragraphs 10 and 12 of the Rules, it has been accepted that a panel may undertake limited factual research into matters of public record if it would consider such information useful to assessing the case merits and reaching a decision, in particular to affirm or corroborate a party’s contention. WIPO Overview of WIPO Panel Views on Select UDRP Questions (“[WIPO Overview 3.1](#)”), section 4.8.

the word “Kinopoisk” in the disputed domain name other than to create a likelihood of confusion with the Complainant. The Complainant adds that the disputed domain name was registered many years after the Complainant’s platform had become widely known among Internet users.

The Complainant contends that the disputed domain name was registered and is being used in bad faith. The Complainant points out that the disputed domain name resolves to a webpage indicating that it is available for sale, which webpage also displays a series of PPC links directly related to the Complainant’s field of activity, including “NEW MOVIE REVIEWS”, “STREAM MOVIES”, “BEST ADVENTURE MOVIES”, and “BEST MOVIES ON STREAMING RIGHT NOW”. According to the Complainant, the fact that the displayed PPC links are thematically identical to the Complainant’s core business — film and television content discovery and streaming — demonstrates that the Respondent was well aware of the Complainant’s trademark when registering and using the disputed domain name, and that it is deliberately trading on the fame of the KINOPOISK trademark to attract Internet users for commercial gain, rather than operating a generic advertising page. In the Complainant’s view, the only plausible explanation for the registration and use of the disputed domain name is that the Respondent attempts to capitalise on the Complainant’s goodwill.

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 3.1](#), section 1.7.

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

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

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 recognised 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 disputed domain name is identical to the Complainant's distinctive and popular KINOPOISK trademark and to the Latin transliteration of its Cyrillic version. The disputed domain name has resolved to a landing page displaying PPC links related to movies, such as "NEW MOVIE REVIEWS", "STREAM MOVIES", and "BEST ADVENTURE MOVIES". These PPC links offer services that are identical or similar to the services provided by the Complainant.

Although the term Kinopoisk itself is not a dictionary word, its Cyrillic version in Russian "Кинопоиск", is a portmanteau of the words "кино" ("cinema") and "поиск" ("search"). Panels have held that merely registering a domain name comprised of a dictionary word or phrase would not by itself automatically confer rights or legitimate interests on the respondent. Section 2.10 of the [WIPO Overview 3.1](#). Here, however, the disputed domain name has been used for a PPC website as described above. As discussed in section 2.9 of the [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), the use of a domain name to host a parked page comprising PPC links does not represent a bona fide offering where such links compete with or capitalise on the reputation and goodwill of the complainant's mark or otherwise mislead Internet users. This is the case here: the Respondent has used a domain name that is identical to the Complainant's trademark with the intention of attracting Internet users who may be searching for the Complainant- to competing services for commercial gain. Such conduct cannot give rise to rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name.

The Panel therefore finds that 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 finds that KINOPOISK is a distinctive trademark identifying the Complainant's online entertainment platform, which has been operated since 2003. The Respondent has registered and used the disputed domain name which is identical to the Complainant's KINOPOISK trademark, long after the Complainant had registered and used that trademark. The disputed domain name resolves to a landing page displaying PPC links offering services similar to or competing with those of the Complainant. The Panel finds, on the balance of probabilities, that the Respondent knew or should have known of the Complainant and its trademark when registering the disputed domain name. It follows that by registering and using the disputed domain name, the Respondent has intentionally attempted to attract, for commercial gain, Internet users to its website by creating a likelihood of confusion with the Complainant's KINOPOISK trademark. This is bad faith under paragraph 4(b)(iv) of the Policy.

The Panel therefore 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 <kinopoisk.cc> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Assen Alexiev/

Assen Alexiev

Sole Panelist

Date: October 2, 2026