

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

BlackRock Finance, Inc., Laurence Douglas Fink v. Marc Kity
Case No. DIO2026-0031

1. The Parties

Complainants are BlackRock Finance, Inc., and Laurence Douglas Fink, United States of America, represented by Day Pitney LLP, United States of America.

Respondent is Marc Kity, United States of America, self-represented.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <larryfink.io> (the “Disputed Domain Name”) is registered with Name.com, Inc. (the “Registrar”).

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the “Center”) on June 26, 2026. On June 29, 2026, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the Disputed Domain Name. On June 30, 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 and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to Complainant on July 1, 2026, providing the registrant and contact information disclosed by the Registrar, and inviting Complainant to submit an amendment to the Complaint. Complainant filed an amended Complaint on July 6, 2026.

The Center verified that the Complaint together with the amended Complaint satisfied the formal requirements of the .IO Domain Name Dispute Resolution Policy (the “Policy”), the Rules for .IO Domain Name Dispute Resolution Policy (the “Rules”), and the WIPO Supplemental Rules for .IO Domain Name Dispute Resolution Policy (the “Supplemental Rules”).

In accordance with the Rules, paragraphs 2 and 4, the Center formally notified Respondent of the Complaint, and the proceedings commenced on July 7, 2026. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was July 27, 2026. Respondent sent email communications on July 1, July 7, August 1, and August 22, 2026. Respondent did not submit a formal response. Accordingly, the Center informed the Parties of the commencement of the panel appointment process on July 28, 2026.

The Center appointed Douglas M. Isenberg as the sole panelist in this matter on August 20, 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 August 24, 2026, the Center notified the Parties of Administrative Panel Procedural Order No.1 (“Procedural Order No. 1”) (discussed below), inviting the Parties to provide comments by August 27, 2026, which neither Party did.

4. Factual Background

Because, as discussed below, the Parties consent to a transfer of the Disputed Domain Name, the Panel provides only an abbreviated description of the factual background.

The Complaint states that Complainant BlackRock Finance, Inc. (“BlackRock”) was founded in 1988 by Complainant Laurence Douglas Fink (“Fink”), its current CEO, and “a team of partners”; and that Fink “is routinely recognized as one of the most noteworthy and influential figures in the international financial landscape”; and that “[t]hroughout Mr. Fink’s tenure as CEO and Chairman of BlackRock, his name has served as an indicator of the high quality of services offered by BlackRock”.

The Disputed Domain Name was created on May 19, 2023. As set forth in the Complaint:

Complainant became aware of the Domain in October 2024, when Respondent sent Mr. Fink dozens of e-mails claiming ownership of three domains, including the subject to this UDRP,¹ and two additional domains subject to a second UDRP on account of use of a different domain extension (collectively, the three Domains referenced in the Annex are referred to as the “Domains”). Respondent repeatedly demanded that Mr. Fink purchase the Domains for increasingly exorbitant fees (e.g., 250,000 Bitcoin, 500,000 Bitcoin). As shown in Annex 4, the individual threatened that it would “misuse [Mr. Fink’s] name domains or sell to [Mr. Fink’s] competitors” if payment was not remitted. After Mr. Fink did not respond to the individual’s initial demands, the individual further stated that “from now onwards I will use your all your domains...Ok Good or Bad way I can sell to anyone in world...No Mercy for you...All risk will not be mine I don’t lie”.

BlackRock reported the Respondent’s actions to Name.com in October 2024 and received confirmation that the Domains were put on “clientHold” status. See Annex 5. In September 2025, the Respondent again emailed Mr. Fink, this time using a new e-mail address and impersonating a Japanese businessman, stating it “shall accept your offer not but below \$10 Trillion USDT / BC otherwise we can misuse your domains names as it’s all our rights to use ok”. Again, neither Mr. Fink nor BlackRock responded to Respondent’s attempts to extort payment from Mr. Fink.

5. Parties’ Contentions

A. Complainant

Because, as discussed below, the Parties consent to a transfer of the Disputed Domain Name, the Panel provides only an abbreviated description of the Parties’ contentions.

Complainant contends that “[a]s a result of Complainant’s use of Complainant’s Mark [LARRY FINK] in connection with financial advisory and investment services, LARRY FINK is a common law trademark of BlackRock and Mr. Fink”; and that the Disputed Domain Name is identical to this mark.

¹ The Panel notes that this proceeding is being conducted pursuant to the .IO Domain Name Dispute Resolution Policy, not the Uniform Domain Name Dispute Resolution Policy (“UDRP”).

Complainant contends that Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in the Disputed Domain Name because it is “is using the Domain in an attempt to extort Complainant for millions of dollars”.

Complainant contends that the Disputed Domain Name was registered or is being used in bad faith because “[w]ith knowledge of Complainant and Complainant’s Mark, Respondent intentionally registered the Domain featuring Complainant’s Mark for the sole purpose of extorting exorbitant sums of money from the Complainant, threatening to use the Domain to harm Complainant’s reputation or transfer control of the Domain to a competitor if Complainant refused to comply with Respondent’s demands”.

B. Respondent

Respondent did not reply to Complainant’s contentions. However, Respondent sent four emails to the Center, the relevant portions of which are set forth below:

- July 1, 2026: “I like to do settlement with the party.”
- July 7, 2026: “We shall request for surrender of domains to Mr Larry fink . And close all the case.... Soon I will send the transfer code to Mr Larry fink of domains. Request from Larry fink to close all the case.”
- August 22, 2026: “Still I am ready to give domains for free to Mr Larry fink ceo.”

6. Discussion and Findings

As set forth in WIPO Overview of WIPO Panel Views on Select UDRP Questions (“[WIPO Overview 3.1](#)”),² section 4.10: “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).”

As a result of the emails sent by Respondent described above – including Respondent’s statement that it would “like to do settlement” and that it “shall request for surrender of domains” to Complainant – the Panel issued Procedural Order No. 1 on August 24, 2026, stating that “the Panel intends to treat the Respondent’s communications of July 7, 2026 and August 22, 2026 as a consent to transfer the Disputed Domain Name <larryfink.io> to the Complainant” and inviting the Parties “to provide comments (if any) on this approach by August 27, 2026”. As noted above, neither party commented on this order. Accordingly, the Panel considers it appropriate to order transfer of the Disputed Domain Name solely on the basis of Respondent’s consent.³

² It is appropriate to refer to the UDRP and relevant UDRP authority because of “the substantial substantive similarities between” the Policy and the UDRP. *WhatsApp Inc. v. WhoisGuard Protected, WhoisGuard, Inc. / Don Stanley*, WIPO Case No. [DIO2021-0002](#).

³ The Panel is also mindful of a very recent decision involving the same Parties and the domain names <larryfinkfoundation.com> and <laurencedouglasfink.com>, *BlackRock Finance, Inc., Laurence Douglas Fink v. Amber Malvia, Exports and Marc Kity*, WIPO Case No. [D2026-2720](#), in which the panel there examined at length the issue of personal names as trademarks and concluded that “Complainant has proved that it used the personal name LARRY FINK as a trademark and that the Mark so used has acquired secondary meaning, thereby proving ownership of unregistered trademark rights in the Mark” – “because Complainant[] uses LARRY FINK in connection with a specific service (a newsletter) and to identify the source of the newsletter.”

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, <larryfink.io>, be transferred to Complainant.

/Douglas M. Isenberg/

Douglas M. Isenberg

Sole Panelist

Date: August 29, 2026