Decision for dispute CAC-UDRP-108453

Case number	**CAC-UDRP-108453**
Time of filing	**2026-02-28 08:02:11**
Domain names	**klingai.art, kling30.link, klingai.link**

Case administrator

Organization	**Iveta Špiclová (Czech Arbitration Court) (Case admin)**

Complainants

Organization	**Beijing Dajia Internet Information Technology Co. Ltd.**
Organization	**Beijing Kuaishou Technology Co. Ltd.**

Respondent

Name	**f z**

OTHER LEGAL PROCEEDINGS

The Panel is not aware of any other legal proceedings which are pending or decided and which relate to the disputed domain names.

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

The Complainants are two related companies, with Complainant 1 being an indirect wholly-owned subsidiary of Complainant 2. The Complainants operate in the field of artificial intelligence and audio-visual technologies.

The Complainants have developed an artificial intelligence product called “KlingAI”, which enables users to generate photos and videos based on textual, visual or audiovisual input. The product has gained significant global recognition and is accessible via the website <klingai.com> as well as through mobile applications.

Complainant 1 is the owner of registered trademarks “KLING” and “KLINGAI” in several jurisdictions, including the United Kingdom, the European Union, the United States and Australia.

The disputed domain names <klingai.art>, <klingai.link> and <kling30.link> were registered between September 2025 and February 2026 with the same registrar, Spaceship, and resolve to identical or highly similar websites offering paid AI services under the name “Kling AI”.

No information is known about the Respondent who registered the disputed domain names using the privacy protection service.

NO ADMINISTRATIVELY COMPLIANT RESPONSE HAS BEEN FILED.

PARTIES CONTENTIONS

COMPLAINANT' CONTENTIONS:

Identical or confusingly similar

The Complainants argue that the disputed domain names <klingai.art>, <klingai.link> and <kling30.link> are confusingly similar to

Complainant 1’s registered trademarks KLING and KLINGAI.

In particular, the Complainants contend that the disputed domain names fully incorporate the Complainants’ trademarks. The additional element “30” in the domain name <kling30.link> is merely a generic numerical suffix which does not prevent a finding of confusing similarity and is likely to refer to the Complainants’ Kling 3.0 model.

The Complainants further submit that the applicable Top-Level Domains “.art” and “.link” do not prevent the likelihood of confusion, as they are merely technical requirements of registration.

No rights or legitimate interests

The Complainants argue that the Respondent is not commonly known by the disputed domain names or any name corresponding to them, and that the Respondent is not affiliated with, nor authorised by, the Complainants.

The Complainants state that they have not granted any licence or authorisation to the Respondent to use their trademarks KLING or KLINGAI or to register any domain names incorporating these marks.

Furthermore, the Respondent is using the disputed domain names to offer competing AI services under the name “Kling AI”, thereby creating a misleading impression of association with the Complainants.

Accordingly, the Complainants contend that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the disputed domain names.

Registered and used in bad faith

As regards bad faith registration, the Complainants submit that, given the worldwide recognition and reputation of the KLING and KLINGAI trademarks, the Respondent had knowledge of the Complainants’ rights at the time of registration of the disputed domain names.

The Complainants further contend that the disputed domain names are used to operate websites offering competing AI services under the Complainants’ brand name, thereby taking unfair advantage of the Complainants’ reputation and misleading Internet users.

In addition, the Complainants point out that the disputed domain names resolve to identical websites and use the same payment provider, which supports the conclusion that they are under common control and used for a coordinated commercial purpose.

Accordingly, the Complainants submit that the Respondent registered and is using the disputed domain names in bad faith.

RESPONDENT'S CONTENTIONS:

The Respondent did not respond to the Complaint.

RIGHTS

The Complainants have, to the satisfaction of the Panel, shown the disputed domain names are identical or confusingly similar to a trademark in which the Complainants have rights (within the meaning of paragraph 4(a)(i) of the Policy).

NO RIGHTS OR LEGITIMATE INTERESTS

The Complainant have, to the satisfaction of the Panel, shown the Respondent to have no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the disputed domain names (within the meaning of paragraph 4(a)(ii) of the Policy).

BAD FAITH

The Complainant have, to the satisfaction of the Panel, shown the disputed domain names have been registered and are being used in bad faith (within the meaning of paragraph 4(a)(iii) of the Policy).

PROCEDURAL FACTORS

The Complainants relate to three domain names which they wish to have dealt with within a single administrative proceeding.

Paragraph 3(c) of the Rules states that the complaint may relate to more than one domain name, provided that the domain names

are registered by the same domain-name holder.

Given that the disputed domain names are registered by the same person, the Complainant is entitled to include all of them in a single complaint.

The Panel is thus satisfied that all procedural requirements under UDRP were met and there is no other reason why it would be inappropriate to provide a decision.

PRINCIPAL REASONS FOR THE DECISION

Paragraph 15 of the Rules states that the Panel decides a Complaint on the basis of the statements and documents submitted and in accordance with the Policy, the Rules and any rules and principles of law deemed applicable.

In the case of default by a Party, Rule 14 states that if a Party, in the absence of exceptional circumstances, does not comply with a provision of, or requirement under the Rules, the Panel draws such inferences therefrom as appropriate.

In the present case, the Respondent has not submitted any Response and consequently has not contested any of the contentions made by the Complainants.

The Panel proceeds therefore to decide only on the basis of the Complainants' factual statements and the documentary evidence provided in support of them.

1. Identical or confusingly similar

The Panel finds that the disputed domain names <klingai.art>, <klingai.link> and <kling30.link> are confusingly similar to the Complainants registered trademarks KLING and KLINGAI.

In particular, the disputed domain names incorporate the Complainant 1's trademarks in their entirety. The addition of the element "30" in the domain name <kling30.link> does not prevent a finding of confusing similarity, as it is a generic numerical element and may be perceived as a reference to the Complainants' Kling 3.0 model.

Moreover, the applicable Top-Level Domains ".art" and ".link" are to be disregarded for the purpose of the comparison, as they are merely technical requirements of registration.

Accordingly, the Panel considers that the disputed domain names are confusingly similar to the Complainants' trademarks and finds that paragraph 4(a)(i) of the Policy is satisfied.

2. Rights or legitimate interests

According to the Complainants' contentions and evidence submitted within this proceeding, which were not disputed, the Respondent is not affiliated with the Complainants, has not been authorised to use the Complainants' trademarks, and is not commonly known by the disputed domain names.

Furthermore, the disputed domain names resolve to websites offering AI-related services under the name "Kling AI", which directly compete with the Complainants' services and imitate the Complainants' official website.

Such use is clearly commercial in nature and is intended to mislead Internet users into believing that the services are provided by, or affiliated with, the Complainants.

In the absence of any evidence of a bona fide offering of goods or services or legitimate non-commercial use, the Panel finds that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain names.

Accordingly, paragraph 4(a)(ii) of the Policy is satisfied.

3. Registered and used in bad faith

As to bad faith registration, the Panel finds that, given the global reputation of the Complainants' KLING and KLINGAI trademarks and the widespread recognition of the KlingAI product prior to the registration of the disputed domain names, the Respondent knew or should have known of the Complainants' rights at the time of registration.

The Panel further notes that the disputed domain names fully incorporate the Complainants' trademarks and are used in connection with competing AI services, which strongly suggests an intention to take unfair advantage of the Complainants' reputation.

The disputed domain names resolve to websites that resemble to the Complainants' official platform and offer paid services under the name "Kling AI". The Panel finds that such use is likely to mislead users into believing that they are accessing the Complainants' official services, while payments are directed to a third party.

This conduct constitutes an attempt to attract Internet users for commercial gain by creating a likelihood of confusion with the Complainants' trademarks within the meaning of paragraph 4(b)(iv) of the Policy.

Taking into account all of the above circumstances, the Panel concludes that the disputed domain names were registered and are being used in bad faith.

Accordingly, the Panel finds that paragraph 4(a)(iii) of the Policy is satisfied.

FOR ALL THE REASONS STATED ABOVE, THE COMPLAINT IS

Accepted

AND THE DISPUTED DOMAIN NAME(S) IS (ARE) TO BE

1. **klingai.art**: Transferred
2. **kling30.link**: Transferred
3. **klingai.link**: Transferred

PANELLISTS

Name	**Hana Číslerová**

DATE OF PANEL DECISION 2026-03-27

Publish the Decision