

## **ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION**

Amadeus IT Group, S.A. v. kevin Liu  
Case No. D2025-1968

### **1. The Parties**

The Complainant is Amadeus IT Group, S.A., Spain, represented by Ubilibet, S.L., Spain.

The Respondent is kevin Liu, China.

### **2. The Domain Name and Registrar**

The disputed domain name <amadeus.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 May 16, 2025. On May 16, 2025, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On May 19, 2025, 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 (REDACTED FOR PRIVACY) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on May 20, 2025, 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 May 29, 2015.

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 May 30, 2025. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was June 19, 2025. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent’s default on June 20, 1015.

The Center appointed Eva Fiammenghi as the sole panelist in this matter on June 27, 2025. 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 Amadeus IT Group, S.A., a company headquartered in Madrid, Spain, active globally in the travel technology and services sector. The Complainant was incorporated in 1987 and provides technology solutions and services for the travel industry ecosystem: airlines, airports and ground handlers, car rental agencies, corporations, cruise and ferry operators, hotels and event venues, insurance providers, travel sellers, tourism boards, travelers themselves and more. The Complainant operates in over 190 countries and is a publicly listed company on the Spanish Stock Exchange.

The Complainant holds several trademark registrations for the trademark AMADEUS in various jurisdictions, including the following:

- European Union trademark AMADEUS, Reg. No: 002069375, registered on August 29, 2005, in classes 9, 12, 16, 35, 36, 38, 39, and 42.

- United States trademark AMADEUS, Reg. No: 73682376, registered on March 14, 1989, in classes 35, 39, and 42.

- International trademark AMADEUS, Reg. No: 511594, registered on April 7, 1987, in class 39.

The Complainant also operates domain names incorporating the AMADEUS trademark, including <amadeus.com>, which hosts the official website of the Complainant.

The disputed domain name <amadeus.name> was registered on February 17, 2025. At the time of filing the Complaint, the disputed domain name resolved to a website of “Amadeus Global Distribution System (AMADEUS GDS) Training” with the following text: “The leader in China’s airline ticketing training field”.

#### **5. Parties’ Contentions**

##### **A. Complainant**

The Complainant contends that it has satisfied each of the three elements required under the Policy for a transfer of the disputed domain name <amadeus.name>.

Notably, the Complainant argues that the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to its AMADEUS trademark, reproducing it in its entirety. The addition of the generic Top-Level Domain (“gTLD”) “.name” should be disregarded from the first element confusing similarity test.

The Complainant further contends that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the disputed domain name. The Respondent is not affiliated with the Complainant in any way, is not commonly known by the name “Amadeus”, and has not been authorized to use the AMADEUS trademark. The Respondent is not making any legitimate noncommercial or fair use of the domain name.

The Complainant submits that the disputed domain name was registered and is being used in bad faith. According to the evidence provided, the disputed domain name resolves to a website offering training services related to the Complainant’s Global Distribution System (GDS), specifically targeting the Chinese civil aviation sector, with an evident commercial and profit-driven purpose of establishing a business within this market. The website also contains unauthorized and outdated information.

The Complainant requests the transfer of the disputed domain name to itself under paragraph 4(i) of the Policy.

## **B. Respondent**

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

## **6. Discussion and Findings**

Under paragraph 4(a) of the Policy, to succeed the Complainant must prove that:

- (i) the disputed domain name is identical or confusingly similar to a trademark or service mark in which the Complainant has rights; and
- (ii) the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the disputed domain name; and
- (iii) the disputed domain name was registered and is being used in bad faith.

These elements are discussed in turn below. In considering these elements, paragraph 15(a) of the Rules provides that the Panel shall decide the Complaint on the basis of statements and documents submitted and in accordance with the Policy, the Rules and any other rules or principles of law that the Panel deems applicable.

### **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 3.0](#), section 1.7.

The Complainant has shown rights in respect of a trademark or service mark for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 1.2.1.

The entirety of the mark is reproduced within the disputed domain name. Accordingly, the disputed domain name is identical to the mark for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 1.7.

The applicable gTLD ".name" is typically disregarded under the first element assessment.

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 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 3.0](#), 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 Complainant has not authorized the Respondent to use its trademark. There is no evidence that the Respondent is commonly known by the disputed domain name, nor is there evidence of any bona fide offering of goods or services, or legitimate noncommercial use.

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.

In the present case, the Panel notes that the Respondent has used the disputed domain name to offer training services related to the Complainant's Global Distribution System, specifically targeting the Chinese civil aviation sector, with an evident commercial and profit-driven purpose of establishing a business within this market.

Paragraph 4(b)(iv) of the Policy applies. The Respondent has intentionally attempted to attract, for commercial gain, Internet users by creating a likelihood of confusion with the Complainant's mark as to the source, sponsorship, affiliation, or endorsement of the service offered on the disputed domain name.

Having reviewed the record, the Panel finds that the Respondent's registration and use of the disputed domain name constitutes bad faith under the Policy.

The Panel finds the third element of the Policy has been established.

## **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 <amadeus.name> be transferred to the Complainant.

*/Eva Fiammenghi/*

**Eva Fiammenghi**

Sole Panelist

Date: July 11, 2025