

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

Amundi Asset Management v. li shi min, li shi min
Case No. D2025-3543

1. The Parties

The Complainant is Amundi Asset Management, France, represented by Nameshield, France.

The Respondent is li shi min, li shi min, China.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <amundibtc.com> is registered with Hello Internet Corp (the “Registrar”).

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the “Center”) on September 2, 2025. On September 2, 2025, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On September 3, 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 (Unknown) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on September 3, 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 September 3, 2025.

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 4, 2025. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was September 24, 2025. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent’s default on September 25, 2025.

The Center appointed Peter Burgstaller as the sole panelist in this matter on September 29, 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 a French established leading asset manager and has offices in Europe, Asia-Pacific, the Middle-East and America (Annex 3 to the Complaint).

It owns the International Trademark Registration (word) for AMUNDI, Reg. No. 1024160, registered September 24, 2009, designating several jurisdictions around the world, *inter alia* Australia, Japan, United States of America, China, Canada and the European Union (Annex 4 to the Complaint).

The Complainant provides its main business website under the domain name <amundi.com>, which was registered on August 26, 2004 (Annexes 3 and 5 to the Complaint).

The disputed domain name was registered on August 26, 2025 (Annex 1 to the Complaint). At the time of filing the Complaint, the disputed domain name resolved to an authentication website containing text fields for entering email-address and password and displaying the Bitcoin logo  (Annex 6 to the Complaint).

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 disputed domain name:

Notably, the Complainant contends that the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to the well-known and distinctive AMUNDI mark in which the Complainant has rights. The only difference to the AMUNDI mark is the suffix “btc”, which is a well-known abbreviation of the Bitcoin crypto currency. The mere addition of this suffix to the Complainant’s trademark does not negate the confusing similarity between the disputed domain name and the Complainant’s trademark under the Policy.

Furthermore, the Complainant notes that the Respondent does not have any rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name. The Respondent is not linked to the Complainant in any way whatsoever and has never been authorized by the Complainant to register a domain name which is similar to its trademark. The Respondent is moreover not commonly known by or associated with the disputed domain name and does not use it for any bona fide offering of goods or services.

The Complainant states that the disputed domain name is registered and used in bad faith by the Respondent. The disputed domain name was registered years after the Complainant has established rights in the mark AMUNDI and this mark is distinctive and well-known; hence, the Respondent must have been aware of the Complainant and its rights in the mark AMUNDI when registering the disputed domain name.

Further, the Complainant contends that the disputed domain name resolves to an authentication page displaying a bitcoin logo and text fields for entering password and email-address which might be used for the purpose of collecting personal information from the Complainant’s customers. This cannot be considered as bona fide use of the disputed domain name – it rather provides evidence that the Respondent has intentionally attempted to attract, for commercial purposes, Internet users to its website, by creating a likelihood of confusion with the Complainant’s trademark as to the source, sponsorship, affiliation or endorsement of its website.

B. Respondent

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

6. Discussion and Findings

According to paragraph 4(a) of the Policy, 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 with respect to the disputed domain name; and
- (iii) the disputed domain name has been registered and is being used in bad faith.

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. This test typically involves a side-by-side comparison of the disputed domain name and the textual components of the relevant trademark to assess whether the mark is recognizable within the disputed domain name. See WIPO Overview of WIPO Panel Views on Selected UDRP Questions, Third Edition ("[WIPO Overview 3.0](#)"), section 1.7.

The Complainant submitted evidence which establishes rights in the trademark AMUNDI.

Since it has long been held that generic Top-Level Domains ("gTLDs") are generally disregarded when evaluating the confusing similarity of a disputed domain name, the crucial question in this case is whether the second-level of the disputed domain name "amundibtc" is confusingly similar to the Complainant's trademark AMUNDI; the Panel finds that it clearly is.

The Complainant's trademark AMUNDI is recognizable within the disputed domain name, and the addition of the suffix "btc", which is the well-known abbreviation for the crypto currency Bitcoin does not prevent a finding of confusing similarity to the AMUNDI mark of the Complainant.

Therefore, 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 the disputed domain names.

While 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 often impossible 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. 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 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, since it has never assigned, granted, licensed, sold, transferred, or in any way authorized the Respondent to register the disputed domain name or use its trademark in any manner.

The Respondent is also not commonly known under the disputed domain name and the disputed domain name is not being used for a bona fide offering of goods or services; rather, it appears most likely that the disputed domain name is specifically chosen to falsely suggest an affiliation with the Complainant.

Furthermore, the composition of the disputed domain name, comprising the Complainant's mark AMUNDI together with the suffix "btc", coupled with the use of the disputed domain name for an authentication website together with the Bitcoin logo, is likely to mislead Internet users and cannot be considered fair use – the opposite is the case: such conduct does not give rise to rights or legitimate interests.

Finally, the Respondent did not provide any evidence showing its rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name – it did not file a Response and has therefore not rebutted the Complainant's contentions.

Based on the available records, the Panel finds the second element of the Policy has been established.

C. Registered and Used in Bad Faith

As stated in many decisions rendered under the Policy (e.g., *Robert Ellenbogen v. Mike Pearson*, WIPO Case No. [D2000-0001](#)) both conditions, registration and use in bad faith, must be demonstrated; consequently, the Complainant must show that:

- the disputed domain name is registered by the Respondent in bad faith, and
- the disputed domain name is being used by the Respondent in bad faith.

(i) The Complainant has established rights in the mark AMUNDI many years before the registration of the disputed domain name. Furthermore, the Complainant is using the mark AMUNDI in its primary domain name <amundi.com> for addressing its main business website.

Because of the distinctiveness of the AMUNDI mark, it is inconceivable for this Panel that the Respondent has registered the disputed domain name without knowledge of the Complainant's rights. Panels have consistently found that the mere registration of a domain name that is identical or confusingly similar to a distinctive trademark by an unaffiliated entity (as it is in the present case) can by itself create a presumption of bad faith. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 3.1.4.

Finally, a simple online search for "amundi" would have shown the Complainant and its marks. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 3.2.2.

Therefore, the Panel is convinced that the disputed domain name was registered in bad faith by the Respondent.

(ii) The Complainant has put forward evidence that the disputed domain name was used by the Respondent prior to filing of the Complaint to resolve to an authentication website featuring the Bitcoin logo and providing text fields for entering password and email-address and purportedly for collecting personal information of Internet users who mistakenly believe that they are on the Complainant's website.

This is likely to disrupt the Complainant's business and shows that the Respondent intentionally attempts to attract, for commercial gain, Internet users by creating a likelihood of confusion with the Complainant's mark, which constitutes bad faith use.

The evidence and documents produced and put forward by the Complainant together with the fact that the Respondent has failed to file a formal Response and therefore failed to present any evidence of any good faith registration and use with regard to the disputed domain name clearly prove that the disputed domain name was registered and is used by the Respondent in bad faith under paragraph 4(a)(iii) of the Policy.

Based on the available record, the Panel 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 <amundibtc.com> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Peter Burgstaller/

Peter Burgstaller

Sole Panelist

Date: October 10, 2025