

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

AirGSM Pte. Ltd. v. Kawtar latif, Amaira

Case No. D2026-0324

1. The Parties

The Complainant is AirGSM Pte. Ltd., Singapore, represented by Lewis Silkin LLP, United Kingdom.

The Respondent is Kawtar latif, Amaira, Spain, self-represented.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <amairalo.com> is registered with NameCheap, Inc. (the “Registrar”).

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the “Center”) on January 27, 2026. On January 27, 2026, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On January 27, 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 (Redacted for Privacy) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on January 28, 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 amendment to the Complaint on February 1, 2026.

The Center verified that the Complaint together with the amendment to the 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 February 2, 2026. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was February 22, 2026. The Response was filed with the Center on February 20, 2026.

The Center appointed Pablo A. Palazzi as the sole panelist in this matter on March 2, 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's business was incorporated in 2019. Since 2019 it has enjoyed aggressive growth and is regarded as the world's leading provider of digital SIM (eSIM) cards, providing its services to over 20 million customers in over 200 countries. The Complainant employs over 200 people, spread over 44 countries and several continents. It conducts its business primarily through its website located at "www.airalo.com", and its AIRALO branded software applications.

The Complainant is the proprietor a portfolio of trademark rights for its AIRALO trademark (and design) including:

- Singapore Trade Mark Registration No. 40201914330P, filed on July 3, 2019 and registered on December 19, 2019, for classes 9, 35 and 38,
- International Trade Mark Registration No. 1701049 for the AIRALO logo, with protection extended to inter alia Australia, Brazil, China, Japan, Indonesia, Viet Nam, Canada, and the European Union. International Trade Mark Registration No. 1701049 protects the same goods and services as the above Singaporean registration, upon which it is based.

The disputed domain name was registered on May 25, 2025. The disputed domain name is currently not active.

The Respondent is an individual entrepreneur based in Logroño, Spain, who claims to develop a fashion brand inspired by Arabic culture under the name "amairalo".

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 wholly incorporates the AIRALO trademark, with the mere addition of the prefix "am";
- The prefix "am" will be understood by business users as referring to "Account Manager" or "Account Management," common roles in customer relationship management, therefore, Internet users and commercial counterparties are likely to assume the disputed domain name relates to an official Airalo account management function or internal business channel; this false implication of authorization or internal affiliation is foreseeable given the Complainant's scale and international operations;
- The addition of "am" heightens rather than reduces the risk of confusion, and weighs heavily against any conceivable good-faith use by the Respondent.

B. Respondent

The Respondent contends that the Complainant has not satisfied all three of the elements required under the Policy for a transfer of the disputed domain name.

In particular, the Respondent states that:

- The disputed domain name was registered in connection with a bona fide project consisting in modest fashion brand inspired by Arabic culture, reflecting the Respondent's personal and geographic identity;
- The name "Amairalo" was independently conceived by combining three personal elements: "ama" (Latin for love), "aira" (phonetic adaptation of the Arabic word for princess, Amira), and "lo" (abbreviation of Logroño, the Respondent's hometown);

- Prior to any notice of this dispute, the Respondent has made demonstrable preparations to use the disputed domain name, including design concepts, branding materials, social media presence, and website development (screenshots provided in annexes 4-10 of the Response);
- The independent naming process is documented through a Zoom meeting and private WhatsApp exchanges predating the registration (screenshots provided in annexes 4-10 annexes 11-12 of the Response);
- At no point did the Respondent had knowledge of the Complainant or its trademark, given the Complainant's limited notoriety in Spain outside the niche eSIM travel sector;
- The Respondent has never offered the disputed domain name for sale, never impersonated the Complainant, and never configured any infrastructure capable of misleading Internet users;
- Passive holding does not constitute bad faith in the circumstances, given the early-stage nature of the project and the absence of any targeting or abusive conduct;
- The parties operate in entirely different fields — telecommunications versus fashion — with no overlap in consumers, channels, or commercial activities.

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 of WIPO Panel Views on Select UDRP Questions ("[WIPO Overview 3.1](#)"), section 1.7.

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

The Panel finds the mark is recognizable within the disputed domain name. Accordingly, the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to the mark for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.7.

Although the addition of other terms like the prefix "am" may bear on assessment of the second and third elements, the Panel finds the addition of such term does not prevent a finding of confusing similarity between the disputed domain name and the mark for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.8.

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 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.

The Respondent contends that it has rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name pursuant to paragraph 4(c)(i) of the Policy, on the grounds that, prior to receiving any notice of the dispute, it had already begun demonstrable preparations to use the domain name in connection with a bona fide offering of goods.

Specifically, the Respondent asserts that it is an individual entrepreneur based in Logroño, Spain, in the process of developing a modest fashion brand inspired by Arabic culture, and that the disputed domain name was registered on May 25, 2025, in direct connection with that project.

In support of this assertion, the Respondent submits design concepts, branding materials, social media presence, website development records, and proof of purchase as documentary evidence of its preparatory activities predating any notice of the present dispute.

The Respondent further contends that the name “Amairalo” was independently conceived through a documented creative process combining elements of Latin, Arabic, and regional Spanish origin. He asserts that “ama” derived from the Latin root *amare* meaning love, “aira” as a phonetic adaptation of the Arabic word for princess (*Amira*, أميرة), and “lo” as an abbreviation of Logroño, the Respondent’s hometown — and that this process is evidenced by records of a meeting and subsequent WhatsApp exchanges with friends predating the domain name registration, submitted as annexes to the Response.

The Respondent also submits that the name was not derived from, nor inspired by, the Complainant’s trademark, and that the independent and spontaneous nature of the naming process negates any inference of targeting.

Finally, the Respondent argues that it has no connection whatsoever to the Complainant’s field of activity, as the Complainant operates exclusively in the telecommunications and eSIM sector, which is entirely unrelated to the Respondent’s clothing and fashion project. The Respondent submits that, at the time of registration, it had no knowledge of the Complainant or its trademark, given the Complainant’s limited notoriety in Spain outside the niche segment of frequent international travelers, and the absence of any overlap between the parties’ respective commercial activities, target consumers, or distribution channels. In these circumstances, the Respondent submits that there is a plausible and credible legitimate explanation for the registration that is entirely consistent with the existence of rights or legitimate interests under the Policy.

The Respondent had notice of the dispute on February 2, 2026. The evidence presented by the Respondent shows that he was configuring Shopify for his online store on May 28, 2025; an Instagram account for the project was opened on May 19, 2025; a search for the disputed domain name availability was also made around that date (which showed that the domain name <amaira.com> was already taken); the design of the logo on May 17, 2025, and four screenshots of WhatsApp conversations about the naming selection process from May 17 to May 24, 2025.

The Panel finds that, before notice to the Respondent of the dispute, the Respondent made demonstrable preparations to use the disputed domain name in connection with a bona fide offering of goods. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 2.2.

The Panel finds the second element of the Policy has not 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.

Given the Panel’s finding that the Complainant has failed to establish that the Respondent lacks rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name, the Panel considers it unnecessary to address the third element of the Policy concerning registration and use in bad faith.

7. Decision

For the foregoing reasons, the Complaint is denied.

/Pablo A. Palazzi/

Pablo A. Palazzi

Sole Panelist

Date: March 12, 2026.