

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

Alstom v. Glob News
Case No. D2026-0711

1. The Parties

The Complainant is Alstom, France, represented by Lynde & Associates, France.

The Respondent is Glob News, United States of America (“United States”).

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <alstomoffshoreengineering.pro> is registered with Atak Domain Hosting Internet ve Bilgi Teknolojileri Limited Sirketi d/b/a Atak Teknoloji (the “Registrar”).

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the “Center”) on February 19, 2026. On February 19, 2026, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On February 20, 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 (APINAME Ltd) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on February 20, 2026, providing the registrant and contact information disclosed by the Registrar, and requesting the Complainant to submit an amendment to the Complaint. The Complainant filed an amended Complaint on February 24, 2026.

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 paragraphs 2 and 4 of the Rules, the Center formally notified the Respondent of the Complaint, and the proceedings commenced on March 5, 2026. In accordance with paragraph 5 of the Rules, the due date for Response was March 25, 2026. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent’s default on March 26, 2026.

The Center appointed Yuji Yamaguchi as the sole panelist in this matter on April 8, 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 paragraph 7 of the Rules.

4. Factual Background

The Complainant is a French company founded in 1928 and a global leader in rail and airport transport infrastructure, with operations in more than 60 countries. The Complainant owns a great number of companies and trade name rights on the denomination “Alstom”, such as: Alstom Power Systems, Alstom Holdings, Alstom Shipworks, Alstom Aptis, Alstom Transport SA, etc.

The Complainant holds the registered trademarks that comprise the word Alstom (the “ALSTOM Trademarks”) in numerous jurisdictions around the world, including United Kingdom Trademark Nos. UK00900948729 (registered on August 8, 2001) and UK00900948802 (registered on June 6, 2002), United States Trademark No. 4236513 (registered on November 6, 2012), European Union Trademark No. 000948729 (registered on August 8, 2001), and International Registration Nos. 706292 (registered on August 28, 1998), and 706360 (registered on August 28, 1998).

The Complainant is also the registrant of numerous domain names under various generic and country code Top-Level Domains (“gTLDs” and “ccTLDs”) that comprise the Complainant’s ALSTOM Trademark, such as <alstom.com> registered on January 20, 1998, and <alstomgroup.com> registered on November 14, 2000.

The disputed domain name was registered on August 3, 2025. Initially, the disputed domain name redirected to a webpage displaying the activities of a Danish entity called “Alstom Offshore Engineering Company Ltd.”, providing engineering services in the field of oil, rig construction, and industrial welling, but it has been deactivated.

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’s contentions may be summarized as follows:

The disputed domain name associates the Complainant’s ALSTOM Trademark with the descriptive words “offshore” and “engineering”, which may lead web users to believe that the Respondent’s website is an official website dedicated to ALSTOM’s activities related to offshore engineering and construction. Furthermore, given the reputation of the Complainant and their activities worldwide, the disputed domain name will be directly considered by the public as belonging to the Complainant.

The Complainant has never authorized a third party to register the disputed domain name. The Respondent is not affiliated to any way to the Complainant. The Respondent did not apply for or obtain any trademark registrations related to the signs ALSTOM or ALSTOM OFFSHORE ENGINEERING. The Respondent is not commonly known under these signs either. The disputed domain name was used to display the activities of a Danish entity named Alstom Offshore Engineering Company Ltd. However, this entity has no legal existence. This name does not even match with the Respondent’s name. Even worse, the contact details which appeared on the website to which the disputed domain name resolved purported to be those of Alstom Offshore Engineering Company Ltd., but in fact belonged to another engineering company duly registered in Denmark, which had never registered the disputed domain name. Therefore, the engineering company had to file complaints for identity theft to the police and the Registrar. Then, the Respondent’s website became

inactive. The Respondent is only trying to take advantage of the Complainant's reputation by displaying the activities of a fictive entity whose name clearly suggests an affiliation with the Complainant.

The disputed domain name was acquired long after the Complainant's ALSTOM Trademarks became well-known. In view of the well-known character of the ALSTOM Trademarks, it is virtually impossible that the Respondent was not aware of the Complainant's activities, at the time it registered the disputed domain name. The disputed domain name is registered in the name of "APINAME Ltd.", which is clearly linked to the Registrar. Therefore, APINAME Ltd. acts as an anonymization company, preventing third party from knowing the identity and contact details of the Respondent who registered the disputed domain name with the Registrar. By using the Registrar's service, the Respondent has tried to prevent the Complainant from identifying the Respondent and take actions against the Respondent's unlawful actions. The Respondent's identity and contact details disclosed by the Registrar are also totally fictive. The Respondent did not respond to the cease and desist letter sent via APINAME Ltd. The disputed domain name was first used to display the activities of a false company which would have been named Alstom Offshore Engineering Company Ltd. This is all the most possible since the ALSTOM Trademark is associated with the generic words "offshore" and "engineering", which will led web users to believe that the disputed domain name belongs with and displays one of the Complainant's subsidiaries. The disputed domain name has no substance at all and has only for goal to impinge upon the Complainant's legal rights.

B. Respondent

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

6. Discussion and Findings

In accordance with paragraph 4(a) of the Policy, the Complainant must assert and prove the following three elements are present:

- (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 has been registered and is being used in bad faith.

A. Identical or Confusingly Similar

It is well accepted that the first element in paragraph 4(a) of the Policy 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. See section 1.7 of the WIPO Overview of WIPO Panel Views on Select UDRP Questions ("[WIPO Overview 3.1](#)").

The Complainant is the owner of the ALSTOM Trademarks and has sufficient standing to file this case. See section 1.2.1 of the [WIPO Overview 3.1](#). The disputed domain name wholly and identically reproduces the Complainant's ALSTOM Trademark with the addition of the words "offshore" and "engineering" with the gTLD ".pro".

Since the disputed domain name incorporates the entirety of the ALSTOM Trademark and then the ALSTOM Trademark is recognizable in the disputed domain name, the disputed domain name is considered confusingly similar to the ALSTOM Trademark. See section 1.7 of the [WIPO Overview 3.1](#). The addition of the words "offshore" and "engineering" does not prevent a finding of confusing similarity between the disputed domain name and the ALSTOM Trademark under the first element in paragraph 4(a) of the Policy. See section 1.8 of the [WIPO Overview 3.1](#).

The gTLD “.pro” is viewed as a standard registration requirement and as such is disregarded for assessing the confusing similarity under the first element of paragraph 4(a) of the Policy. See section 1.11.1 of the [WIPO Overview 3.1](#).

Accordingly, the Panel finds that the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to the Complainant’s ALSTOM Trademark and the first element in paragraph 4(a) 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.

As the Complainant asserts, the Respondent is not commonly known by the disputed domain name pursuant to paragraph 4(c)(ii) of the Policy and did not have any trademark registrations related to the ALSTOM Trademark or the disputed domain name. The Respondent is neither affiliated nor authorized by the Complainant to register or use the ALSTOM Trademark.

After sending a cease and desist letter on September 4, 2025 to both the Respondent and the entity Alstom Offshore Engineering Company Ltd. at the address mentioned on the website to which the disputed domain name resolved, the Complainant received a reply on September 10, 2025 from another engineering company which is located at the same address, and found that the Respondent has used a third party’s contact details without authorization. Therefore, the Respondent’s use of the disputed domain name cannot be regarded as a bona fide offering of goods or services pursuant to paragraph 4(c)(i) of the Policy.

Since the composition of the disputed domain name which consists of the ALSTOM Trademark plus additional words “offshore” and “engineering” suggests sponsorship or endorsement by the Complainant, such composition cannot constitute fair use pursuant to paragraph 4(c)(iii) of the Policy. See section 2.5.1 of the [WIPO Overview 3.1](#).

Although the overall burden of proof in the proceedings is on the complainant, where a complainant makes out a prima facie case that the respondent lacks rights or legitimate interests, the burden of production on the second element in paragraph 4(a) of the Policy 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 in paragraph 4(a) of the Policy. See section 2.1 of the [WIPO Overview 3.1](#).

Having reviewed the available record, the Panel finds that 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.

Consequently, the Panel finds that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the disputed domain name and the second element in paragraph 4(a) of the Policy has been established.

C. Registered and Used in Bad Faith

Given the strong worldwide reputation of the Complainant’s ALSTOM Trademarks, the Panel considers that the Respondent knew or should have known of the ALSTOM Trademarks at the time of the registration of the disputed domain name. See *Alstom v. Name Redacted*, WIPO Case No. [D2023-1123](#).

Although the Respondent has never replied to the Complainant’s cease and desist letter on September 4, 2025, the Respondent is considered to have used fictitious contact details and have engaged in using the

third party's contact details without authorization based on the reply on September 10, 2025 from another engineering company which is located in the same address as Alstom Offshore Engineering Company Ltd. The Respondent's contact information disclosed by the Registrar also seems to be fictitious. These facts are sufficient to support the finding of bad faith use. The Panel finds that the Respondent has registered and used the disputed domain name in bad faith pursuant to paragraph 4(b)(iv) of the Policy.

Even though the Respondent's website has been deactivated, it does not prevent the Panel's finding of the Respondent's bad faith considering (i) the degree of distinctiveness or reputation of the Complainant's ALSTOM Trademark, (ii) the failure of the Respondent to submit a response or to provide any evidence of actual or contemplated good-faith use, (iii) the Respondent's taking active steps to conceal its identity, and (iv) the use of false or inaccurate contact details. See section 3.3 of the [WIPO Overview 3.1](#).

In conclusion, the Panel finds that the disputed domain name has been registered and is being used in bad faith and the third element in paragraph 4(a) 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 <alstomoffshoreengineering.pro> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Yuji Yamaguchi/

Yuji Yamaguchi

Sole Panelist

Date: April 22, 2026