

## **ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION**

**Airbus SAS v. ALVIN AFIFUL AMRULLOH AMRULLOH**  
**Case No. D2026-0952**

### **1. The Parties**

The Complainant is Airbus SAS, France, represented by CSC Digital Brand Services Group AB, Sweden.

The Respondent is ALVIN AFIFUL AMRULLOH AMRULLOH, Indonesia.

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

The disputed domain names <airbusbet.com>, <airbusbet.net>, <airbusbet.org>, <airbuslot.com>, <airbuslot.net>, <airbuslot.org>, <airbus4d.com>, <airbus4d.net>, and <airbus4d.org> are registered with NameSilo, LLC (the “Registrar”).

### **3. Procedural History**

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the “Center”) on March 5, 2026. On March 6, 2026, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain names. On the same date, the Registrar transmitted by email to the Center its verification response disclosing registrant and contact information for the disputed domain names which differed from the named Respondent (Registrant Information Redacted) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on March 9, 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 amended Complaint on March 13, 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 the Rules, paragraphs 2 and 4, the Center formally notified the Respondent of the Complaint, and the proceedings commenced on March 16, 2026. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was April 5, 2026. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent’s default on April 9, 2026.

The Center appointed Halvor Manshaus as the sole panelist in this matter on April 15, 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 is an international aerospace company engaged in the design, manufacture, and delivery of commercial aircraft, helicopters, military transport, satellites, and launch vehicles. The Complainant's history dates to the formation of the Airbus Industrie GIE consortium in 1970 and maintains a wide global presence through approximately 180 locations across Europe, the Americas, Africa, the Middle East, and Asia, with more than 157,000 employees.

The Complainant has marketed and sold its goods and services under the AIRBUS trademark since 1970. Since then, the Complainant has grown into a leading global aerospace company, having delivered over 13,500 aircrafts and with approximately 12,000 helicopters in operation worldwide. The Complainant also operates in the space and defense sectors and is recognized among the leading companies in these fields.

The Complainant holds trademark registrations comprising AIRBUS in several jurisdictions around the world, including:

- The international registration number 1112012 for various goods and services in classes 3, 6, 7, 8, 9, 12, 13, 14, 16, 17, 18, 21, 24, 25, 28, 35, 36, 37, 38, 39, 40, 41, 42, 43, and 45, registered on June 24, 2011, designating various jurisdictions such as the European Union, the United States of America, Australia, and Singapore;
- The international registration number 1247403 for various goods and services in classes 3, 4, 6, 7, 8, 9, 11, 12, 13, 14, 16, 17, 18, 19, 21, 24, 25, 28, 29, 30, 31, 32, 33, 34, 35, 36, 37, 38, 39, 40, 41, 42, 43, and 45, registered on June 18, 2014, designating various jurisdictions such as Australia, the European Union, the United Kingdom, India, New Zealand, Singapore and the United States of America; and
- The German registration number 302010054700 for various goods and services in classes 3, 6, 7, 8, 9, 12, 13, 14, 16, 17, 18, 21, 24, 25, 28, 35, 36, 37, 38, 39, 40, 41, 42, 43, and 45, registered on June 24, 2011.

The Complainant also operates its primary website through the domain name <airbus.com>, registered on May 23, 1995.

The disputed domain names were registered on December 1, 2025. The disputed domain names resolve to websites purportedly operating online gambling and slot gaming platforms.

The Respondent has not replied to the Complainant's cease-and-desist letter and reminders sent through the Registrar on January 7, 2026, January 14, 2026, and January 21, 2026, respectively.

#### **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 names.

Notably, the Complainant contends that the disputed domain names are confusingly similar to its trademark. The disputed domain names incorporate the AIRBUS trademark in its entirety, together with the addition of the generic terms “bet”, “slot”, and “4d” respectively, which does not prevent a finding of confusing similarity.

Additionally, the Complainant asserts that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the disputed domain names. The Complainant holds exclusive rights to the AIRBUS trademark and has never granted the Respondent any license, permission, or authorization to use its trademark. Further, the Respondent is neither sponsored nor affiliated with the Complainant, nor is the Respondent commonly known by the disputed domain names. According to the Complainant, the disputed domain names resolve to websites featuring gambling-related content unrelated to its business, which does not constitute a bona fide offering of goods or services or a legitimate noncommercial or fair use.

Lastly, the Complainant contends that the disputed domain names were registered and are being used in bad faith. The Complainant argues that its trademark is widely known and that the Respondent must have been aware of the Complainant’s rights when registering the disputed domain names. Further, the Complainant argues that the disputed domain names are used to attract Internet users for commercial gain by creating a likelihood of confusion with the Complainant’s trademark, misleading Internet users into visiting its gambling websites amounting to a “bait-and-switch” tactic constituting bad faith registration and use. The Complainant further contends that the registration of nine domain names, each incorporating the Complainant’s trademark, constitutes a pattern of cybersquatting, supporting a finding of bad faith.

## **B. Respondent**

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

## **6. Discussion and Findings**

### **A. Identical or Confusingly Similar**

It is 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 names. Accordingly, the disputed domain names are confusingly similar to the mark for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.7.

Although the addition of other terms here, “bet”, “slot”, and “4d”, may bear on assessment of the second and third elements, the Panel finds the addition of such terms does not prevent a finding of confusing similarity between the disputed domain names 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.

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 names. 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 names such as those enumerated in the Policy or otherwise.

The Panel notes that the Respondent is not affiliated with or authorized by the Complainant to use its trademark, nor is there any evidence that the Respondent is commonly known by the disputed domain names. Further, the Panel notes that the Respondent uses the disputed domain names, which incorporate the Complainant’s mark, to operate websites purportedly offering online gambling services. Such use does not confer any rights or legitimate interests on the Respondent.

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 disputed domain names incorporate the Complainant’s well-known trademark in its entirety, and that the Complainant’s trademark registration predates the registration of the disputed domain names. The Panel therefore finds it unlikely that the Respondent was unaware of the Complainant’s trademark rights at the time of registering the disputed domain names, particularly given the international recognition of the AIRBUS brand.

Paragraph 4(b) of the Policy sets out a list of non-exhaustive circumstances that may indicate that a domain name was registered and used in bad faith, but other circumstances may be relevant in assessing whether a respondent’s registration and use of a domain name is in bad faith. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 3.2.1.

The Panel finds that the Respondent is using the disputed domain names to intentionally attract Internet users to its websites for commercial gain by creating a likelihood of confusion with the Complainant’s trademark, constituting bad faith under paragraph 4(b)(iv) of the Policy. The disputed domain names resolve to websites purportedly offering online gambling services. The Panel finds that the Respondent deliberately incorporated the Complainant’s trademark into the disputed domain names to attract Internet users searching for the Complainant to its own commercial gambling websites, thereby taking advantage of the reputation and goodwill associated with the Complainant’s trademark.

Furthermore, the Panel notes that the Respondent registered multiple domain names incorporating the Complainant’s trademark across different combinations of additional terms and Top-Level Domains, which constitutes a pattern of conduct consistent with bad faith under paragraph 4(b)(ii) of the Policy known as cybersquatting. The Panel also finds that the Respondent’s failure to respond to the Complainant’s cease-and-desist letters sent through the Registrar may further support a finding of bad faith.

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 names <airbusbet.com>, <airbusbet.net>, <airbusbet.org>, <airbuslot.com>, <airbuslot.net>, <airbuslot.org>, <airbus4d.com>, <airbus4d.net>, and <airbus4d.org> be transferred to the Complainant.

*/Halvor Manshaus/*

**Halvor Manshaus**

Sole Panelist

Date: April 29, 2026