

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

ATTIJARIWAFABANK v. Domain Admin, TotalDomain Privacy Ltd
Case No. D2026-2511

1. The Parties

The Complainant is ATTIJARIWAFABANK, Morocco, represented by CSC Digital Brand Services Group AB, Sweden.

The Respondent is Domain Admin, TotalDomain Privacy Ltd, Panama.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <attijaribank.com> is registered with PDR Ltd. d/b/a PublicDomainRegistry.com (the "Registrar").

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the "Center") on June 10, 2026. On June 10, 2026, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On June 11, 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 (Domain Admin, Privacy Protect, LLC (PrivacyProtect.org)) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on June 11, 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 June 15, 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 June 16, 2026. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was July 6, 2026. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent's default on July 7, 2026.

The Center appointed Emre Kerim Yardimci as the sole panelist in this matter on July 14, 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 a Moroccan banking and financial group created in 2004 through the merger of Banque Commerciale du Maroc and Wafabank, and operating across Africa, Europe, and other jurisdictions through banking and financial services activities.

The Complainant owns trademark registrations for ATTIJARI BANK and ATTIJARI, including;

- International Registration No. 844632 for ATTIJARI BANK, registered on November 29, 2004, in class 36; and
- International Registration No. 844633 for ATTIJARI, registered on November 29, 2004, in class 3.

The Complainant owns and uses several domain names incorporating ATTIJARI and variations of that term, including <attijariwafabank.com>, which was registered on January 9, 2004.

The disputed domain name was registered on March 16, 2006. The evidence shows that the disputed domain name resolved to a parked webpage headed "attijaribank.com" and stating that the domain "maybe for sale" through Afternic, with pay-per-click ("PPC") links including "Personal Loans Online", "Personal Loans for Very Poor Credit", "Online Personal Loan Apply", "Financial Products", and "Credit Card Debt Relief for Seniors". The Complainant has also furnished evidence showing that the disputed domain name is offered for sale on a third-party platform.

The evidence includes a screenshot showing a premium domain purchase price of USD 16,211.99 for the disputed domain name.

The Complainant, through its representative, sent cease-and-desist correspondence dated October 10, 2025, October 17, 2025, and October 24, 2025, concerning the disputed domain name. The Complainant states that no response was received.

5. Parties' Contentions

A. Complainant

The Complainant contends that the disputed domain name is identical to its ATTIJARI BANK mark because the second-level portion of the disputed domain name consists of the mark without the space between the terms, and the ".com" Top-Level Domain ("TLD") should be disregarded for comparison purposes.

The Complainant contends that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name. It states that the Respondent is not sponsored by or affiliated with the Complainant, has not been authorized to use the Complainant's marks, is not commonly known by the disputed domain name, uses a privacy service, and uses the disputed domain name for a parked page with PPC links related to banking or financial services; the disputed domain name is also offered for sale.

The Complainant contends that the disputed domain name was registered and is being used in bad faith. It argues that the Respondent had the Complainant and its marks in mind when registering a domain name identical to the ATTIJARI BANK mark, that the Respondent is using the disputed domain name to attract Internet users for commercial gain by creating a likelihood of confusion with the Complainant's mark as to the

source, sponsorship, affiliation, or endorsement of its website, that the disputed domain name is offered for sale at a price far exceeding likely out-of-pocket costs, and that the Respondent did not respond to cease-and-desist correspondence.

The Complainant requests transfer of the disputed domain name.

B. Respondent

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

6. Discussion and Findings

Under paragraph 4(a) of the Policy, the Complainant must establish each of the following three elements:

(i) the disputed domain name is identical or confusingly similar to a trademark or service mark in which the Complainant has rights;

(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 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 registered rights in the ATTIJARI BANK and ATTIJARI marks for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.2.1.

The disputed domain name consists of the ATTIJARI BANK trademark, followed by the ".com" TLD. 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 3.1](#), section 1.7.

The Panel finds that the Complainant has established the first element of paragraph 4(a) of the Policy.

B. Rights or Legitimate Interests

Paragraph 4(c) of the Policy sets out circumstances that may demonstrate rights or legitimate interests in a disputed domain name. The Complainant has made a prima facie showing that none of those circumstances applies.

The record contains no evidence that the Respondent has been authorized by the Complainant to use the ATTIJARI BANK or ATTIJARI marks, that the Respondent is affiliated with the Complainant, or that the Respondent has been commonly known by the disputed domain name. The disclosed registrant's name, Domain Admin, TotalDomain Privacy Ltd, does not correspond to the disputed domain name.

The disputed domain name, which reproduces the Complainant's ATTIJARI BANK mark, resolves to a parked page containing PPC links related to loans, financial products, and credit card debt relief. Those links are in the Complainant's field (or adjacent) of banking and financial services. The record also shows that the disputed domain name was offered for sale at USD 16,211.99. Such use appears to capitalize on the trademark of the Complainant, which does not confer any rights or legitimate interests on the Respondent.

Such use is not a bona fide offering of goods or services and is not a legitimate noncommercial or fair use. Past panels have held that the use of a domain name to host a parked page comprising PPC links does not represent a bona fide offering where such links compete with or capitalize on the reputation and goodwill of the complainant's mark or otherwise mislead Internet users. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 2.9

The Respondent has not come forward with any evidence or argument to rebut the Complainant's prima facie case. The Panel finds that the Complainant has established the second element of paragraph 4(a) of the Policy.

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 finds that the disputed domain name was registered and is being used in bad faith.

The Complainant's ATTIJARI BANK and ATTIJARI registrations predate the disputed domain name. The disputed domain name reproduces the ATTIJARI BANK mark in its entirety.

Given the composition of the disputed domain name, the evidence of the Complainant's domain name portfolio, and the finance-related links appearing on the webpage to which the disputed domain name resolved, the Panel finds it more likely than not that the Respondent had the Complainant and its mark in mind when registering the disputed domain name.

The Respondent uses the disputed domain name for a parked page displaying finance-related sponsored links. By using a domain name identical to the Complainant's ATTIJARI BANK mark for such links, the Respondent has intentionally attempted to attract Internet users for commercial gain by creating a likelihood of confusion with the Complainant's mark as to source, sponsorship, affiliation, or endorsement, within the meaning of paragraph 4(b)(iv) of the Policy.

The record also shows that the disputed domain name was offered for sale through a third-party platform with a purchase price of USD 16,211.99. In the circumstances of this case, the offer for sale of the disputed domain name for a price seemingly exceeding the out-of-pocket expenses clearly corroborates a finding of bad faith under paragraph 4(b)(i) of the Policy.

The Respondent's failure to answer the cease-and-desist correspondence and its failure to participate in these proceedings reinforce the inference that no good-faith explanation exists in the present case. While privacy services are not inherently improper, the disclosed registrant information and the Respondent's lack of participation further support bad-faith inference arising from the composition and use of the disputed domain name.

The Panel finds that the Complainant has established the third element of paragraph 4(a) 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 <attijaribank.com> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Emre Kerim Yardimci/

Emre Kerim Yardimci

Sole Panelist

Date: July 28, 2026