

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

Amundi Asset Management v. Nuri Murat
Case No. D2024-3062

1. The Parties

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

The Respondent is Nuri Murat, France.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <amundi-france.com> is registered with CloudFlare, Inc. (the “Registrar”).

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the “Center”) on July 26, 2024. On July 26, 2024, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On the same date, 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 (DATA REDACTED) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on July 31, 2024, 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 the same date.

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 August 21, 2024. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was September 10, 2024. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent’s default on September 16, 2024.

The Center appointed William Lobelson as the sole panelist in this matter on September 30, 2024. 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 AMUNDI ASSET MANAGEMENT, an international financial company, that is the owner of:

- The International Trademark AMUNDI No. 1024160 registered on September 24, 2009.

The domain name <amundi.com> was registered since August 26, 2004.

The disputed domain name <amundi-france.com> was registered on July 24, 2024, and redirects to the Complainant's official web site. MX servers appear to have been set up, so that it is technically possible to use the disputed domain name for sending emails.

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 its earlier trademark, that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name, and that the disputed domain name has been registered and is being used in bad faith.

The Complainant requests the transfer of the disputed domain name.

B. Respondent

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

6. Discussion and Findings

Notwithstanding the default of the Respondent, it remains incumbent on the Complainant to make out its case in all respects under the rules set out in paragraph 4(a) of the Policy.

Namely, 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 (paragraph 4(a)(i));
- (ii) the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the disputed domain name (paragraph 4(a)(ii));
- (iii) the disputed domain name has been registered and is being used in bad faith (paragraph 4(a)(iii)).

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 Selected UDRP Questions, Third Edition, ("[WIPO Overview 3.0](#)"), section 1.7.

The Complainant has shown rights in respect of a trademark or service mark for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 1.2.1.

The entirety of the mark is reproduced within the disputed domain name. Accordingly, the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to the mark for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 1.7.

Although the addition of other terms, here, "-france", 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 3.0](#), section 1.8.

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 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 3.0](#), section 2.1.

The Complainant has made a prima facie showing that the Respondent does not have any rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name, particularly by asserting that the Respondent is not affiliated with it in any way and that it never authorized the Respondent to use its trademark as part of the disputed domain name.

The Complainant further contends that the Respondent is not commonly known under the disputed domain name and does not make any bona fide or legitimate noncommercial use of the same.

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 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.

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 Complainant has substantiated the fact that its trademark AMUNDI has been registered and used for years, is distinctive and now benefits from a high level of public awareness.

See *Amundi Asset Management v. Whois Privacy Protection Foundation / daniel, clark*, WIPO Case No. [D2019-1335](#) (“the Complainant’s AMUNDI trade mark is well known, and has been in use since at least 2009”).

Due to the longstanding use and reputation of the Complainant’s mark, the Respondent could not reasonably be unaware of the Complainant’s rights when it registered the disputed domain name.

It is also observed that the disputed domain name redirects to the Complainant’s official web site, thus reflecting that the Respondent had the Complainant’s trademark in mind when it registered the disputed domain name, and that, not being affiliated in any way to the Complainant, he is using the said domain name in bad faith. UDRP panels have found that a respondent redirecting a domain name to the complainant’s website can establish bad faith insofar as the respondent retains control over the redirection thus creating a real or implied ongoing threat to the complainant. See section 3.1.4 of the [WIPO Overview 3.0](#),

Further, the Complainant has filed evidence showing that the Respondent had set up MX servers in relation with the disputed domain name, thus revealing a possible intention to use the same as an email address.

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 <amundi-france.com> be transferred to the Complainant.

/William Lobelson/

William Lobelson

Sole Panelist

Date: October 11, 2024