

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

ALSTOM v. George Bassil, allaum Lines DMCC

Case No. D2025-1094

1. The Parties

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

The Respondent is George Bassil, allaum Lines DMCC, Portugal.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

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

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the “Center”) on March 17, 2025. On March 18, 2025, the Center requested registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On March 18, 2025 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 (Privacy service provided by Withheld for Privacy ehf) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on March 19, 2025, 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 20, 2025.

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 26, 2025. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was April 15, 2025. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent’s default on April 16, 2025.

The Center appointed Erica Aoki as the sole panelist in this matter on April 28, 2025. 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, ALSTOM, is a global leader in rail transport and infrastructure solutions, founded in France in 1928. ALSTOM owns numerous trademark registrations worldwide, including in Iceland and the European Union, such as:

- Icelandic Trademark Registration No. V0117264 –for ALSTOM registered on April 15, 2022.
- European Union Trademark Registration No. 948729 for ALSTOM registered on August 8, 2001
- United States of America Trademark Registration No. 85250501 for ALSTOM registered on July 22, 2014

ALSTOM also holds multiple domain names incorporating the ALSTOM trademark, including <alstom.com>, <alstomgroup.com>, and <alstomsgroup.com>.

The disputed domain name <alstomsgroup.cam> was registered on January 23, 2025, and resolves to an error page. No content was ever developed. The Respondent did not reply to the cease-and-desist letter sent by the Complainant.

5. Parties' Contentions

A. Complainant

The Complainant contends that it has satisfied each of the elements required under the Policy for the transfer of the disputed domain name.

The Complainant contends that the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to its ALSTOM trademark, that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests, and that the domain name was registered and is being used in bad faith, likely as part of a typo-squatting scheme.

The Complainant owns numerous trademark registrations worldwide incorporating the name ALSTOM, including in Iceland (TM No. V0117264), the European Union (EU TM No. 948729), and the United States of America (US TM No. 85250501).

The disputed domain name reproduces the Complainant's trademark ALSTOM in its entirety and adds only the descriptive terms "s" and "group", which refer to the group of companies of ALSTOM. Therefore, the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to the Complainant's well-known trademark.

The Respondent should be considered as having no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the disputed domain name, and the Respondent has registered and is using the disputed domain name in bad faith.

B. Respondent

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

6. Discussion and Findings

The Complainant is required to establish the requirements specified under paragraph 4(a) of the Policy: (i) that the disputed domain name is identical or confusingly similar to a trademark or service mark in respect of which the Complainant has rights; (ii) that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the disputed domain name; and (iii) that the disputed domain name has been registered and is being used in bad faith.

A. Identical or Confusing Similar

The Complainant has shown rights in a trademark for the purposes of the Policy.

The entirety of the mark ALSTOM is recognizable within the disputed domain name. The additional terms “s” and “group” and the “.cam” suffix is irrelevant to the analysis of confusing similarity. (see sections 1.7 and 1.8 of the WIPO Overview of Panel Views on Selected UDRP Questions, Third Edition ([“WIPO Overview 3.0”](#))).

The Panel finds the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to the ALSTOM mark.

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

B. Rights or Legitimate Interests

The Respondent is in default and thus has made no attempt to show any rights or legitimate interest in the disputed domain name.

There is no evidence on record that the Respondent is or was commonly known by the disputed domain name as an individual, business, or other organization. See section 2.3 of the [WIPO Overview 3.0](#).

There is no evidence on record that the Respondent is making a legitimate noncommercial or fair use of the disputed domain name, without intent for commercial gain to misleadingly divert consumers or to tarnish the Complainant’s trademark. Paragraph 4(c) of the Policy indicates that a respondent may have a right or legitimate interest in a domain name if it uses the domain name in connection with a bona fide offering of goods or services prior to notice of the dispute.

In this regard, the Respondent is not connected with the Complainant and has not received any authorization to use any of the Complainant’s trademarks. The disputed domain name resolves to inactive webpage. The non-use of the disputed domain name does not confer any rights or legitimate interests to the Respondent under the circumstances of this case, given that there is nothing on the record to suggest that the Respondent is commonly known by the disputed domain name.

The Panel therefore finds that the Complainant has established an un rebutted prima facie case, i.e., that the Complainant has established the second element of paragraph 4(a) of the Policy.

C. Registered and Used in Bad Faith

The Complainant contends that the Respondent has registered and is using the disputed domain name in bad faith.

The Complainant contends that the Respondent registered the disputed domain name to attract Internet users by creating a likelihood of confusion with the Complainant’s earlier marks. The Complainant’s trademarks were registered long before the registration of the disputed domain name. Given the reputation of the Complainant’s trademarks and the composition of the disputed domain name which incorporates the Complainant’s trademark in its entirety together with the terms “s” and “group”, the Respondent very likely registered the disputed domain name having the Complainant’s trademarks in mind.

As to the use, the Panel notes that the disputed domain name resolves to an inactive page. According to section 3.3 of the [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), passive holding does not prevent a finding of bad faith. Given the distinctiveness of the ALSTOM trademark, the lack of legitimate use, and the Respondent’s failure to submit a response in this case, the Panel concludes that the disputed domain name was registered and is being used in bad faith.

Accordingly, the Panel finds that the Respondent has registered and used the disputed domain name in bad faith under the Policy, paragraph 4(a)(iii).

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 <alstomsgroup.cam> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Erica Aoki/

Erica Aoki

Sole Panelist

Date: May 9, 2025