

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

Ile-de-France Mobilités v. azjfazifa fafiazjofafa, ZangoCo, Perté Baodie, Jssdans, and Jean Poulet, tech
Case No. D2025-2003

1. The Parties

The Complainant is Ile-de-France Mobilités, France, represented by De Gaulle Fleurance & Associés, France.

The Respondents are azjfazifa fafiazjofafa, ZangoCo, France, Perté Baodie, Jssdans, United States of America ("United States"), and Jean Poulet, tech, United States.

2. The Domain Names and Registrars

The disputed domain names <ilede-france-mobilites.com> and <navigo-iledefrance-mobilites.com> are registered with Squarespace Domains II LLC, and the disputed domain name <mobilites-ile-de-france.com> is registered with GMO Internet, Inc. d/b/a Discount-Domain.com and Onamae.com (collectively, the "Registrars").

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the "Center") on May 20, 2025. On May 20, 2025, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrars requests for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain names. On May 20, 2025 and May 26, 2025, the Registrars transmitted by email to the Center their verification responses, disclosing registrant and contact information for the disputed domain names which differed from the named Respondent (Redacted for privacy, Jssdans, and Redacted for privacy, Tech) and contact information in the Complaint.

The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on June 11, 2025 with the registrant and contact information of nominally multiple underlying registrants revealed by the Registrars, requesting the Complainant to either file separate complaint(s) for the disputed domain names associated with different underlying registrants or alternatively, demonstrate that the underlying registrants are in fact the same entity and/or that all domain names are under common control. The Complainant filed an amended Complaint on June 16, 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 Respondents of the Complaint, and the proceedings commenced on June 20, 2025. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was July 10, 2025. The Respondents did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondents’ default on July 22, 2025.

The Center appointed Nayiri Boghossian as the sole panelist in this matter on July 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 is a French administration in charge of the public transportation services in Paris, France, and its suburbs. The Complainant owns trademark registrations for ILE-DE-FRANCE MOBILITES such as:

- French trademark registration No. 4351425, registered on July 28, 2017.

The Complainant owns the domain names <iledefrance-mobilites.fr> and <iledefrance-mobilites.com>.

The Complainant also owns the trademark NAVIGO, which is used in connection with a card that offers passengers access to public transportation. The Complainant owns trademark registrations for NAVIGO such as:

- French trademark registration No. 3675722, registered on February 12, 2010.

The disputed domain name <ilede-france-mobilites.com> was registered on December 10, 2023. The disputed domain name <mobilites-ile-de-france.com> was registered on October 1, 2024. The disputed domain name <navigo-iledefrance-mobilites.com> was registered on July 17, 2024.

The disputed domain names resolve to inactive websites. The Complainant submitted that the disputed domain names <mobilites-ile-de-france.com> and <navigo-iledefrance-mobilites.com> have been used in connection with a phishing campaign fraudulently claiming to offer users compensation during the Olympic Games.

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 a trademark or service mark in which the Complainant has rights. Two of the disputed domain names reproduce the Complainant’s trademark ILE-DE-FRANCE MOBILITES in an identical manner. In the case of the disputed domain name <navigo-iledefrance-mobilites.com>, the Complainant’s trademark NAVIGO is also reproduced. The disputed domain name <mobilites-ile-de-france.com> reproduces the Complainant’s trademark ILE-DE-FRANCE MOBILITES in a reversed manner. The generic Top-Level Domain (“gTLD”) should typically be ignored.

The Complainant contends that the Respondents have no rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain names. There is no evidence that the Respondents have any intellectual property rights in the trademarks. The Respondents cannot claim legitimate or bona fide use of the disputed domain names.

The Complainant contends that the disputed domain names were registered and are being used in bad faith.

The Complainant's trademarks are well known in the transport sector. The Respondents must have been aware of the Complainant's trademarks. The fake address and fabricated contact details indicate bad faith.

Two of the disputed domain names were used in a phishing campaign. All three disputed domain names currently resolve to inactive websites. The disputed domain name <ilede-france-mobilites.com> was never used. This constitutes passive holding.

B. Respondents

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

6. Discussion and Findings

Consolidation: Multiple Respondents

The amended Complaint was filed in relation to nominally different domain name registrants. The Complainant alleges that the domain name registrants are the same entity or mere alter egos of each other, or under common control. The Complainant requests the consolidation of the disputes against the multiple disputed domain name registrants pursuant to paragraph 10(e) of the Rules.

The disputed domain name registrants did not comment on the Complainant's request.

Paragraph 3(c) of the Rules states that a complaint may relate to more than one domain name, provided that the domain names are registered by the same domain name holder.

In addressing the Complainant's request, the Panel will consider whether (i) the disputed domain names or corresponding websites are subject to common control; and (ii) the consolidation would be fair and equitable to all Parties. See WIPO Overview of WIPO Panel Views on Selected UDRP Questions, Third Edition (["WIPO Overview 3.0"](#)), section 4.11.2.

As regards common control, the Panel notes that both disputed domain names <mobilités-ile-de-france.com> and <navigo-iledefrance-mobilites.com> were registered the same year, i.e. 2024. All three domain names are registered with the gTLD ".com". The composition of two of the disputed domain names <mobilités-ile-de-france.com> and <ilede-france-mobilites.com> is very similar as they incorporate the Complainant's trademark ILE-DE-FRANCE MOBILITES, reversed in the case of the domain name <mobilités-ile-de-france.com>, together with the gTLD ".com". The composition of the disputed domain name <navigo-iledefrance-mobilites.com> is highly similar as it also incorporates the Complainant's trademarks ILE-DE-FRANCE MOBILITES and NAVIGO together with the gTLD ".com". The registrants' addresses seem to be erroneous, which prevented the courier from delivering the Center's written communications. The disputed domain names <ilede-france-mobilites.com> and <navigo-iledefrance-mobilites.com> are registered with the same registrar, Squarespace Domains II LLC. All of the disputed domain names currently resolve to inactive websites. Lastly, the Respondent did not participate in these proceedings or comment on the Complainant's request for consolidation.

As regards fairness and equity, the Panel sees no reason why consolidation of the disputes would be unfair or inequitable to any Party.

Accordingly, the Panel decides to consolidate the disputes regarding the nominally different disputed domain name registrants (referred to below as “the Respondent”) in a single proceeding.

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 Panel finds the marks ILE-DE-FRANCE MOBILITES and/or NAVIGO are recognizable within the disputed domain names. Accordingly, the disputed domain names are confusingly similar to the marks for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 1.7.

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 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.

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 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 Respondent must have been aware of the Complainant’s trademark as the disputed domain names were registered many years after the registration of the Complainant’s trademark and the links to the websites at two of the disputed domain names were included in fraudulent emails claiming to offer compensation for the use of public transportation.

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 3.0](#), section 3.2.1.

All of the disputed domain names resolve to inactive websites at the time of filing of the Complaint. Panels have found that the non-use of a domain name (including a blank page) would not prevent a finding of bad faith under the doctrine of passive holding. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 3.3. Having reviewed the available record, the Panel notes the reputation of the Complainant's trademark, the composition of the disputed domain names, and the Respondent's failure to submit a response, and finds that in the circumstances of this case the passive holding of the disputed domain name does not prevent a finding of bad faith under the Policy.

In relation to the disputed domain names <navigo-iledefrance-mobilites.com> and <mobilites-ile-de-france.com>, panels have held that the use of a domain name for illegal activity here, claimed phishing constitutes bad faith. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 3.4. Having reviewed the record, the Panel finds the Respondent's registration and use of the disputed domain names constitutes bad faith under the Policy.

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 <ilede-france-mobilites.com>, <mobilites-ile-de-france.com> and <navigo-iledefrance-mobilites.com> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Nayiri Boghossian/

Nayiri Boghossian

Sole Panelist

Date: August 8, 2025