

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

Ile-De-France Mobilités v. Xavier Meringis
Case No. D2025-2029

1. The Parties

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

The Respondent is Xavier Meringis, France.

2. The Domain Names and Registrar

The disputed domain names <iledefrance-mobilites-remboursements.com> and <remboursement-iledefrance-mobilites.com> are registered with GMO Internet, Inc. d/b/a Discount-Domain.com and Onamae.com (the “Registrar”).

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the “Center”) on May 22, 2025. On May 22, 2025, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain names. On May 26, 2025, 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 (Redacted for Privacy) and contact information in the Complaint.

The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on May 28, 2025 with the registrant and contact information of nominally multiple underlying registrants revealed by the Registrar, 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 the Amended Complaint on June 2, 2025. On the same date, the Complainant notified the Center its intention to withdraw the complaint against the domain name <navigo-compensation-fr.com>. On June 5, 2025, the Center acknowledged the receipt of the aforementioned communication and notified the withdraw to the corresponding registrar and registrant.

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 5, 2025. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was June 25, 2025. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent's default on June 26, 2025.

The Center appointed Elise Dufour as the sole panelist in this matter on July 1, 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 Ile-de-France Mobilités, a French State-owned entity located in Paris, France. It is in charge of operating public transportation services in Paris and its suburbs. It has an operating budget of EUR 12 billion.

The Complainant owns several trademark registrations among which the following ones :

- the French trademark ILE-DE-FRANCE MOBILITES No. 4351425 registered on July 28, 2017 for goods and services in classes 9, 12, 16, 18, 35, 36, 37, 38, 39, 41, and 42
- the French word and design trademark ILE-DE-FRANCE MOBILITES No. 4359694 registered on August 25, 2017 for goods and services in classes 9, 12, 16, 18, 35, 36, 37, 38, 39, 41, and 42

The Complainant is also the owner of the domain names <iledefrancemobilites.fr> and <iledefrance-mobilites.com> registered on March 31, 2017 and May 2, 2017 respectively which links to the Complainant's official website.

The disputed domain names were both registered on November 14, 2024.

According to the Complainant, the disputed domain name <iledefrance-mobilites-remboursements.com> was used in a phishing campaign. This disputed domain name resolves to an inactive webpage.

The disputed domain name <remboursement-iledefrance-mobilites.com> resolves to a parking page with PPC links.

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, <iledefrance-mobilites-remboursements.com> and <remboursement-iledefrance-mobilites.com>, are identical or at least highly similar to its registered trademarks and tradename ILE-DE-FRANCE MOBILITES, as the generic Top-Level domain ("gTLD") ".com" should be disregarded when comparing the domain names to the Complainant's marks, both disputed domain names entirely reproduce the Complainant's trademark and tradename "ILE DE FRANCE MOBILITES", the addition of the word "remboursement" (meaning "refund" in French) does not distinguish the domain names from the Complainant's marks. On the contrary, this term directly refers to the Complainant's well-known refund policies for transport service disruptions, further strengthening the association in the minds of the public.

The Complainant further argues that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain names. Indeed, the Complainant conducted thorough searches in trademark databases and found no trademark registrations or applications by the Respondent for marks containing “iledefrancemobilités” or “mobilités” in any jurisdiction. In addition, the Complainant has never authorized or licensed the Respondent to use its ILE-DE-FRANCE MOBILITES trademarks or to register domain names incorporating these marks. Furthermore, the Respondent cannot claim any legitimate interest or bona fide use of the disputed domain names, especially given the risk of confusion and as will be further detailed, evidence of bad faith registration and use.

Finally, the Complainant argues that the disputed domain names were both registered and used in bad faith.

Regarding registration, the Complainant emphasizes that the trademark ILE-DE-FRANCE MOBILITES is highly distinctive and widely recognized in the public transport sector, making it unlikely that the Respondent was unaware of it. The disputed domain names were registered shortly after public announcements of refund campaigns following transport strikes, and they incorporate the term “remboursement” (“refund”), clearly referencing the Complainant’s policies and increasing the risk of confusion. The Complainant never authorized the Respondent to use its trademark or to register disputed domain names incorporating it. Furthermore, the Respondent used false and anonymous contact information, indicating an intent to conceal their identity and register the disputed domain names in bad faith.

As for use, one of the disputed domain names was employed in a phishing scheme that imitated the Complainant’s refund communications to collect users’ personal and banking data. As per the inactive website, even when inactive, the disputed domain names are likely to cause confusion, as they suggest affiliation with the Complainant. Under established WIPO case law, passive holding of disputed domain names that incorporate a well-known trademark, without legitimate use, also constitutes bad faith. The Complainant concludes that no plausible legitimate use exists for the disputed domain names beyond exploiting its reputation or misleading the public.

B. Respondent

The Respondent 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 Complaint 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 were registered on the same day, November 14, 2024;
- both disputed domain names are registered with the same registrar;
- both use the same gTLD, “.com”;
- the contact information used for the registration of both disputed domain names is identical;
- both disputed domain names reproduce the Complainant’s distinctive trademark, ILE-DE-FRANCE MOBILITES, combined with the French word for “refund” or “reimbursements” (“remboursement(s)”);
- most importantly, the disputed domain names pursue the same purpose — namely, impersonating the Complainant and misleading users by creating a false association with the Complainant’s official refund campaigns.

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 names. WIPO Overview of WIPO Panel Views on Selected UDRP Questions, Third Edition, (“[WIPO Overview 3.0](#)”), section 1.7.

Based on the available record, 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 entirety of the mark is reproduced within the disputed domain names. Accordingly, the disputed domain names are confusingly similar to the mark for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 1.7. Indeed, although the addition of other terms (here, “remboursements”, “remboursement” and a hyphen) may bear on assessment of the second and third elements, the Panel finds the addition of such term and element does not prevent a finding of confusing similarity between the disputed domain names and the mark for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 1.8.

Based on the available record, 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.

According to the Complaint, the Complainant has not authorized or granted the Respondent to use its ILE-DE-FRANCE MOBILITES marks. Furthermore, the Respondent is not sponsored by or affiliated with the Complainant in any way.

The Respondent is not commonly known by either of the disputed domain names. The Respondent is not using the disputed domain names in connection with a bona fide offering of goods or services. Furthermore, in the present case, no evidence demonstrated that the Respondent is in preparations to use the disputed domain names corresponding to it in connection with a bona fide offering of goods or services prior to receiving notice of the dispute.

The Respondent is also not making any legitimate noncommercial or fair use of the disputed domain names, without intent for commercial gain to misleadingly divert consumers or to tarnish the Complainant's ILE-DE-FRANCE MOBILITES marks. The evidence shows that one of the disputed domain names has been linked to phishing activities. Panels have established that the use of a domain name for an illegitimate or illegal activity, including phishing or impersonation/passing off, or other types of fraud, can never confer rights or legitimate interests on a respondent.

Based on the evidence provided, the other disputed domain name has not been used for phishing activities and resolves to a webpage with PPC links. Panels have found 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 3.0](#), section 2.9.

The use of the disputed domain name <iledefrance-mobilites-remboursements.com> for an illegitimate or illegal activity, here claimed as phishing, impersonation/passing off, or other types of fraud can never confer rights or legitimate interests on a respondent. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 2.13.1.

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 are confusingly similar with the Complainant's trademark, which was registered prior to the registration of both disputed domain names. Given the well-established reputation of the Complainant's ILE-DE-FRANCE MOBILITES marks in respect of public transportation services, it is unlikely that the Respondent selected the disputed domain names by chance. Therefore, the Panel finds that it is inconceivable that the Respondent was unaware of the existence of the Complainant, its trademark, and the Complainant's domain names at the time of registering the disputed domain names.

In addition, the Panel has reviewed the evidence presented by the Complainant where one of the disputed domain name resolves a webpage with PPC links and the other disputed domain name has been used for phishing activities.

If one of the disputed domain names was indeed used in connection with fraudulent activities such as phishing, it has been determined by panels that the use of a domain name for illegitimate activity or illegal activity including phishing, impersonation/passing off, or other types of fraud constitutes bad faith. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 3.4.

The other disputed domain name which resolves a website with PPC links is evidence of bad faith use as per paragraph 4(b)(iv) of the Policy.

Having reviewed the record, the Panel has determined that the Respondent's registration and use of the disputed domain names constitutes bad faith under the Policy. For all the foregoing reasons, the Panel finds that the disputed domain names were registered and have been used in 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 <iledefrance-mobilites-remboursements.com> and <remboursement-iledefrance-mobilites.com> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Elise Dufour/

Elise Dufour

Sole Panelist

Date: July 15, 2025