

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

EGIS v. Name Redacted

Case No. D2025-2477

1. The Parties

The Complainant is EGIS, France, represented by Novagraaf France, France.

The Respondent is Name Redacted¹.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <egis-grouop.com> is 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 June 23, 2025. On June 24, 2025, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On June 25, 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 (x) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on June 27, 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 July 2, 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”).

¹ The Respondent appears to have used the name of a third party when registering the disputed domain name. In light of the potential identity theft, the Panel has redacted the Respondent's name from this Decision. However, the Panel has attached as Annex 1 to this Decision an instruction to the Registrar regarding transfer of the disputed domain name, which includes the name of the Respondent. The Panel has authorized the Center to transmit Annex 1 to the Registrar as part of the order in these proceedings, and has indicated Annex 1 to this Decision shall not be published due to the exceptional circumstances of this case. See *Banco Bradesco S.A. v. FAST 12785241 Attn. Bradescourgente.net / Name Redacted*, WIPO Case No. [D2009-1788](#)

In accordance with the Rules, paragraphs 2 and 4, the Center formally notified the Respondent of the Complaint, and the proceedings commenced on July 4, 2025. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was July 24, 2025. On July 9, 2025, the Center received an email communication from a third party whose contact information was used by the registrant. The third party informed the Center that they did not register or authorize registration of the disputed domain name.

Pursuant to paragraph 6 of the Rules, on July 28, 2025, the Center informed the Parties that it would proceed with the panel appointment process.

The Center appointed Andrea Mondini as the sole panelist in this matter on August 4, 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 part of the EGIS Group, a major consulting, construction, engineering and operating firm that focuses on transport, infrastructure and buildings. Founded in France, EGIS has established a global network in over 100 countries and a team of 16,200 employees.

The Complainant owns numerous trademark registrations in several jurisdictions, including:

TRADEMARK	JURISDICTION	REGISTRATION NUMBER	REGISTRATION DATE	INTERNATIONAL CLASSES
EGIS	France	97684881	June 30, 1997	35, 37, 42 and 45
EGIS (fig.)	European Union	005831946	May 6, 2008	35, 36, 37, 39, 40, 41, 42, 44 and 45

The Complainant holds several domain names containing the term “EGIS”, among them <egis-group.com> which hosts its main website.

The Respondent appears to have used the name of a third party when registering the disputed domain name.

The disputed domain name was registered on April 16, 2025.

According to the evidence submitted with the Complaint, the disputed domain name resolves to an inactive page.

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 as follows:

The disputed domain name is confusingly similar to the EGIS trademark in which the Complainant has rights, because it incorporates this trademark in its entirety, and the addition of the misspelled term “group” is not sufficient to prevent a finding of confusing similarity but rather constitutes a case of “typosquatting”.

The Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the disputed domain name. The trademark EGIS has been extensively used to identify the Complainant and its services. The Respondent has not been authorized by the Complainant to use this trademark, is not commonly known by the disputed domain name, and there is no evidence of the Respondent's use, or demonstrable preparation to use, the disputed domain name in connection with a bona fide offering of goods and services. On the contrary, the disputed domain name resolves to an inactive page.

The disputed domain name was registered and used in bad faith because it is obvious that the Respondent had knowledge of both the Complainant and its well-known trademark EGIS at the time it registered the disputed domain name. The absence of an active website and the use of obviously false contact information are further evidence of bad faith. Under these circumstances, the Respondent's configuration of Mail Exchange (MX) records associated with the disputed domain name creates a threat that the Respondent may send potentially fraudulent emails.

B. Respondent

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

On June 9, 2025, the Center received an email from a third party apparently in receipt of the Center's written notice of the proceeding claiming to have no relationship with the disputed domain name.

6. Discussion and Findings

According to paragraph 4(a) of the Policy, in order to succeed, a complainant must establish each of the following elements:

- (i) the disputed domain name is identical or confusingly similar to the 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 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 entirety of the mark EGIS is reproduced within the disputed domain name.

The addition of the misspelled term "ggroup" to the disputed domain name is considered an intentional misspelling and does not prevent a finding of confusing similarity under the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 1.9

The addition of the generic Top-Level-Domain ("gTLD") ".com" in the disputed domain name is a standard registration requirement and as such may be disregarded under the confusing similarity test under the Policy, paragraph 4(a)(i). [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 1.11.1.

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 for a complainant to prove that 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 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.

Panels have held that the use of a domain name for illegal activity such as here committing identity theft can never confer rights or legitimate interests on a respondent. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 2.13.1.

Furthermore, the disputed domain name itself suggests a connection or affiliation between the Complainant and the Respondent which in fact does not exist.

Based on the available record, 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.

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.

In the view of the Panel, noting that that the Complainant’s trademark predates the registration of the disputed domain name and considering that the Complainant’s trademark is well-known it is inconceivable that the Respondent could have registered the disputed domain name without knowledge of the Complainant’s well-known trademark. In the circumstances of this case, this is evidence of registration in bad faith.

The disputed domain name resolves to an inactive page. Panels have found that the non-use of a domain name (including a blank or “coming soon” page) would not prevent a finding of bad faith under the doctrine of passive holding. Having reviewed the available record, the Panel finds the non-use of the disputed domain name does not prevent a finding of bad faith in the circumstances of this proceeding. Although panelists will look at the totality of the circumstances in each case, factors that have been considered relevant in applying the passive holding doctrine include: (i) the degree of distinctiveness or reputation of the complainant’s mark, (ii) the failure of the respondent to submit a response or to provide any evidence of actual or contemplated good-faith use, and (iii) the respondent’s concealing its identity or use of false contact details (noted to be in breach of its registration agreement). [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 3.3. Having reviewed the

available record, the Panel notes the distinctiveness and reputation of the Complainant's trademark, the failure of the Respondent to submit a response or to provide any evidence of actual or contemplated good-faith use and the Respondent's use of false contact details which suggests that the Respondent committed an identity theft. Therefore, the Panel 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.

Based on the available record, the Panel finds that the Complainant has established the third element of the Policy with regard to the disputed domain name.

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 <egis-grouop.com> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Andrea Mondini/

Andrea Mondini

Sole Panelist

Date: August 8, 2025