

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

Mistral AI v. wang wei
Case No. D2025-2818

1. The Parties

The Complainant is Mistral AI, France, represented by Blanche Avocats, France.

The Respondent is wang wei, China.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

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

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the “Center”) on July 17, 2025. On July 17, 2025, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On July 17, 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 July 18, 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 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 July 22, 2025. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was August 11, 2025. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent’s default on August 12, 2025.

The Center appointed Peter Burgstaller as the sole panelist in this matter on August 19, 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 was founded in early 2023 and is one of the leaders in generative artificial intelligence (“AI”) in Europe, specializing in developing and offering large language models (“LLMs”) and a multilingual conversational assistant based on the Complainant’s AI models. (Annex 1, 8 -12 to the Complaint).

The Complainant owns several trademark registrations containing the mark MISTRAL AI, inter alia:

- French trademark registration for MISTRAL AI (word), Registration No 4970012, registered on November 10, 2023;
- European Union trademark registration for MISTRAL AI (word), Registration No 018942618, registered on February 14, 2024; and
- International trademark registration for MISTRAL AI (word), Registration No 1794809, registered on December 15, 2023, designating several countries including China and Russian Federation (Annex 5 to the Complaint).

The Complainant operates its main business website under the domain name <mistral.ai> and owns several other domain names containing the mark MISTRAL AI, e.g. <mistralai.fr>, <mistralai.com>, <mistral-ai.fr> and <mistraldev.net> (Annex 7 to the Complaint).

The disputed domain name was registered on March 7, 2025; at the time of filing of the Complaint, the disputed domain name referred to a website promoting a Complainant’s free online tool “Mistral OCR” which enables to convert images and PDFs into editable text by using advanced AI technology (Annex 14 to the Complaint).

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 to be the European leader in generative AI that was founded in early 2023 and enjoyed quick and significant success by fundraising hundreds of millions of euros in 2023 and 2024, meanwhile enjoying high and worldwide reputation.

The Complainant submits that the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to the Complainant’s MISTRAL AI trademark, as it reproduces the distinctive element “mistral” as well as the Complainant’s company name and domain names. Furthermore, the suffix “ocr” stands for “optical character recognition”, a service which was introduced by the Complainant in March 2025 which leads the public to falsely believe that the website exploited under the domain name is the Complainant’s official website.

Moreover, the Complainant asserts that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the disputed domain name since the Complainant has never authorized the Respondent to register and/or use the disputed domain name, and the Respondent has no link whatsoever with the Complainant and is totally unknown by it.

Further, the Respondent itself apparently does not own any MISTRAL AI or similar trademarks and there is no reason for the Respondent to justify choosing the word “mistral” other than misleading the public and free riding on the Complainant’s reputation and investments.

Finally, the Complainant argues that the Respondent has registered and is using the disputed domain name in bad faith since the Complainant’s MISTRAL AI trademark has been enjoying a worldwide reputation since its creation in 2023, widely relayed by the media, which is why the Respondent at the time of registering the disputed domain name knew about the Complainant and sought to take unfair advantage of the latter’s reputation, investments, and Internet referencing.

Furthermore, the website under the disputed domain name promotes a tool which replicates the OCR service provided by the Complainant.

B. Respondent

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

6. Discussion and Findings

According to paragraph 4(a) of the Policy, 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; and
- (ii) the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests with respect to 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 submitted evidence which incontestably and conclusively establishes rights in the mark MISTRAL AI.

In the present case the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to the MISTRAL AI mark in which the Complainant has rights since it only replaces the term “AI” by “ocr”. It has long been established under UDRP decisions that where at least a dominant feature of the relevant mark is recognizable in the domain name, the domain name will normally be considered confusingly similar to that mark for purposes of UDRP standing ([WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 1.7).

The dominant element “mistral” of the Complainant’s trademark MISTRAL AI is still recognizable in the disputed domain name.

Finally, it has also long been held that generic Top-Level Domains are generally disregarded when evaluating the confusing similarity between a disputed domain name and a trademark. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 1.11.

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.

While 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 often impossible 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. 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 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 Complainant’s trademark MISTRAL AI is well known in the field of AI; it is therefore inconceivable that the Respondent had not been aware of it when registering the disputed domain name.

Further, the Complainant expressly denies there being any relationship between itself and the Respondent.

The Panel also notes that the disputed domain name is not being used for a bona fide offering of goods or services – it resolves to an unauthorized website promoting the Complainant’s AI tool, which is an image or a PDF conversion tool on the basis of AI technology.

There is also no justification to use the disputed domain name under the Oki Data test, since the Respondent must inter alia accurately and prominently disclose the registrant’s relationship with the trademark holder to show a legitimate use of a trademark as a reseller, distributor, or service provider. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 2.8; *Oki Data Americas, Inc. v. ASD, Inc.*, WIPO Case No. [D2001-0903](#).

The evidence in the Complaint does not reveal any disclaimer that discloses the Respondent’s relationship with the Complainant, and the Respondent has not introduced any evidence to the contrary. Rather, it appears that the Respondent has purposely attempted to create a false association with the Complainant both through the disputed domain name itself and the website content, which, notably, contains a copyright notice “...2025 Mistral OCR [...]”.

Accordingly, the Panel concludes that the Respondent clearly does not comply with the Oki Data test.

The Respondent did not reply to the Complainant’s contentions; hence, the Respondent has not rebutted the Complainant’s prima facie showing.

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.

In the present case, the Complainant provided evidence which demonstrates that it has rights and is the owner of the well-known registered trademark MISTRAL AI, registered and used in many jurisdictions around the world before the disputed domain was registered.

Further, the Complainant registered and is using various domain names containing the mark MISTRAL AI e.g., <mistral.ai> among others; the Complainant has also a strong Internet presence.

It is therefore inconceivable for the Panel that the Respondent registered and used the disputed domain name without knowledge of the Complainant's rights, which leads to the necessary inference of bad faith. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 3.2.2.

This finding is supported by the fact that the disputed domain name incorporates the dominant element "mistral" of the Complainant's MISTRAL AI trademark together with the suffix "ocr" which, as combined, corresponds to the name of the Mistral OCR service provided by the Complainant and, therefore, even strengthens the impression that the disputed domain name is in some way connected with the Complainant which is not the case.

In fact, the disputed domain name directs Internet users to a website promoting the Complainant's AI tool, as discussed above, without any information as to the lack of relationship with the Complainant; this clearly disrupts the Complainant's business and is an intentional attempt to attract, for commercial gain, Internet users by creating a likelihood of confusion with the Complainant's mark, which constitutes bad faith registration and use.

Based on the available record, 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 <mistralocr.com> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Peter Burgstaller/

Peter Burgstaller

Sole Panelist

Date: September 1, 2025