

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

TriOptima AB v. karim moufekkir
Case No. D2025-3346

1. The Parties

The Complainant is TriOptima AB, Sweden, represented by Ashurst LLP, United Kingdom.

The Respondent is karim moufekkir, France.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <trioptim.com> is registered with Hostinger Operations, UAB (the “Registrar”).

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the “Center”) on August 20, 2025. On August 20, 2025, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On August 21, 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 (“Domain Admin”) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on August 21, 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 amendment to the Complaint on August 21, 2025.

The Center verified that the Complaint together with the amendment to the 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 August 22, 2025. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for the Response was September 11, 2025. The Response was filed with the Center on September 4, 2025.

The Center appointed Ingrida Kariņa-Bērziņa as the sole panelist in this matter on September 16, 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.

At the request of the Complainant, the proceedings were suspended for settlement discussions on October 1, 2025, with an extension granted on November 3, 2025. The proceedings were reinstituted on December 4, 2025.

4. Factual Background

The Complainant is a registered investment firm established in Sweden in the year 2000. Since 2021, it operates as a subsidiary of OSTTRA, which is a joint venture of S&P Global and the CME Group. Under the TRIOPTIMA mark, it offers post-trade financial investment optimization services.

The Complainant is the proprietor of the following trademark registrations:

- International Trademark Registration No. 1363203 for TRIOPTIMA (word mark), registered on June 8, 2017, for services in class 36;
- United Kingdom Trademark Registration No. UK00801363203 for TRIOPTIMA (word mark), registered on February 9, 2018, for services in class 36;
- International Trademark Registration No. 1552421 for TRIOPTIMA (device mark), registered on August 13, 2020, for goods and services in classes 9, 36 and 42.

The Complainant has registered the domain name <trioptima.com>, which it uses to redirect Internet users to the website of its parent company OSTTRA.

The disputed domain name was registered on April 10, 2024. At the time of the Complaint and of this Decision, it did not resolve to an active website. The Complainant provides evidence that the disputed domain name previously resolved to a landing page on which the Respondent indicated it was operating a financial consultancy including “optimization services”.

The Respondent, identified in the record as a private individual located in France, states that he is a consulting company marketing a “Tri Optim” package of social, tax, and organizational consulting services. The record contains a Power Point presentation that the Respondent identifies as describing “TriOptim’s projected activity.” The presentation, dated 2024 (French version) and 2025 (English version), describes the consulting services of an entity named “AA+”. The contact information on this presentation is given as “AA+ EXPERTISE & ADVISORY” with an address in Andorra, and a website at the domain name <auditaction.eu.>

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 that it was established in the year 2000 and since 2021 is a unit of OSTTRA, a 50/50 joint venture owned by CME Group and S&P Global that has 1,350 employees in eight international offices. OSTTRA offers post-trade financial investment services and operates several optimization businesses, among them TriOptima, which is a multilateral portfolio compression service for optimizing risk and capital allocation for market participants and creating a global network for portfolio reconciliation, analysis and margin management. The Complainant’s parent company OSTTRA continues to market the TRIOPTIMA services on its website.

- The disputed domain name appears to be a misspelling of the Complainant’s TRIOPTIMA mark, lacking only the terminal letter “a”.

- For a short time in May 2024, the Respondent used the disputed domain name for a website offering “optimization services,” which appears to intersect materially with the optimization services offered by the Complainant. The Respondent does not have any rights in the disputed domain name. An Internet search did not reveal any actual activity of the Respondent in the area of consulting services following this brief period of hosting a website at the disputed domain name.
- The Complainant’s TRIOPTIMA mark has become well known through extensive and lengthy use. The Complainant has developed a class-leading financial solutions service under the TRIOPTIMA mark. The registration of a confusingly similar disputed domain name indicates bad faith, as does the use of a privacy service. The financial services sector is subject to various harmful schemes.

The Complainant requests transfer of the disputed domain name.

B. Respondent

The Respondent contends that the Complainant has not satisfied the elements required under the Policy for a transfer of the disputed domain name.

Notably, the Respondent contends that the disputed domain name was chosen as part of a French consulting company project focused on social, tax, and organizational optimization, intended for French small and medium-sized enterprises, with the element “tri” referring to a tripartite approach covering social, tax, and organizational optimization, and the element “optim” as a common term in business and consulting language, used to evoke optimization. The disputed domain name does not seek to profit from the “TriOptima AB” trademark.

The Respondent has engaged in a real professional project under the name “TrioOptim”, and the disputed domain name was registered to host a service presentation website, optimization tools, and a client area.

The disputed domain has never been offered for sale to the Complainant or a competitor. The planned website does not imitate or evoke the Complainant’s graphic or commercial identity, and the Respondent’s project targets a local French clientele that is very different from the market targeted by the Complainant.

6. Discussion and Findings

Paragraph 4(a) of the UDRP requires the Complainant to make out all three of the following:

- (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 in respect of the disputed domain name; and
- (iii) the Respondent has registered and is using the disputed domain name in bad faith.

Under paragraph 15(a) of the Rules, “[a] Panel shall decide a complaint on the basis of the statements and documents submitted and in accordance with the Policy, these Rules and any rules and principles of law that it deems applicable”.

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.

In comparing the Complainant's mark with the disputed domain name, the Panel finds that the disputed domain name, which differs only by the lack of the terminal letter "a", is a deliberate misspelling of the Complainant's mark. See [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 1.9. Accordingly, the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to the mark 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 name.

The Respondent argues that it selected the disputed domain name for its semantic meaning, comprising the elements "tri", meaning "three", and "optim," for "optimization", for the French market. The Panel independently consulted an online French language dictionary (Larousse) and was unable to find any results for "trioptim" or "optim." The word "tri," on the other hand, appears to have an entirely unrelated meaning in French. These elements separately and the "trioptim" term have no dictionary meaning in English. Accordingly, the Panel is unable to find that the disputed domain name corresponds to a dictionary word in respect of which the Respondent has established rights or legitimate interests. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 2.10.

Further, the Respondent states that it is operating a consulting project for the French market entitled "TrioOptim" and offers two marketing presentations, dated in 2024 and 2025, to support this contention. From the available materials it is evident that the Respondent, a private individual, is not known by the disputed domain name, and that his business, identified as "AA+ Expertise & Conseil" with an address in Andorra, is also not known by the disputed domain name. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 2.1.

The Panel notes the composition of the disputed domain name, which comprises a minor misspelling of the Complainant's TRIOPTIMA mark, which does not distinguish it from the mark. The record indicates that the disputed domain name was previously used to resolve to a webpage offering "optimization services," which appears to overlap with the Complainant's business. Together with the use to which it has been put, the Panel finds that the nature of the disputed domain name carries a risk of implied affiliation to the Complainant's business that cannot constitute fair use. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 2.5.1.

The Respondent's marketing presentations mention the term "TriOptim" on just three of 15 slides; the record does not confirm that these materials were ever shown to any clients, actual or prospective. The record contains no other evidence in support of the Respondent's contentions related to its alleged business activities or preparations for same. The Respondent uses a different domain name to market his business through a website that does not appear to make use of the term "TriOptim". On the evidence available, the Panel is unable to find that the Respondent has demonstrated use of, or demonstrable preparations to use, the disputed domain name in connection with a bona fide offering of goods or services. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 2.2.

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 finds that the Respondent intentionally attempted to attract, for commercial gain, Internet users by creating a likelihood of confusion with the Complainant's mark. The disputed domain name comprises a minor misspelling of the Complainant's TRIOPTIMA mark. As discussed above, on the available record the Panel is unable to credit the Respondent's argument that the disputed domain name was chosen for its semantic meaning. The Complainant's TRIOPTIMA mark predates the registration of the disputed domain name. Under these circumstances, the Panel finds that the available evidence supports a finding that the disputed domain name was registered in bad faith. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 3.1.4.

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.

The Respondent states that it plans to use the website to offer, inter alia, "optimization services." The record indicates that the disputed domain name previously resolved to a website on which such services were offered. The Respondent further states that it has not offered the disputed domain name for sale, and that the appearance of its planned website will not imitate or evoke the Complainant's corporate identity.

As noted, however, the Respondent has provided no credible evidence in support of these and other statements. Accordingly, the Panel is not prepared to draw inferences favorable to the Respondent on these matters. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 4.2. The Panel finds that, on the record available and absent any plausible explanation to the contrary, the use of the disputed domain name to resolve to a website offering services proximate to the Complainant's business is an indication of bad faith use of the disputed domain name.

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 <trioptim.com> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Ingrīda Kariņa-Bērziņa/

Ingrīda Kariņa-Bērziņa

Sole Panelist

Date: December 4, 2025