

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

Aixtron SE v. Shful wise

Case No. D2025-3406

1. The Parties

The Complainant is Aixtron SE, Germany, represented by CMS Hasche Sigle Partnerschaft von Rechtsanwälten und Steuerberatern mbB, Germany.

The Respondent is Shful wise, United States of America ("United States").

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <aixtron.com> is registered with NameSilo, LLC (the "Registrar").

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the "Center") on August 25, 2025. On August 25, 2025, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On August 25, 2025, the Registrar transmitted by email to the Center its verification response confirming that the Respondent is listed as the registrant and providing the contact details.

The Center verified that 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 28, 2025. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was September 17, 2025. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent's default on September 18, 2025.

The Center appointed Christelle Vaval as the sole panelist in this matter on September 26, 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, AISTRON SE, is a German company incorporated in 1983, with international operations. It is a provider of deposition equipment to the semiconductor industry. Its products are used in technology and industrial applications. The Complainant owns the AIXTRON trademark in multiple jurisdictions, including European Union Trade Mark Registration No. 001224906 (registered March 23, 2001), United Kingdom Registration No. UK00901224906 (registered March 23, 2001), and United States Registration No. 1587642 (registered March 20, 1990). The Complainant's domain name is <aixtron.com>.

The Respondent registered the disputed domain name on June 10, 2025, well after the Complainant obtained its trademark registrations. The disputed domain name does not resolve to an active website and instead displays a "This site can't be reached" page due to a connection timeout. The Complainant has submitted evidence indicating that the Respondent used the disputed domain name to facilitate fraudulent and other unlawful activities.

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:

1. Identical or confusingly similar

The Complainant asserts that it has invested substantial time, financial resources, and effort in building the goodwill associated with the AIXTRON trademark. The disputed domain name consists of the Complainant's mark with the addition of the letter "i", a minor alteration that Internet users can easily overlook. This constitutes a typical case of typosquatting, where the insertion of an extra letter seeks to exploit common typographical errors.

2. No rights or legitimate interests

The Complainant contends that the Respondent lacks any legitimate interest in the use of the disputed domain name. Furthermore, it is alleged that the Respondent has utilized the disputed domain name for unlawful activities, including fraud, without evidence of proper use or authorization from the Complainant.

3. Registered and used in bad faith

The Complainant submits that both it and one of its customers were victims of a cyberattack involving the email address "[...]"@aixitron.com". According to the Complainant, the Respondent hijacked an email exchange between the Complainant's employee and the customer to induce a change of banking details. The Complainant contends that this conduct demonstrates the Respondent registered the disputed domain name for the sole purpose of obtaining financial gain through fraudulent activity.

Additionally, the Respondent had previously participated in a similar case involving the registration of a domain name resembling another company's name. In that instance, another administrative panel determined that the conduct constituted bad faith.

B. Respondent

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

6. Discussion and Findings

The case record shows the Center verified the Complaint's formal compliance and formally commenced the proceeding on August 28, 2025 (with a 20-day Response deadline that fell on September 17, 2025). The Center then notified the Respondent of default on September 18, 2025.

The Center employed all reasonably available means to contact the Respondent, pursuant to paragraph 2(a) of the UDRP Rules.

The record reflects service consistent with the Rules and WIPO Supplemental Rules. In the absence of a Response, the Panel may draw appropriate inferences from the Respondent's default (Rules, paragraph 14), as the Center's default notice also notes.

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 mark is recognizable within the disputed domain name. Accordingly, the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to the mark for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), sections 1.7 and 1.9.

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 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.

Additionally, there is no indication that the Respondent is commonly known under the disputed domain name, nor is there evidence of a bona fide offering of goods or services, or of legitimate noncommercial or fair use (Policy, paragraph 4(c)).

Panels have held that the use of a domain name for illegal activity here, claimed impersonating and 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 Respondent actions were intentional and aimed at defrauding the Complainant's clients.

The disputed domain name was created on June 10, 2025, long after Complainant's trademark had become distinctive and widely used. The typosquatting nature of the disputed domain name supports an inference that Respondent knew of the Complainant and targeted its trademark at the time of registration. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 3.2.1.

Indeed, the record shows that the disputed domain name was used to perpetrate a cyberattack by hijacking an email exchange between the Complainant's employee and a customer to induce a change in banking details, evidencing that the disputed domain name was registered and used to obtain financial gain through fraudulent activity.

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.).

Panels have held that the use of a domain name for illegitimate activity here, claimed committing fraud 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 name 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 name <aixitron.com> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Christelle Vaval/

Christelle Vaval

Sole Panelist

Date: October 3, 2025