

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

AMUNDI ASSET MANAGEMENT v. Andreas Jens

Case No. D2025-3758

1. The Parties

The Complainant is AMUNDI ASSET MANAGEMENT, France, represented by Nameshield, France.

The Respondent is Andreas Jens, Austria.

2. The Domain Names and Registrar

The disputed domain names <amundo-immobilien.com>, and <amundo-realestate.com> are registered with united-domains AG (the “Registrar”).

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed in English with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the “Center”) on September 16, 2025. On September 17, 2025, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain names. On September 17, 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 (Unknown) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on September 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 the amended Complaints in English on September 19, 2025.

On September 18, 2025, the Center informed the parties in German and English, that the language of the registration agreement for the disputed domain names is German. On September 19, 2025, the Complainant requested English to be the language of the proceeding. The Respondent did not submit any comment on the Complainant’s submission.

The Center verified that the Complaint together with the amended Complaints 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 in English and German of the Complaint, and the proceedings commenced on September 29, 2025. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was October 19, 2025. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent's default on October 31, 2025.

The Center appointed Andrea Jaeger-Lenz as the sole panelist in this matter on November 6, 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 engages in asset management for third parties with offices in Europe, Asia-Pacific, the Middle East and the Americas. With 5,700 employees and EUR 2.2 trillion of assets under management it serves over 100 million retail clients through around 600 savings and wealth partners, and 1,000 institutional and corporate clients (as per Annex 3 to the Complaint). The asset management services of the Complainant include services relating to real estate investments (as per Annex 8 to the Complaint). The Complainant is owner of the following trademark (as per Annex 4 to the Complaint):

- International trademark ("IR") no. 1024160 AMUNDI (word), registered on September 24, 2009 for services in Class 36, with designations to numerous jurisdictions worldwide, including the European Union, Australia, Japan, the United States of America and China.

The Complainant owns the domain name <amundi.com>, registered since August 26, 2004 (as per Annex 5 to the Complaint), which resolves to its official website.

The disputed domain names were both registered on July 5, 2025 (as per Annex 1 to the Complaint) and redirect to a parking page (as per Annex 6 to the Complaint). Besides that, Mail Exchange ("MX") servers are configured for the disputed domain names (as per Annex 7 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 names.

Notably, the Complainant contends that the disputed domain names are confusingly similar to a trademark, in which it owns rights. For that, the Complainant points to its registered IR AMUNDI. The Complainant argues that the mere substitution of the letter "i" by the letter "o" and the addition of the terms "immobilier" and "real estate", respectively, is not sufficient to avoid likelihood of confusion, as in the overall impression of the disputed domain names are still connected to the Complainant's trademark. The added descriptive terms even relate to a particular field of activities of the Complainant and thus reinforces the likelihood of confusion, and the Top-Level-Domain ("TLD") ".com", as a standard registration requirement, could be disregarded.

On the second element, the Complainant claims that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests with regards to the disputed domain names. The Complainant asserts that the Respondent is not identified in the Whois database as the disputed domain names and as such is not commonly known by them. Further, the Complainant states that the Respondent is not affiliated with or authorized by the Complainant in any way, that it does not carry out any business with or for the Complainant nor has been granted an authorization or license to use the Complainant's trademark. As the disputed domain names merely resolve to a parking page, there are no demonstrable plans to use the disputed domain names either.

On the third element, the Complainant argues that the disputed domain names were registered and are being used in bad faith. As for registration in bad faith, the Complainant puts forth that its AMUNDI trademark is used world wide and that the Complainant is Europe's number one asset manager by assets and ranks in the top 10 globally. The Complainant points to a previous panel decision having confirmed the notoriety of the Complainant's trademark. Also, the combination of the variation of AMUNIDI with the words "immobilien" and "real estate" cannot be accidental, as both terms refer to an area of the Complainant's activities. Thus, the Complainant finds it reasonable to infer that the disputed domain names were registered in full knowledge of the Complainant's trademark. As to use in bad faith, the Complainant claims that – given the alleged fame of its trademark - the fact that disputed domain names incorporating this trademark are not actively used amounts to bad faith use. Besides that, the Respondent has, so the Complainant puts forth, configured MX servers which suggests an imminent use for email purposes.

B. Respondent

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

6. Discussion and Findings

A. Language of proceedings

It is in the Panel's discretion to determine the language of proceedings. The Panel agrees with the Complainant's request to conduct proceedings in English. First of all, the registration of one of the disputed domain names, namely <amundo-realestate.com>, shows that the Respondent understands English, which, apart from this, it's the most widely understood language in the world. Secondly, the Respondent has been given the opportunity to respond to the Complaint and, in doing so, object to proceedings being conducted in English. It chose not to respond and thereby did not object to English as language of proceedings. Against this background, conducting the proceedings in English rather requesting the Complainant to present the Complaint and Annexes in German does not appear unfair to the Respondent and is in the interest of due expedition of proceedings.

B. 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.

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.

Even though the Complainant's trademark is not identically reproduced within the disputed domain names, the Panel finds the mark is clearly recognizable within the disputed domain names. The misspelling of the mark by the variation of the letter "i" to the letter "o" in the middle of both disputed domain names is likely to go unnoticed by an Internet user, in particular in case of the receipt of emails containing a minor variation of the element "amundi". Accordingly, the disputed domain names are confusingly similar to the mark for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 1.9.

Although the addition of other terms, here "immobilien", which is the German word for "real estate", and "real estate", may bear on assessment of the second and third elements, the Panel finds the addition of such terms 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.

The Panel finds the first element of the Policy has been established.

C. 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.

The Panel finds the second element of the Policy has been established.

D. 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 has registered the disputed domain names incorporating the Complainant’s trademark with a misspelling in the last letter and combining it with the descriptive terms “immobilien” and “real estate”. While the disputed domain names are not in active use for a website, MX servers are configured, allowing the potential conclusion of their intended use for email correspondence.

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 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 notes the distinctiveness of the Complainant’s trademark, and the composition of the disputed domain names, and finds that in the circumstances of this case the passive holding of the disputed domain names does not prevent a finding of bad faith under the Policy. While, in the Panel’s view, the available record does not allow the conclusion that the Complainant’s trademark is well-known, the totality of the circumstances of the case still support a finding of bad faith, namely the inherent distinctiveness of the Complainant’s trademark, the combination of a term incorporating a minor typo of the mark with descriptive terms relating to the business of the Complainant, the Respondent having concealed its identity upon registration and its failure to submit a response and provide arguments for the plausibility of a good faith use to which the disputed domain names would be put. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), Section 3.3. This, in combination with the configuration of MX servers for the disputed domain names, allows the potential conclusion that the Respondent had the Complainant in mind when registering the disputed domain names with the intention to use them for deceptive email correspondence.

Accordingly, 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 <amundo-immobilien.com> and <amundo-realestate.com> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Andrea Jaeger-Lenz/

Andrea Jaeger-Lenz

Sole Panelist

Date: November 20, 2025