

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

Daher Aerospace v. Nassim Bezzou
Case No. D2025-3801

1. The Parties

Complainant is Daher Aerospace, France, represented by INSCRIPTA, France.

Respondent is Nassim Bezzou, Algeria.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

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

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the “Center”) on September 18, 2025. On September 18, 2025, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On the same day, 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 (Redacted for Privacy, Privacy service provided by Withheld for Privacy ehf) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to Complainant on September 19, 2025, providing the registrant and contact information disclosed by the Registrar, and inviting Complainant to submit an amendment to the Complaint. Complainant filed an amendment to the Complaint on the same day.

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 Respondent of the Complaint, and the proceedings commenced on September 23, 2025. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was October 13, 2025. Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent’s default on October 24, 2025.

The Center appointed Frederick M. Abbott as the sole panelist in this matter on October 28, 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

Complainant is a French Public limited company registered in the French Companies Register. Complainant is a subsidiary of COMPAGNIE DAHER, a worldwide group of companies. Complainant employs more than 5500 individuals, with an annual turnover of approximately EUR 950 million. Complainant principally specializes in designing, developing, and manufacturing aircraft and aerospace equipment and systems, mainly structures such as fuselages, airframes and wings. Information concerning Complainant can be found at “www.daher.com”. Complainant states it is the registrant of various DAHER AEROSPACE-formative domain names, including <daheraerospace.com>, <daher-aerospace.com>, <daheraerospace.eu>, <daher-aerospace.eu>, <daheraerospace.fr> and <daher-aerospace.fr>.

Complainant is the owner of registration for the word trademark DAHER AEROSPACE on the register of the French Institute of Intellectual Property (INPI), registration number 4986574, registration dated August 28, 2023, in international classes (“ICs”) 12, 37 and 42, covering aircraft, repair and maintenance of aircraft, and aircraft design. Complainant also is the owner of registration for the word trademark DAHER AEROSPACE on the register of the European Union Intellectual Property Office (EUIPO), registration number 018918592, registration dated January 17, 2024, in ICs 12, 37 and 42. Complainant notes that its parent company, COMPAGNIE DAHER, is the owner of various DAHER and DAHER-formative trademark registrations in a substantial number of countries, e.g., the word trademark DAHER on the register of the EUIPO, registration number 001373596, registration dated December 11, 2000, in ICs 6, 20, 36, 37, 38, and 39.

According to the Registrar’s verification, Respondent is registrant of the disputed domain name. According to the Whois report, the disputed domain name was registered on April 8, 2025.

Respondent has used the disputed domain name to direct Internet users to a web-based subscription service offering vaguely defined products said to be responsive to the individual user for a fee (stated as EUR 49.99). The website to which the disputed domain name was previously directed was headed “ABONNEMENT”, and included a telephone contact number with a French country code (33), and an address which did not identify a city. Complainant’s trademark did not appear on this website. At the time Complainant filed its Complaint in these proceedings the disputed domain name was no longer associated with an active website. In May 2025, Complainant transmitted cease-and-desist emails to the available email addresses for Respondent, to which it did not receive a response.

There is no evidence on the record of these proceedings of any association, commercial or otherwise, between Complainant and Respondent.

5. Parties’ Contentions

A. Complainant

Complainant contends that it has satisfied each of the elements required under the Policy for a transfer of the disputed domain name.

Notably, Complainant contends that it owns rights in the DAHER AEROSPACE trademark and that the disputed domain name is almost identical, or at least highly and confusingly similar to that trademark.

Complainant argues that Respondent lacks rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name because: (1) Respondent has no trademark rights corresponding to the disputed domain name, and is not commonly known by the disputed domain name or Complainant’s trademark; (2) Complainant has not licensed or otherwise permitted Respondent or any third party to use its trademark in the manner used in the disputed domain name; (3) Respondent failed to respond to a cease-and-desist letter that sought justification for its registration and use of the disputed domain name, and; (4) Respondent employed a privacy shield.

Complainant alleges that Respondent registered and is using the disputed domain name in bad faith because: (1) Respondent registered the disputed domain name after Complainant registered its trademark; (2) the disputed domain name is highly similar to Complainant's trademark, which is incorporated in full in the disputed domain name; (3) Complainant's trademark is well known and it is virtually impossible that Respondent was not aware of that trademark when it registered and used the disputed domain name; (4) Respondent's use of a privacy shield supports an inference of bad faith; (5) Respondent failed to reply to cease-and-desist emails; (6) Respondent directed the disputed domain name to a website such that Respondent cannot believe that its use of the disputed domain name is truthful and well-founded; (7) the current passive holding of the disputed domain name by Respondent does not prevent a finding of bad faith registration and use, and (8) Complainant has well-founded concerns that Respondent may choose to use the disputed domain name as part of a phishing or other scheme to defraud customers, as the disputed domain name is configured with Mail Exchange servers.

Complainant requests the Panel to direct the Registrar to transfer the disputed domain name to Complainant.

B. Respondent

Respondent did not reply to Complainant's contentions.

6. Discussion and Findings

The Center formally notified the Complaint to Respondent at the email and physical address provided in its record of registration. It appears that email transmission to Respondent's Registrar-disclosed email address was successful, whereas courier delivery to the physical address provided by Respondent in its record of registration was seemingly not successfully completed due to provision of false or incomplete contact details. The Center took those steps prescribed by the Policy and the Rules to provide notice to Respondent, and those steps are presumed to satisfy notice requirements.

Paragraph 4(a) of the Policy sets forth three elements that must be established by a complainant to merit a finding that a respondent has engaged in abusive domain name registration and use and to obtain relief. These elements are that:

- (i) the disputed domain name is identical or confusingly similar to a trademark or service mark in which complainant has rights; and
- (ii) 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 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.

Complainant has shown rights in respect of the DAHER AEROSPACE trademarks for the purposes of the Policy. ¹ [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 1.2.1.

¹ The Panel uses the term "trademark" in its inclusive sense, to cover both trademarks and service marks.

The entirety of the mark is reproduced within the disputed domain name taken in its entirety.² Accordingly, the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to the mark for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 1.7.

Although the addition of other terms, here “sp”, may bear on assessment of the second and third elements, the Panel finds the addition of such term does not prevent a finding of confusing similarity between the disputed domain name and the mark for the purposes of the Policy.³ [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 1.8. 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 Respondent may demonstrate rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name.

Although the overall burden of proof in UDRP proceedings is on Complainant, panels have recognized that proving 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 Respondent. As such, where Complainant, as here, makes out a prima facie case that Respondent lacks rights or legitimate interests, the burden of production on this element shifts to Respondent to come forward with relevant evidence demonstrating rights or legitimate interests in the domain name (although the burden of proof always remains on Complainant). If Respondent, as here, fails to come forward with such relevant evidence, Complainant is deemed to have satisfied the second element. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 2.1.

Having reviewed the available record, the Panel finds Complainant has established a prima facie case that Respondent lacks rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name. Respondent has not rebutted 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.

Respondent’s use of the disputed domain name incorporating Complainant’s distinctive trademark to direct Internet users to an ill-defined subscription website does not constitute a bona fide offering of services prior to notice of a dispute on the part of Respondent. Such use by Respondent presumptively was intended to take unfair advantage of Internet user association with Complainant’s trademark. Respondent did not seek to rebut that presumption.

Respondent’s use, and subsequent nonuse, of the disputed domain name does not otherwise manifest rights or legitimate interests.

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 Respondent registered the disputed domain name after Complainant had secured rights in its DAHER AEROSPACE trademark. Complainant’s parent company also had established rights in the DAHER trademark substantially before Complainant secured its registrations for DAHER AEROSPACE. Complainant’s trademark is distinctive, and Respondent has provided no justification for registering the disputed domain name corresponding to that distinctive

² In the instant proceedings, the disputed domain name uses the Top-Level Domain (“TLD”) “.space” to create the combination that fully incorporates Complainant’s trademark. In these circumstances it is appropriate for the Panel to include the TLD in its analysis of confusing similarity, recognizing that the disputed domain name also includes the additional letters “sp” at the second-level portion.

³ See, id.

trademark. The Panel draws a reasonable inference that Respondent registered the disputed domain name for purposes of taking unfair advantage of Complainant's trademark.

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.

Respondent has used the disputed domain name, although it appears to have ceased that use prior to Complainant's initiation of these proceedings. Nonetheless, panels have found that the non-use of a domain name would not prevent a finding of bad faith under the doctrine of passive holding. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 3.3. Having reviewed the available record, the Panel notes the distinctiveness of Complainant's trademark, and the composition of the disputed domain name, and 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.

Respondent previously used the disputed domain name substantially and confusingly similar to Complainant's distinctive trademark for commercial gain to direct Internet users to a website offering a vaguely defined subscription service for a fee. Such use by Respondent was likely to confuse Internet users regarding Complainant as the source, sponsor, affiliate or endorser of Respondent's website. Such use by Respondent constitutes bad faith within the meaning of paragraph 4(b)(iv) of the Policy.

The Panel finds that 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 <daheraerosp.space> be transferred to Complainant.

/Frederick M. Abbott/

Frederick M. Abbott

Sole Panelist

Date: November 6, 2025