

## ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

Alstom, ALSTOM Holdings v. mesut erdogan  
Case No. D2025-3906

### 1. The Parties

The Complainants are Alstom and ALSTOM Holdings S.A., France, represented by Lynde & Associates, France.

The Respondent is mesut erdogan, Türkiye.

### 2. The Domain Names and Registrar

The disputed domain names <alstomadessia.com>, <alstominnovia.com>, and <alstomtraxx.com> are registered with Dynadot Inc (the “Registrar”).

### 3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the “Center”) on September 25, 2025. On September 25, 2025, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain names. On September 26, 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 (“REDACTED FOR PRIVACY (DT), Super Privacy Service LTD c/o Dynadot”) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on September 26, 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 September 29, 2025.

The Center verified that the Complaint [together with the amendment to the Complaint/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 September 30, 2025. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was October 20, 2025. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent’s default on October 22, 2025.

The Center appointed Uwa Ohiku as the sole panelist in this matter on October 27, 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 Complainants are two entities within a group of related companies (such as Alstom Holdings, Alstom Shipworks, Alstom Transport S.A., Alstom Power Systems, Alstom Transport U.K. Limited, etc.) under the umbrella of Alstom.

In the circumstances, the Panel reference to the “Complainant” in this consolidated Complaint, is to Alstom.

The Complainant is a French company founded in 1928 and a global leader in the transportation sector, from high-speed trains, metros, monorails, trams to turnkey systems, services, infrastructure, signaling and digital mobility. The Complainant operates worldwide and has an extensive reach of over 250 sites in over 60 countries, 86,000 employees, with over 150,000 vehicles in service. Its 2024 published figures show EUR 18.5 billion in sales, EUR 19.8 billion in orders and EUR 95 billion in order backlog. Previous panels have said that ALSTOM is famous and/or well-known. See *ALSTOM v. Daniel Bailey*, WIPO Case No. [D2010-1150](#).

The Complainant owns a large international portfolio of trademarks, among which are:

- Turkish Trademark Registration No. 2019/04371 for ALSTOM, registered on September 18, 2019;
- European Union Trade Mark No. 00948729 for ALSTOM, registered on August 8, 2001;
- International Trademark Registration No. 706292 for ALSTOM registered on August 28, 1998.

The Complainant also owns the following sub-marks, among several others, via Alstom Holdings, S.A.:

- European Union Trade Mark No. 003160835 TRAXX registered on November 19, 2004;
- International Trademark Registration No. 1813024 TRAXX registered on February 7, 2024;
- French Trademark Registration No. 4907860 ADESSIA registered on October 24, 2022;
- International Trademark Registration No. 1742976 ADESSIA registered on April 21, 2023;
- European Union Trade Mark No. 000864058 INNOVIA registered on June 30, 1998;
- United States Registration No.3030948 INNOVIA registered on December 20, 2005.

The Complainant also owns domain names featuring its ALSTOM trademark, including <alstom.com> registered since January 20, 1998, and <alstomgroup.com> registered since November 14, 2000.

The Respondent is an individual located in Türkiye.

The disputed domain names were registered on March 18, 2025, and according to submitted evidence, resolved to Registrar parking pages, on sale for USD 2,988 each. On the date of this decision, the position of the disputed domain names is the same.

#### **5. Parties' Contentions**

##### **A. Complainant**

The Complainant contends that it has satisfied all three elements required under the Policy for a transfer of the disputed domain names (that the disputed domain names are confusingly similar to the trademarks in which the Complainant has established rights; that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the disputed domain names; and that the disputed domain names were registered and are being

used in bad faith), and provides copious information and documentary evidence by way of several annexures and references to previous UDRP Panel decisions in support of its contentions in this Complaint.

The Complainant further asserts that Türkiye, where the Respondent indicates having his address, is a key country for the Complainant as it has been present in that territory since 1955, recently expanding its presence by establishing Alstom Türkiye Engineering and Technology Center in 2023, among several other business expansion ventures. The Complainant also asserts that it tried to contact the Respondent to assert its rights before filing the Complaint but did not hear back from the Respondent.

## **B. Respondent**

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

## **6. Discussion and Findings**

### **A. Procedural issues: Consolidation of Complainants**

The Complainants requested the Panel to hear the present dispute brought by two Complainants as a consolidated Complaint.

In assessing whether a complaint filed by multiple complainants may be brought against a single respondent, panels look at whether (i) the complainants have a specific common grievance against the respondent, or the respondent has engaged in common conduct that has affected the complainants in a similar fashion, and (ii) it would be equitable and procedurally efficient to permit the consolidation. WIPO Overview of WIPO Panel Views on Selected UDRP Questions, Third Edition, ("[WIPO Overview 3.0](#)"), section 4.11.1.

The Complainants assert they are related corporate entities and have a common legal interest sufficient to justify consolidation.

Accordingly, the Panel accepts the single consolidated Complaint as fair and equitable to all the Parties.

### **B. Substantive issues**

Paragraph 15(a) of the Rules instructs the Panel to "decide a complaint on the basis of the statements and documents submitted in accordance with the Policy, these Rules, and any rules and principles of law that it deems applicable".

The Respondent failed to file a response to the Complainant's assertions, but this does not automatically mean that the Complainant has established all three elements for a transfer of the disputed domain names and the Panel will review the evidence provided in the Complaint to verify that all three elements are indeed established. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 4.3.

The Panel has authority to decide the dispute, examining the three elements in paragraph 4(a) of the Policy, taking into consideration all the relevant evidence, annexed materials and allegations, and carrying out limited independent research under the general powers of the Panel, amongst others, specified in paragraph 10 of the Rules.

### **C. 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 3.0](#), section 1.7.

The Complainant has shown rights in respect of trademarks or service marks for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 1.2.1.

The Panel finds that the entirety of the Complainant's marks ALSTOM, ADESSIA, INNOVIA, and TRAXX marks are reproduced and recognizable within the disputed domain names. Accordingly, the disputed domain names are confusingly similar to the Complainant's marks for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 1.7.

Further, the generic Top-Level Domain ("gTLD") ".com" may be disregarded for the purposes of assessing confusing similarity as this is a standard registration requirement.

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

#### **D. 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 Complainant's unrebutted assertions, the preponderance of evidence submitted as annexures to the Complaint and the failure of the Respondent to come forward to establish any rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain names such as those enumerated in the Policy or otherwise, 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 Panel finds the second element of the Policy has been established.

#### **E. 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.

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.

In the present case, the Panel notes that the disputed domain names replicated the trademark ALSTOM with the Complainant's sub-marks ADESSIA, INNOVIA and TRAXX, which combination, in the Panel's view, was not a coincidence, but a deliberate step by the Respondent to take advantage of the reputation and goodwill attaching to the Complainant's trademarks and tradenames. The Panel is further convinced of the deliberateness of the Respondent, given the Complainant's continued expansive business operations in Türkiye where the Respondent is supposedly based, which according to evidence submitted, dates back to 1955 with the delivery of passenger locomotives and the country's first electric locomotive.

Further, the Respondent did not respond to the Complainant's attempt to reach the Respondent before the Complaint was filed and failed to respond to the Complaint and to present any evidence or reasons for registering the disputed domain names. The Panel is of the view that it is highly unlikely that the Respondent registered the disputed domain names without having knowledge of the Complainant's prior trademarks and without intent to target the Complainant and its trademarks. The Panel also finds that the Respondent's listing of the disputed domain names for sale at prices in excess of any out-of-pocket expenses that the Respondent could have reasonably incurred in acquiring the disputed domain names, amounts to bad faith registration and use envisaged by Paragraph 4(b)(i) of the Policy and [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 3.1.1.

Furthermore, as part of its general powers under paragraphs 10 of the Rules, the Panel undertook limited factual research into matters of public record which it considered useful in assessing the merits of the case and reaching a decision. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 4.8. Limited searches for the Respondent's name revealed prior UDRP proceedings which concluded in findings of bad faith, resulting in the transfer of the disputed domain names to the brand owners. In many of these cases, the Respondent "mesut erdogan" registered the domain names of the complainants and offered them for sale at USD 2,850 or USD 2,988, as in the present case. See *Chiesi Farmaceutici S.p.A v. mesut Erdogan and Domain Admin*, WIPO Case No. [D2025-1946](#); *Verisure Sarl v. mesut erdogan*, WIPO Case No. [D2024-4586](#); *AGAVE VENTURES LL.C v. mesut erdogan*, WIPO Case No. [D2024-4382](#); *Outfront Media LLC v. mesut erdogan*, WIPO Case No. [D2025-2711](#).

In the Panel's view, the Respondent's actions of registering domain names corresponding to the marks of brand owners to extract revenue from such domain names is the kind of predatory bad faith which the Policy is established to prevent. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 3.1.2.

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 <alstomadessia.com>, <alstominnovia.com>, and <alstomtraxx.com> be transferred to the Complainant Alstom.

/Uwa Ohiku/

**Uwa Ohiku**

Sole Panelist

Date: November 10, 2025