

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

Safran v. Robin Johnson
Case No. D2025-4387

1. The Parties

The Complainant is Safran, France, internally represented.

The Respondent is Robin Johnson, United States of America ("United States").

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <safrangroupllc.com> is registered with NameCheap, Inc. (the "Registrar").

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the "Center") on October 24, 2025. On October 24, 2025, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On October 24, 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 (Unknown Registrant/Privacy service provided by Withheld for Privacy ehf) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on October 29, 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 October 29, 2025.

The Center verified that the Complaint together with the 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 October 31, 2025. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was November 20, 2025. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent's default on November 24, 2025.

The Center appointed Kiyoshi Tsuru as the sole panelist in this matter on December 1, 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 is an international high-technology group operating in the aviation industry, including the propulsion, equipment, interiors, defense, and space markets.

The Complainant is the holder of the following trademark registrations, among others:

Trademark	Registration No.	Date of Registration	Classes	Jurisdiction
SAFRAN	004535209	August 17, 2005	Classes 7, 9, 11, 12, 13, 16, 35, 37, 38, 39, 41, and 42	European Union trademark
SAFRAN	884321	August 5, 2005	Classes 2, 7, 9, 11, 12, 13, 16, 36, 37, 38, 41, and 42	International trademark
SAFRAN	3608914	April 21, 2009	Classes 7, 9, 12, 37, 38, and 42	United States

The Complainant also owns the domain name <safran-group.com> which resolves to the Complainant's official website. The Complainant's domain name was registered on February 25, 2005.

The disputed domain name <safrangroupllc.com> was registered on July 18, 2025, and it is inactive.

5. Parties' Contentions

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 the following:

A. Complainant

That it is a leading international high-technology group operating in aviation including propulsion, equipment, interiors, defense, and space markets. That, with a longstanding global presence, it holds world or regional leadership positions across its core businesses. That, guided by its purpose of contributing to a safer and more sustainable world, it invests heavily in research and development to advance environmentally responsible innovation and maintain the environmental priorities of its research, technology, and innovation roadmaps.

That it maintains a significant presence in the United States, built upon more than 50 years of continuous and committed operations in the country, particularly through its affiliated companies, which further underscores the Complainant's strong international footprint and longstanding commercial activities in key global markets.

Notably, the Complainant contends that:

I. Identical or Confusingly Similar

That by virtue of its trademark registrations, the Complainant is the exclusive owner of the SAFRAN trademark, as well as of a registered domain name portfolio with use and registration dates predating those of the disputed domain name.

That the disputed domain name incorporates the Complainant's SAFRAN trademark in its entirety, and that the addition of the descriptive terms "group" and "llc" does not prevent a finding of confusing similarity. That the SAFRAN mark remains clearly recognizable in the disputed domain name, and that the added terms are not distinctive and as such they do not diminish the resulting confusion.

That the ".com" generic Top-Level Domain ("gTLD") is irrelevant to this assessment, as gTLDs are disregarded when comparing domain names and trademarks.

II. Rights or Legitimate Interests

That the Respondent should be considered as having no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the disputed domain name, as the Respondent does not use the disputed domain name in connection with a good faith offer of products or services. That the Respondent is not commonly known by the disputed domain name.

That the Respondent is not affiliated with or sponsored by the Complainant, and that the Complainant has not authorized, licensed or permitted the Respondent to use its trademarks in any manner, including in the registration of domain names incorporating the SAFRAN mark.

That the Complainant is not engaged in any litigation or dispute with the Respondent other than the present proceeding. That, in the absence of any relationship, authorization, or prior dealings between the parties, the Respondent cannot claim any rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name.

III. Registered and Used in Bad Faith

That the Respondent, who has no rights in the SAFRAN trademark and no relationship with the Complainant or its U.S. affiliates, has registered the disputed domain name incorporating the SAFRAN mark in its entirety, being the disputed domain name confusingly similar to the Complainant's official domain name, as it reproduces the same structure with the addition of "llc" referring to the Complainant's corporate presence in the United States. This composition shows that the Respondent was aware of the Complainant, and that he intentionally sought to create a likelihood of confusion, evidencing bad-faith registration and use under the Policy.

That the Complainant SAFRAN and its trademarks are internationally renowned in the aerospace, aeronautics, space, and defense sectors, such that the Respondent must have been aware of this reputation at the time of registration of the disputed domain name and cannot reasonably claim any legitimate purpose for registering it. That the incorporation of the well-known SAFRAN trademark therefore appears to be a deliberate attempt to improperly capitalize on the Complainant's rights and established reputation.

That the Complainant sent a cease-and-desist letter, followed by a reminder, to the Respondent in August 2025, both of which have remained unanswered. That this silence constitutes a further factual indication of the Respondent's lack of good faith in the registration and use of the disputed domain name and reinforces a finding of bad-faith registration and use.

That a messaging server has been configured for the disputed domain name using multiple IP addresses, which, in light of the surrounding circumstances of this case, gives rise to a reasonable concern that the disputed domain name is being used, or is intended to be used, for phishing or other fraudulent purposes through impersonation of the Complainant. That the postal address disclosed for the Respondent appears to be unreliable, as it is referenced on unrelated third-party websites, thereby casting serious doubt on its

accuracy. That, taken together, these elements further support a finding of bad-faith registration and use of the disputed domain name.

B. Respondent

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

6. Discussion and Findings

Paragraph 4(a) of the Policy sets out the three requirements that the Complainant must prove in order to successfully request remedies:

- (i) that the disputed domain name is identical or confusingly similar to a trademark or service mark in which the Complainant has rights;
- (ii) that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name; and
- (iii) that the disputed domain name has been registered and is being used in bad faith.

Given the Respondent's default and therefore, failure to specifically address the case merits as they relate to the three UDRP elements, the Panel may decide this proceeding based on the Complainant's undisputed factual allegations under paragraphs 5(f), 14(a), and 15(a) of the Rules (see *Joseph Phelps Vineyards LLC v. NOLDC, Inc., Alternative Identity, Inc., and Kentech*, WIPO Case No. [D2006-0292](#); *Encyclopaedia Britannica, Inc. v. null John Zuccarini, Country Walk*, WIPO Case No. [D2002-0487](#); see also WIPO Overview of WIPO Panel Views on Selected UDRP Questions, Third Edition ("WIPO Jurisprudential Overview 3.0"), section 4.3).

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 3.0](#), section 1.7.

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

The disputed domain name entirely reproduces the Complainant's SAFRAN trademark. The Panel finds that the Complainant's SAFRAN trademark is recognizable within the disputed domain name. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 1.7.

The addition of the terms "group" and "llc" does not prevent the finding of confusing similarity between the disputed domain name and the mark for the purposes of the Policy (see [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 1.8).

It is also well established that the addition of the gTLD ".com" is viewed as a standard registration requirement and as such is typically disregarded under the first element confusing similarity test. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 1.11.1.

Accordingly, the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to the Complainant's SAFRAN trademark 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 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. Specifically, the Respondent has failed to submit evidence of bona fide or legitimate noncommercial or fair use of the disputed domain name. No evidence has been filed in connection with the Respondent being commonly known by the disputed domain name.

Furthermore, the Panel considers that the composition of the disputed domain name carries a risk of implied affiliation with the Complainant. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 2.5.1.

Therefore, 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.

The Complainant has ascertained its rights over the SAFRAN trademark. The dates of registration of said trademark and further registered domain names significantly precede the date of registration of the disputed domain name.

The Complainant has argued and submitted information claiming that it is a leading international high-technology group operating in aviation including propulsion, equipment, interiors, defense, and space markets, that it holds world or regional leadership positions across its core businesses and is widely recognized for its advanced technological capabilities, and maintains a significant presence in the United States through more than 50 years of continuous operations via its affiliated companies. These uncontested arguments and information support the conclusion that the SAFRAN trademark enjoys substantial goodwill and a significant degree of fame worldwide and a high degree of fame and public recognition as a well-known trademark (see *Audi AG and Volkswagen AG v. Glenn Karlsson-Springare* WIPO Case No. [D2011-2121](#), *Tetra Laval Holdings & Finance S.A. v. Ricardo Lopez Ortega* WIPO Case No. [D2022-4037](#) and *Swarovski AG v. Marius Muller* WIPO Case No. [D2016-2315](#)).

Previous panels appointed under the Policy have found that the mere registration of a domain name that is identical or confusingly similar to a well-known trademark by an unaffiliated entity can in itself create a presumption of bad faith (see [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 3.1.4; see also *Ferrari S.p.A. v. Ms. Lee Joohee (or Joo-Hee)*, WIPO Case No. [D2003-0882](#)).

In the present case, the Panel notes that the fact that the Respondent registered the disputed domain name, which entirely reproduces the Complainant's SAFRAN trademark, shows that the Respondent has targeted the Complainant, which constitutes opportunistic bad faith (see section 3.2.1 of the [WIPO Overview 3.0](#); see also *L'Oréal v. Contact Privacy Inc. Customer 0149511181 / Jerry Peter*, WIPO Case No. [D2018-1937](#); *Gilead Sciences Ireland UC / Gilead Sciences, Inc. v. Domain Maybe For Sale c/o Dynadot*, WIPO Case No. [D2019-0980](#); *Dream Marriage Group, Inc. v. Romantic Lines LP, Vadim Parhomchuk*, WIPO Case No. [D2020-1344](#); *Valentino S.p.A. v. Qiu Yufeng, Li Lianye*, WIPO Case No. [D2016-1747](#), *Landesbank Baden-Württemberg (LBBW) v. David Amr*, WIPO Case No. [D2021-2322](#): "Given the distinctiveness of the Complainant's trademark, it is reasonable to infer that the Respondent has registered the disputed domain name with full knowledge of the Complainant's trademarks, constituting opportunistic bad faith. The Panel finds it hard to see any other explanation than that the Respondent knew of the Complainant's well-known trademark").

The evidence submitted by the Complainant, and not rebutted by the Respondent, demonstrates that the disputed domain name does not currently resolve to an active website. Further, there is an active MX record associated with the disputed domain name, indicating that the Respondent may potentially send impersonating emails as part of a phishing campaign. Previous panels appointed under the Policy have found that this is an indication of bad faith use of a disputed domain name (see also *WH Smith Plc. v. Djoel Primus*, WIPO Case No. [D2023-5342](#); *G4S Limited v. Zakiyullah Parkar, Sole Owner*, WIPO Case No. [D2024-4797](#); *Magna International Inc. v. TsukimuraReiko*, WIPO Case No. [D2025-1930](#)).

Panels have found that the non-use of a domain name would not prevent the finding of bad faith under the doctrine of passive holding. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 3.3. Having reviewed the available record, and considering that the Respondent has declared to reside in the United States, the Panel notes the distinctiveness or reputation of the 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.

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 <safrangroupllc.com> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Kiyoshi Tsuru/

Kiyoshi Tsuru

Sole Panelist

Date: December 15, 2025