

## **ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION**

Dassault Systemes v. tou tou  
Case No. D2025-4551

### **1. The Parties**

The Complainant is Dassault Systemes, France, represented by IP Twins, France.

The Respondent is tou tou, United States of America ("United States" or "USA").

### **2. The Domain Names and Registrar**

The disputed domain names <3dsdassabet.com>, <3dsdassaueo.com>, <3dsdassaure.com>, <3dsdassause.com>, <3dsdassauve.com>, and <3dsdassope.com> are registered with Gname.com Pte. Ltd. (the "Registrar").

### **3. Procedural History**

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the "Center") on November 4, 2025. On November 4, 2025, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain names. On November 5, 2025, the Registrar transmitted by email to the Center its verification response registrant and contact information for the disputed domain names which differed from the named Respondent (Redacted for Privacy) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on November 6, 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 November 7, 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 November 19, 2025. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was December 9, 2025. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent's default on December 12, 2025.

The Center appointed Frank Schoneveld as the sole panelist in this matter on December 24, 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

The Complainant is Dassault Systèmes, a company headquartered in France active in the field of digital and virtual twins that come in the form of software objects or models that mirror physical objects, processes, organizations, persons or other abstractions. The Complainant's solutions and technologies in Product Lifecycle Management (PLM), Digital Mock-up (DMU) and 3D (three-dimensional) design assist others in areas such as manufacturing, life sciences, healthcare and infrastructure planning. The Complainant uses its 3DS brand, which consists of a term combining "3D" a central notion for the Complainant solutions, and "DS", the initials of "Dassault Systèmes".

The Dassault Systèmes group of companies has nearly 24,000 employees worldwide on more than 180 sites spread across 45 countries, with over 300,000 enterprise customers.

The Complainant has registered its trademark 3DS in numerous countries worldwide including:

<u>Jurisdiction</u>	<u>Registration Number</u>	<u>Date of Registration</u>
Australia	879184	June 14, 2001
Mexico	746774	May 14, 2002
Brazil	824020472	May 15, 2007
Germany	30136149	September 4, 2002

The Complainant's corporate website is at "www.3ds.com". This domain name <3ds.com> was first registered by the Complainant on July 29, 1995.

The Complainant is the registered holder of over 100 domain names that include its 3DS trademark, including (for example) <3dshape.com>, <3dshape.biz>, <3dsuniverse.com>, <3dsuniverses.org>, <3dscit.info>, and <3ds-prm.com>.

The Complainant provides the results of trademark searches performed by the Complainant on the disputed domain names noting that the results do not show any trademark registrations on the WIPO Global Brand Database.

##### Disputed Domain Names

The disputed domain names have the following registration dates:

<u>Disputed Domain Name</u>	<u>Registration Date</u>
3dsdassabet.com	September 19, 2025
3dsdassaueo.com	July 16, 2025
3dsdassaure.com	July 16, 2025
3dsdassause.com	July 16, 2025
3dsdassauve.com	July 16, 2025
3dsdassope.com	September 19, 2025

For each of the six disputed domain names, the registrant's name, email address, and address are exactly the same.

The disputed domain names have been used as follows:

<3dsdassabet.com> as a website prominently using the name "Dassault Systemes" in its banner;  
<3dsdassaueo.com> as a website prominently using the name "Dassault Systemes" in its banner;  
<3dsdassaure.com> redirects to the website at the disputed domain name <3dsdassaueo.com> and its website which prominently uses the name "Dassault Systemes" in its banner;  
<3dsdassope.com> redirects to the website at the disputed domain name <3dsdassabet.com> and its website which prominently uses the name "Dassault Systemes" in its banner;  
<3dsdassause.com> reverts to a website with the message "Error 10001 ... DNS resolution error"; and  
<3dsdassauve.com> reverts to a website with the message "Error 10001 ... DNS resolution error".

## **Respondent**

According to the information received from the Registrar of the disputed domain names, the Respondent has its address in the United States. An Internet search of the Respondent's address at the search function of the United States Postal Service on January 11, 2026 returns the result "Unfortunately, this information wasn't found." The Panel finds that the Respondent has registered all of the disputed domain names using a non-existent address in the USA.

## **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 websites to which four of the disputed domain names revert are fake websites that display the Complainant's 3DS registered trademark on its banner as well the Complainant's company name "Dassault Systemes" as several texts and image contents copied from the Complainant's website at "www.3ds.com". The Complainant states that it has not authorized the use by the Respondent of the Complainant's 3DS trademark, or terms similar thereto, in the disputed domain names in any manner or form. The disputed domain names <3dsdassabet.com>, <3dsdassaueo.com>, <3dsdassaure.com> and <3dsdassope.com> resolve or redirect to the above described websites (that prominently use the Complainant's name "Dassault Systemes" in their banner). The Complainant asserts that the websites associated with these four of the six disputed domain names are meant to be a copy of the official website of the Complainant available at "www.3ds.com", and such use of these four disputed domain names shows that the Respondent explicitly targeted the Complainant with the registration and use of the disputed domain names.

### **B. Respondent**

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

## **6. Discussion and Findings**

### **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 that the mark 3DS is recognizable within each of the disputed domain names. Accordingly, the disputed domain names are 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, "dassabet", "dassause", "dassauve", "dassauéo", "dassaure", and "dassope") 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.

### **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 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.

### **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.

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.

The disputed domain names were registered by the Respondent more than 20 years after the Complainant registered, in numerous jurisdictions around the world, its trademark 3DS that is incorporated into the disputed domain names. In this proceeding there are two distinguishing features of the disputed domain names. The first is that four of the disputed domain names resolve or redirect to the webpages that copy significant parts of the Complainant's webpage at "www.3ds.com". These disputed domain names are <3dsdassabet.com>, <3dsdassauéo.com>, <3dsdassauere.com>, and <3dsdassauope.com>; all of which prominently use the name "Dassault Systemes" in the banner of their webpage. The second distinguishing feature is that the other two disputed domain names (i.e. <3dsdassause.com>, and <3dsdassauve.com>) revert to an error message.

With respect to the first four disputed domain names (i.e. <3dsdassabet.com>, <3dsdassauéo.com>, <3dsdassauere.com> and <3dsdassauope.com>) that resolve or redirect to the impersonation websites copying large parts of the Complainant's webpage at "www.3ds.com", UDRP panels have held that the use of a domain name for illegitimate activity, here the claimed impersonation/passing off, or other types of fraud, constitutes bad faith. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 3.4.

Having reviewed the record, and noting that such illegitimate passing off/impersonation has been done at four of the disputed domain names (being the disputed domain names <3dsdassabet.com>, <3dsdassauéo.com>, <3dsdassauere.com> and <3dsdassauope.com>) the Panel finds that the Respondent's registration and use of these four disputed domain names constitutes bad faith under the Policy.

With respect to the other two disputed domain names (i.e. <3dsdassause.com> and <3dsdassauve.com>) UDRP panels have also found that the non-use of a domain name (including a blank page) would not prevent a finding of bad faith under the doctrine of passive holding. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 3.3. The Panel notes that the two other disputed domain names <3dsdassause.com> and <3dsdassauve.com> that revert to an error page, include the Complainant's 3DS trademark and a recognizable part of the corporate name of the Complainant (being "dassau" an apparent shortening of part of the Complainant's corporate name "Dassault").

The Panel also notes that the Respondent has provided to the Registrar a non-existent address in the USA for all of the disputed domain names, and has not responded to the Complainant's assertion of bad faith use and registration of any of the six disputed domain names.

Having reviewed the available record and taking into account all of the above, the Panel finds that in the circumstances of this case the passive holding of the disputed domain names <3dsdassause.com>, and <3dsdassauve.com> does not prevent a finding of bad faith under the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 3.3.

The Panel notes that the Respondent had already made impersonation websites of the four other disputed domain names, so it can be expected that the registration of the two remaining disputed domain names (i.e. <3dsdassause.com>, and <3dsdassauve.com>) would be used in the same way as the other four disputed domain names, namely to link them to impersonation websites in the same way as the four other disputed domain names.

The Panel finds that the Complainant has established the third element of the Policy in respect of all the disputed domain names.

## **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 <3dsdassabet.com>, <3dsdassaueo.com>, <3dsdassaure.com>, <3dsdassause.com>, <3dsdassauve.com>, and <3dsdassope.com> be transferred to the Complainant.

*/Frank Schoneveld/*

**Frank Schoneveld**

Sole Panelist

Date: January 13, 2026