

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

Thales Group v. amaka nwabuo

Case No. D2025-4771

1. The Parties

The Complainant is Thales Group, France, represented by CSC Digital Brand Services Group AB, Sweden.

The Respondent is amaka nwabuo, United States of America (“United States”).

2. The Disputed Domain Name and Registrar

The Disputed Domain Name <thalesraytheons.com> is registered with CloudFlare, Inc. (the “Registrar”).

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the “Center”) on November 18, 2025. On November 18, 2025, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the Disputed Domain Name. On November 19, 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 (DATA REDACTED) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on November 25, 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 25, 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 December 4, 2025. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was December 24, 2025. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent’s default on December 26, 2025.

The Center appointed Marilena Comanescu as the sole panelist in this matter on January 5, 2026. 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 Thales Group, is a French multinational aerospace and defense corporation, founded in 1893 under the name “Compagnie Francaise Thomson-Houston”, and rebranded as Thales in 2000. The Complainant engages in the manufacture, marketing, sale of electronic equipment and systems for aeronautics, naval, and defense sectors and operates through the following segments: Defense and Security, Digital Identity and Security, and Aerospace.

The Complainant has more than 81,000 employees on five continents, more than 500 offices and facilities worldwide, and EUR 18.4 billion in revenue in 2024.

The Complainant has received various industry awards and recognitions for innovation and corporate responsibility, including repeated listings in the Thomson Reuters Top 100 Global Innovators and recognition by the Dow Jones Sustainability Index (DJSI) for its strong corporate responsibility policy.

The Complainant holds trademark registrations for THALES, such as the following:

- the United States trademark registration no. 3017144 for THALES (word), filed on April 25, 2001, and registered on November 22, 2005, for goods and services in the International Classes 9, 38, and 42;
- the European Union trademark registration no. 002186088 for THALES (word), filed on April 20, 2001 and registered on November 9, 2006, for goods and services in the International Classes 9, 13, 16, 35, 38, 41, and 42; and
- the French Trademark registration no. 1525967 for THALES (word), registered on October 6, 1989, for goods and services in the International Classes 9, 35, 38, 40, 41, and 42.

The Complainant provides information about its THALES products and services on its main website <thalesgroup.com>, registered on November 7, 2000.

As part of its organisation, the Complainant operates a transatlantic 50:50 joint venture with Raytheon Technologies to create “Thales-Raytheon Systems Company LLC”, an aerospace and defence company co-headquartered in Massy, France and Fullerton, California, United States. The Complaint provides information about its “Thales-Raytheon” brand from the website <thalesraytheon.com>. Raytheon Company, United States holds trademark rights for RAYTHEON, such as the European Union trademark registration no. 002236149 filed on May 28, 2001, and registered on December 19, 2002, for goods in the International Classes 1, 9, 12, and 13.

The Disputed Domain Name <thalesraytheons.com> was registered on July 10, 2025 and, at the time of filing the Complaint, it resolved to an error page.

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 Name.

Notably, the Complainant contends that THALES is a brand well recognized and respected worldwide and in its industry because the Complainant has spent substantial time (over 25 years), effort, and money for marketing and promoting THALES mark, and has thus developed substantial goodwill in its mark, and THALES has become distinctive and uniquely associated with the Complainant and its products and services; the Disputed Domain Name is confusingly similar to its trademark since it combines the Complainant's THALES trademark and a third-party trademark, RAYTHEON (with the additional letter "s", effectively pluralizing the third-party trademark); and the fact that the additional trademark is closely linked and associated with the Complainant's brand and trademark only serves to underscore and increase the confusing similarity between the Disputed Domain Name and the Complainant's trademark.

The Complainant further contends that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in the Disputed Domain Name; the Respondent is not an affiliated company, has no permission to use the Complainant's trademark in any manner, and is not commonly known by the Disputed Domain Name.

Moreover, the Respondent has registered and is using the Disputed Domain Name in bad faith mainly for the following reasons: (i) by registering a domain name that comprises the entirety of the Complainant's trademark in conjunction with a trademark that directly relates to the Complainant, specifically the Complainant's joint venture with Raytheon Technologies, "Thales-Raytheon Systems Company LLC", the Respondent has created a domain name that is confusingly similar to Complainant's trademark, as well as its <thalesgroup.com> domain. The mere composition of the Disputed Domain Name makes it illogical to believe that the Respondent has registered the Disputed Domain Name for some benign reason other than to target the Complainant. As such, Respondent has demonstrated more than a general knowledge of and familiarity with Complainant's brand and business but a deeper understanding of the Complainant's corporate relationships; (ii) the Disputed Domain Name is not used to host any active content, however the passive holding of a domain name can constitute a factor in finding bad faith registration and use pursuant to the Policy; (iii) the Disputed Domain Name has been set up with mail exchanger (MX) records and therefore, it is more likely that the Disputed Domain Name may be actively used to facilitate fraudulent activity such as phishing, impersonating or passing off as the Complainant; and (iv) the Respondent had employed a privacy service to hide its identity, and this may serve as further evidence of bad faith registration and use of a domain name.

B. Respondent

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

6. Discussion and Findings

Under the Policy, the Complainant is required to prove on the balance of probabilities that:

- (i) the Disputed Domain Name is identical or confusingly similar to a trademark or service mark in which the Complainant has rights;
- (ii) the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in 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 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 THALES mark is recognizable within the Disputed Domain Name. Accordingly, the Disputed Domain Name is confusingly similar to the mark for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 1.7.

While the addition of other term, here the misspelling of a third party's trademark "raytheons" from the trademark RAYTHEON, which belongs to the Complainant's business partner Raytheon Company, 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. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), sections 1.8 and 1.12.

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.

The Panel notes that the composition of the Disputed Domain Name itself carries a risk of implied affiliation given that the Complainant's distinctive trademark has been combined with its associate's trademark (slightly misspelled), being also very similar to the Complainant's domain name <thalesraytheon.com>, thus suggesting an affiliation with the trademark owner. UDRP panels have largely held that such composition cannot constitute fair use if it effectively impersonates or suggests sponsorship or endorsement by the trademark owner. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 2.5.1.

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 the Disputed Domain Name was registered in bad faith, with knowledge of the Complainant, its trademark and products, particularly because the Disputed Domain Name incorporates the Complainant's trademark and the trademark (slightly misspelled) of the Complainant's business partner, and the use of the THALES trademark predates the registration of the Disputed Domain Name by more than 25 years and is distinctive and well-known worldwide in its industry.

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.

At the time of filing the Complaint, the Disputed Domain Name resolved to an error page. UDRP 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. The Panel notes the distinctiveness and international reputation of the Complainant's trademark; the composition of the Disputed Domain Name; the Respondent's failure to provide a response in this procedure; the implausibility of any good faith use to which the Disputed Domain Name may be put, 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. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 3.3.

Moreover, previous UDRP panels have found that the mere registration of a domain name that is identical or confusingly similar to a widely known trademark by an unaffiliated entity can, by itself, create a presumption of bad faith for the purpose of Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 3.1.4.

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 <thalesraytheons.com> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Marilena Comanescu /

Marilena Comanescu

Sole Panelist

Date: January 19, 2026