

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

Airbus SAS v. Thitiya Phuanghiran, Settakit Nilgat, Pimniti Thummultri, tao insiders, Insider, tananya somphet, ATIWICH NUMNAK, Draratat Jitwotan, Seo icg, ICG Gaming, Rungrote Pholsiri, NANTAWADEE SAOON and Sunthorn Prasit
Case No. D2025-4879

1. The Parties

The Complainant is Airbus SAS, France, represented by CSC Digital Brand Services AB, Sweden.

The Respondents are Thitiya Phuanghiran, Thailand, Settakit Nilgat, Thailand, Pimniti Thummultri, Thailand, tao insiders, Insider, Thailand, tananya somphet, Thailand, ATIWICH NUMNAK, Thailand, Draratat Jitwotan, Thailand, Seo icg, ICG Gaming, Cambodia, Rungrote Pholsiri, Thailand, NANTAWADEE SAOON, Thailand and Sunthorn Prasit, Thailand.

2. The Domain Names and Registrars

The disputed domain names <airbus369.bet>, <airbus369.co>, <airbus-369.com>, <airbus369.net>, <airbus-369.net>, <airbus-369.org>, <airbus369.site>, <airbus3699.com>, <airbus369lucabet.xyz> and <airbus369.biz> are registered with NameCheap, Inc.

The disputed domain name <airbus369.cloud> is registered with Spaceship, Inc.

The disputed domain name <airbus369.com> is registered with 1API GmbH.

The disputed domain names <airbus369.info> and <airbus369.org> are registered with Dynadot Inc.

The disputed domain name <airbus369.vip> is registered with Name.com, Inc.

The abovementioned registrars are collectively referred to as the “Registrars”. The abovementioned disputed domain names are collectively referred to as the “Domain Names”.

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the “Center”) on November 24, 2025 in relation to the Domain Names except for <airbus369.biz>. On November 25, 2025, the Center

transmitted by email to the Registrars a request for registrar verification in connection with the Domain Names. On November 26 and 27, 2025, the Registrars transmitted by email to the Center their verification responses disclosing registrant and contact information for the disputed domain names which differed from the named Respondents (Redacted for Privacy / Domain Protection Services, Inc., Redacted for Privacy / Privacy service provided by Withheld for Privacy ehf, REDACTED FOR PRIVACY / Super Privacy Service LTD c/o Dynadot, c/o WHOISt trustee.com Limited / Registrant of airbus369.com and tananya somphet) and contact information in the Complaint.

The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on November 28, 2025 with the registrant and contact information of nominally multiple underlying registrants revealed by the Registrars, requesting the Complainant to either file separate complaints for the disputed domain names associated with different underlying registrants or alternatively, demonstrate that the underlying registrants are in fact the same entity and/or that all domain names are under common control. The Complainant filed the first amended Complaint on December 3, 2025, requesting addition of the Domain Name <airbus369.biz>. On December 4, 2025, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar NameCheap, Inc. a request for registrar verification in connection with the newly-added Domain Name. On the same day, the Registrar transmitted by email to the Center its verification response disclosing registrant and contact information for the newly-added Domain Name which differed from the named Respondent (Redacted for Privacy) and contact information in the first amended Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on December 4, 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 the second amended Complaint on December 8, 2025.

The registrant of the domain name <airbus369a.com> sent an email to the Center on December 8, 2025. The proceeding was suspended on December 22, 2025, following the Complainant's suspension request, and the suspension was once extended. On January 23, 2026, the Center issued the Notification of (Partial) Dismissal regarding the settled domain name <airbus369a.com> and requested the Complainant to submit an amended Complaint for the remaining disputed domain names. The proceeding was reinstated as of that day. The Complainant filed the third and fourth amended Complaints on January 26 and 27, 2026.

The Center verified that the Complaint together with the amended Complaints 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 Respondents of the Complaint, and the proceedings commenced on January 28, 2026. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was February 17, 2026. The Respondent NANTAWADEE SAOON sent an email communication to the Center on January 27, 2026. The Center commenced the panel appointment process on February 24, 2026.

The Center appointed Mathias Lilleengen as the sole panelist in this matter on March 6, 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 has designed, manufactured and delivered commercial aircraft, helicopters, military transports, satellites and launch vehicles for over 50 years. As of November 2024, over 15,700 aircrafts to airlines worldwide, and 12,400 helicopters operated by over 32,000 customers. The Complainant has a wide global presence through roughly 180 locations and more than 157,000 employees.

The Complainant has registered numerous trademarks across various jurisdictions for AIRBUS, for example International word trademark no. 471782 (registered on August 10, 1982). The Complainant has a strong Internet presence, communicating with its customers through its primary domain name <airbus.com> (registered since May 23, 1995).

The Respondents registered the Domain Names between February 2023 and November 2025. The Complainant documents that some of the disputed domain names have directly or indirectly resolved to Thai language websites promoting gambling services unrelated to the Complainant. Other disputed domain names have resolved to pay-per-click websites with links to third-party websites, some in competition with the Complainant's business. One disputed domain name has resolved to an active website but a generic holding page.

5. Parties' Contentions

A. Complainant

The Complainant lists the Domain Names:

1. <airbus369.bet>
2. <airbus369.cloud>
3. <airbus369.co>
4. <airbus369.com>
5. <airbus-369.com>
6. <airbus369.info>
7. <airbus369.net>
8. <airbus-369.net>
9. <airbus369.org>
10. <airbus-369.org>
11. <airbus369.site>
12. <airbus3699.com>
13. <airbus369lucabet.xyz>
14. <airbus369.vip>
15. <airbus369.biz>

and argues that the Domain Names are under common control as:

- All Disputed Domain Names are comprised of the term "airbus369" or "airbus-369"
- Disputed Domain Names 1-4, 6-7, 9, 11-12, and 14-15 are identical in composition
- Disputed Domain Names 1, 4, 5, 9, and 11 resolve to websites using the same stylized version of Complainant's AIRBUS trademark
- Disputed Domain Name 4 redirects to Disputed Domain Name 1
- Disputed Domain Names 6 and 7 resolves to websites using the same stylized version of Complainant's AIRBUS trademark
- Disputed Domain Names 1, 3, 5, 8 and 11 were created using the same email address
- Disputed Domain Names 7 and 15 share the same city, province, postal code and country
- Disputed Domain Names 1, 3, 5, 8, and 13 all feature "moo 6" in the address field
- Disputed Domain Names 3 and 12 both share the same registrar and use the same name servers
- Disputed Domain Names 1-6, 9-11, 13-15 use Cloudflare name servers.

With reference to the above, the Complainant believes that all 15 Domain Names are under common control, given 13 are nearly identical in composition and 8 are hosting websites using a similar version of the Complainant's AIRBUS trademark. In addition, there are numerous commonalities in the registrant data, including physical and email addresses.

The Complainant provides evidence of trademark registration and argues that the Domain Names wholly incorporate the Complainant's trademark, with the mere addition of generic terms such as "369" and "369lucabet", sometimes with a hyphen. The additions do not negate the confusing similarity between the Domain Names and the Complainant's trademark.

The Complainant argues that the Respondents have no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the Domain Names. The Respondents have not been given permission to use the Complainant's trademark in any manner. The Respondents are not commonly known by the Domain Names. At the time of filing the Complaint, the Respondents were using a privacy Whois service on all but one of the disputed domain names, which underlines the lack of legitimate interest. Some of the Domain Names have directly or indirectly resolved to websites promoting gambling services and others to pay-per-click websites with links to third-party websites. This may not be considered bona fide, in particular taking into consideration that the Complainant's rights predate with decades the registration of the Domain Names.

The Complainant argues that the Respondents at the time of registration of the Domain Names knew, or at least should have known, of the existence of the Complainant and its trademarks. The Respondents have intentionally misappropriated the Complainant's trademark as a way of redirecting Internet users. As for the disputed domain name <airbus-369.org> it currently resolves to a generic holding page and is not being used. However, this does not prevent a finding of bad faith under the doctrine of passive holding.

B. Respondents

The Respondents did not formally reply to the Complainant's contention, while one of the Respondents, NANTAWADEE SAOON, sent an email communication simply stating: "I will".

6. Discussion and Findings

6.1. Procedural Matter – Consolidation

The Complaint was filed in relation to nominally different domain name registrants. The Complainant argues that the domain name registrants are the same entity or under common control. The Complainant requests consolidation of the disputes against the multiple disputed domain name registrants pursuant to paragraph 10(e) of the Rules. Paragraph 3(c) of the Rules states that a complaint may relate to more than one domain name, provided that the domain names are registered by the same domain name holder. In addressing the Complainant's request, the Panel will consider whether (i) the disputed domain names or corresponding websites are subject to common control; and (ii) the consolidation would be fair and equitable to all Parties. See WIPO Overview of WIPO Panel Views on Select UDRP Questions, (["WIPO Overview 3.1"](#)), section 4.11.2.

As to the common control, the Panel notes that all the Domain Names reproduce the AIRBUS trademark and are identical or very similar in composition. Many of the disputed domain names have resolved to websites using the same version of the Complainant's AIRBUS trademark. There are also many similarities in the registration details of the Domain Names and some similarities in the use of registrars and name servers.

As regards fairness and equity, the Panel sees no reason why consolidation of the disputes would be unfair or inequitable to any Party. The registrants have been granted the right to comment but opted not to.

Accordingly, the Panel decides to consolidate the disputes regarding the nominally different domain name registrants (referred to as "the Respondent") in a single proceeding.

6.2. Substantive Issues

A. Identical or Confusingly Similar

The test for confusing similarity involves a reasoned but relatively straightforward comparison between the Complainant's trademark and the disputed domain names. See [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.7.

The Complainant has established that it has rights in the trademark AIRBUS. The Domain Names incorporate the Complainant's trademark with the addition of terms such as "369" and "369lucabet", sometimes with a hyphen. The additions do not prevent a finding of confusing similarity. See [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), sections 1.7. and 1.8. For the purpose of assessing the confusing similarity under paragraph 4(a)(i) of the Policy, the Panel may ignore the generic Top-Level Domain ("gTLD"). See [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.11.

Based on the available record, 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. While 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 often impossible 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. If the respondent fails to come forward with such relevant evidence, the complainant is deemed to have satisfied the second element. See [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 2.1.

Having reviewed the record, the Panel finds the Complainant has established a prima facie case that the Respondent lacks rights or legitimate interests in the Domain Names. The Respondent has not rebutted the Complainant's showing and has not come forward with any relevant evidence demonstrating rights or legitimate interests in the Domain Names. The Respondent is not affiliated or related to the Complainant. There is no evidence that the Respondent has registered the Domain Names as a trademark or acquired trademark rights. There is no evidence of the Respondent's use of, or demonstrable preparations to use, the Domain Names or names corresponding to the Domain Names in connection with a bona fide offering of goods or services. On the contrary, save one disputed domain name that has not resolved to an active website, the Domain Names have directly or indirectly resolved to websites promoting gambling services or pay-per-click websites. This is not bona fide, in particular taking into consideration that the Complainant's rights predate the registration of the Domain Names.

Based on the available record, 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 fame of the Complainant's trademark, coupled with the composition and use of the Domain Names, makes it more probable than not that the Respondent was aware of the Complainant and its prior rights when the Respondent registered the Domain Names. For the gambling websites associated with 11 disputed domain names displaying AIRBUS(/369), the Respondent has intentionally attempted to attract, for commercial gain, Internet users to its websites by creating a likelihood of confusion with the Complainant's trademark, which falls within paragraph 4(b)(iv) of the Policy. The three websites generating pay-per-click

links also support a finding of bad faith. See [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 3.5. The current non-use of one of the Domain Names does not prevent a finding of bad faith under the doctrine of passive holding. See [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 3.3.

For the reasons set out above, the Panel concludes that the Domain Names were registered and are being used in bad faith, within the meaning of paragraph 4(a)(iii) of the Policy. The third element of the Policy has been established.

7. Decision

For the foregoing reasons, in accordance with paragraphs 4(i) of the Policy and 15 of the Rules, the Panel orders the Domain Names <airbus369.bet>, <airbus369.biz>, <airbus369.cloud>, <airbus369.co>, <airbus-369.com>, <airbus369.com>, <airbus369.info>, <airbus369lucabet.xyz>, <airbus-369.net>, <airbus369.net>, <airbus-369.org>, <airbus369.org>, <airbus369.site>, <airbus369.vip> and <airbus3699.com> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Mathias Lilleengen/

Mathias Lilleengen

Sole Panelist

Date: March 9, 2026