

## ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

Euronext N.V. v. Gabrielle Windsor  
Case No. D2025-4952

### 1. The Parties

The Complainant is Euronext N.V., Netherlands (Kingdom of the), represented by LegalMatters.com B.V., Netherlands (Kingdom of the).

The Respondent is Gabrielle Windsor, Peru.

### 2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <euronextlisbon-engine.com> is registered with MainReg Inc. (the “Registrar”).

### 3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the “Center”) on November 27, 2025. On November 27, 2025, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On November 28, 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 (“MainReg. Inc.”) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on November 28, 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 amendment to the Complaint on December 1, 2025.

The Center verified that the Complaint together with the amendment to the 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 1, 2025. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was December 21, 2025. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent’s default on December 26, 2025. On January 6, 2026, the Respondent sent an email communication to the Center.

The Center appointed Pablo A. Palazzi 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 is a Dutch company operating regulated exchanges in the financial field in Belgium, France, Ireland, Italy, Netherlands (Kingdom of the), Norway and Portugal and owning several trademark registrations worldwide for EURONEXT.

The Complainant is the owner of the following trademarks:

- European Union, registration No. 013343629, word mark EURONEXT for the classes 9, 35, 36, 38, 41, and 42, filed October 8, 2014, and registered March 3, 2015;
- United Kingdom, registration No. UK00913343629, word mark EURONEXT for the classes 9, 35, 36, 38, 41, and 42, filed October 8, 2014, and registered March 3, 2015;
- European Union, registration No. 018920609, word mark EURONEXT for the classes 9, 35, 36, 38, 41, and 42, filed September 1, 2023, and registered February 23, 2024; and
- International registration No. 1506088, designating the United Kingdom, Norway, Russian Federation, Singapore and the United States of America, word mark EURONEXT for the classes 9, 35, 36, 38, 41, and 42, registered May 22, 2019.

The Complainant is the owner of the domain name <euronext.com>.

The disputed domain name was registered on September 30, 2025. At the time of filing the complaint, the disputed domain name resolved to a website with content related to the Complainant's activity (including its trademark), repeatedly referring to EuroNext Lisbon (Euronext Lisbon, the Portuguese Stock Exchange, is part of the Complainant), and purportedly offering trading of amongst others Contracts for Difference (CFDs), commodities, bonds and forex. The disputed domain name is currently inactive.

#### **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.

##### **B. Respondent**

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

On January 6, 2026, the Respondent sent an email communication to the Center stating: "Good day! We took care of this issue and the domain has been taken down regards."

#### **6. Discussion and Findings**

Paragraph 4(a) of the Policy lists three elements, which a complainant must satisfy in order to succeed. The Complainant must satisfy that:

(i) the disputed domain name is identical or confusingly similar to a trademark or service mark in which the Complainant has rights; and

- (ii) the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of 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**

The Complainant has shown rights in respect of a trademark or service mark for the purposes of the Policy. WIPO Overview of WIPO Panel Views on Selected UDRP Questions, Third Edition ("[WIPO Overview 3.0](#)"), section 1.2.1.

The entirety of the mark is reproduced 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.

Although the addition of other terms like "lisbon" or "engine" 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 name 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 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 finds the nature of the disputed domain name carries a risk of implied affiliation with the Complainant. The composition of the disputed domain name, comprising the Complainant's EURONEXT trademark in its entirety and the addition of geographical and dictionary terms like "lisbon" and "engine", together with the content related to the Complainant's activities, signals the Respondent's intention of taking unfair advantage of the likelihood of confusion between the disputed domain name and the Complainant.

The Panel finds the second element of the Policy has not 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 Respondent registered the disputed domain name containing the trademark EURONEXT many years after the Complainant has used the trademark EURONEXT in commerce.

- the Respondent appears to have been aware of the Complainant and its EURONEXT trademark since (i) the Respondent is not only using the word mark EURONEXT in the disputed domain name but also on the active website under the disputed domain name; (ii) the website at the disputed domain name uses an image of a bronze bull that is similar to the one located in front of the Complainant's headquarters in Amsterdam; (iii) the disputed domain name is offering the trading of amongst others CFDs, commodities, bonds and forex that are similar to Complainant services; and (iv) the website at the disputed domain name refers to EuroNext Lisbon, which is the Portuguese Stock Exchange that is part of the Complainant.

Apart from an email communication described above, the Respondent failed to put forward any formal argument in its favor, and appears to have provided inaccurate/false postal contact details in the WhoIs.

The Panel concludes that the Respondent registered and is using the disputed domain name to attract Internet users, for commercial gain, in accordance with paragraph 4(b)(iv) of the Policy, by creating a likelihood of confusion with the Complainant's mark as to the source, sponsorship, affiliation, or endorsement of the Respondent's website.

At the time of the decision, the disputed domain name does not resolve to any active website. Such change does not affect the Panel's findings of the Respondent's bad faith.

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 <euronextlisbon-engine.com> be transferred to the Complainant.

*/Pablo A. Palazzi/*

**Pablo A. Palazzi**

Sole Panelist

Date: January 19, 2026.