

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

Amadeus IT Group, S.A. v. Yanamaria Otero, Job Application Process Case No. D2025-4966

1. The Parties

The Complainant is Amadeus IT Group, S.A., Spain, represented by Ubilibet, Spain.

The Respondent is Yanamaria Otero, Job Application Process, United States of America (“United States”).

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <amadeusdevelop.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 November 28, 2025. On November 28, 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 (REDACTED FOR PRIVACY, REDACTED FOR PRIVACY) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on December 1, 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 December 2, 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 Wilson Pinheiro Jabur as the sole panelist in this matter on January 2, 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 was founded in 1987 in Spain and is a provider of technology solutions and services for the travel industry, currently counting with over 15,000 professionals serving in more than 190 countries, and being listed in the Spanish stock exchange.

The Complainant is the owner of several trademark registrations amongst which:

- International Trademark Registration No. 511594 for the word mark AMADEUS, registered on April 7, 1987, successively renewed, in class 39;
- United States Trademark Registration No. 73682376 for the word mark AMADEUS, registered on March 14, 1989, successively renewed, in classes 35, 39 and 42; and
- International Trademark Registration No. 1321806 for the word mark AMADEUS, registered on June 22, 2016, in classes 9, 35, 36, 38, 39, 41, 42, 43, and 45.

Previous UDRP panels have found that the Complainant's "AMADEUS mark is well known in the field of air transport and tourism, as well as to the users of these services". (*AMADEUS IT GROUP, S.A. v. Karla Guajardo*, WIPO Case No. [D2015-0167](#)); as well as that AMADEUS is a "well-known" trademark (*Amadeus IT Group, S.A. v. Connect Systems / Hostonik.com Web Hosting*, WIPO Case No. [D2018-0252](#)).

The disputed domain name was registered on May 22, 2025, and presently does not resolve to an active webpage.

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.

According to the Complainant, the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to the Complainant's AMADEUS trademark given that the disputed domain name incorporates its well-known AMADEUS trademark with the mere addition of the descriptive term "develop", which strongly suggests an intent by the Respondent to mislead Internet users into believing that the disputed domain name is operated by, affiliated with, or endorsed by the Complainant, particularly in connection with services related to the development of operations or technologies.

As to the lack of rights or legitimate interests, the Complainant confirms that it has not authorized, licensed, or allowed the Respondent or any third party to use its trademark in the disputed domain name; also there being no indication that the Respondent has been recognized by the disputed domain name. The Complainant further contends that there is no proof of any use of the disputed domain name in association with a genuine offering of goods or services, also characterizing the Respondent's lack of rights or legitimate interest in the disputed domain name the Respondent's failure to respond or engage in communication regarding the cease-and-desist action initiated by the Complainant in June 2025, through the Registrar and service provider.

Lastly, the Complainant contends that the renown of its trademark is indisputable, given that the Complainant is a global company with a presence in more than 190 countries, prominently operating in stock markets worldwide, making it implausible that the Respondent registered the disputed domain name in connection with a bona fide intent. In addition to that, the current inactive use of the disputed domain name is a further indicative of the Respondent's bad faith

B. Respondent

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

6. Discussion and Findings

Paragraph 4(a) of the Policy sets forth the following three requirements which the Complainant must meet in order for the Panel to order the transfer of the disputed domain name:

(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

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 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, here, "develop", 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](#), 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.

It appears from the Complainant's uncontested submissions that the Respondent has no business or any kind of relationship with the Complainant. Further, the Respondent is not commonly known by the disputed domain name. Considering the absence of a response by the Respondent to the Complainant's contentions putting forward any legitimate non-infringing purpose, the use to which the disputed domain name has been put and the Complainant's reputation and well-known trademark, the Panel finds, on the balance of probabilities, that the Complainant has established a prima facie case that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name. Under these circumstances and absent evidence to the contrary, the Panel finds that the Respondent does not have rights or legitimate interests with respect to the disputed domain name.

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.

This case presents the following circumstances which indicate under the balance of probabilities bad faith registration and use of the disputed domain name:

- a) the Respondent has provided no evidence whatsoever of any actual or contemplated good faith use by it of the disputed domain name and has not responded to the Complaint;
- b) the reputation of the Complainant's trademark;
- c) the present inactive use of the disputed domain name, which does not prevent a finding of bad faith under the passive holding doctrine ([WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 3.3);
- d) the Respondent's choice to retain a privacy protection service; and
- e) the use of an incomplete and/or a false address by the Respondent when registering the disputed domain name, as evidenced by the inability of the courier service to deliver the Written Notice to such address.

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 <amadeusdevelop.com> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Wilson Pinheiro Jabur/

Wilson Pinheiro Jabur

Sole Panelist

Date: January 13, 2026