

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

EURAZEO v. Oliver Thompson

Case No. D2025-4978

1. The Parties

The Complainant is EURAZEO, France, represented by IP Twins, France.

The Respondent is Oliver Thompson, United States of America ("United States").

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <eurazeoo.com> is registered with Dynadot Inc (the "Registrar").

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the "Center") on December 1, 2025. On December 1, 2025, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On December 2, 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 (Super Privacy Service LTD c/o Dynadot) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on December 2, 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 11, 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 12, 2025. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was January 1, 2026. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent's default on January 10, 2026.

The Center appointed Adam Samuel as the sole panelist in this matter on January 20, 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 French investment group. It owns a number of trademarks for EURAZEO, including a United States trademark, registration no. 2751809, registered on August 19, 2003. The disputed domain name was registered on November 15, 2024. The Complainant uses the domain name <eurazeo.com>, registered on November 13, 2000, to market its services.

The disputed domain name does not resolve to an active website.

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 the disputed domain name is highly similar to its earlier trademarks. The only difference lies in the addition of the second letter "o" in the disputed domain name. Otherwise, the disputed domain name reproduces the Complainant's trademarks.

After performing searches, the Complainant has found no EURAZEO trademark owned by the Respondent or evidence that the Respondent is known by the disputed domain name as an individual, business, or other organization. The Respondent does not have a license or authorization from the Complainant to use the disputed domain name. The Respondent had not, before the original filing of the Complaint, used or made preparations to use the disputed domain name in relation to a bona fide offering of goods or services.

The disputed domain name resolves to a parking page of pay-per-click commercial links. The use of pay-per-click advertisements through the disputed domain name trades off the goodwill of the Complainant and accordingly cannot constitute a bona fide offering of goods or services through the disputed domain name by the Respondent.

The Complainant's EURAZEO trademark is an invented word arising from the merger of Azeo and Eurafrance and is not a common word in any language. The Complainant's trademark registrations significantly predate the registration date of the disputed domain name. By simply maintaining the disputed domain name, the Respondent is preventing the Complainant from reflecting its trademark in the corresponding domain name. The Respondent's contact details show a postal address in the United States while the phone number appears to be from Hong Kong, China. The Respondent has supplied false contact details in bad faith in order to escape the present proceedings.

B. Respondent

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

6. Discussion and Findings

To succeed, the Complainant must demonstrate that all of the elements listed in paragraph 4(a) of the Policy have been satisfied:

- (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 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 disputed domain name consists of the Complainant's trademark with the letter "o" added to it and the generic Top-Level Domain ("gTLD") ".com". The gTLD is irrelevant here as it is a standard registration requirement. See section 1.11.1 of the WIPO Overview of WIPO Panel Views on Selected UDRP Questions, Third Edition ("[WIPO Overview 3.0](#)").

Section 1.9 of the [WIPO Overview 3.0](#) says:

"A domain name which consists of a common, obvious, or intentional misspelling of a trademark is considered by panels to be confusingly similar to the relevant mark for purposes of the first element. This stems from the fact that the domain name contains sufficiently recognizable aspects of the relevant mark."

Here, the insertion in the disputed domain name of the letter "o" after the Complainant's trademark does not prevent a finding of confusing similarity between the disputed domain name and the Complainant's trademark.

The Panel finds the first element of the Policy has been established.

B. Rights or Legitimate Interests

The Respondent is not called "eurazeoo" or anything similar. There is no evidence that the Complainant has ever authorised the Respondent to use its trademarks. For these reasons, the Panel concludes that the Complainant has met this element. See section 2.1 of the [WIPO Overview 3.0](#).

C. Registered and Used in Bad Faith

The disputed domain name consists of the Complainant's trademark, a made-up name with no independent meaning, the letter "o" and the gTLD ".com". The Respondent seems highly likely to have known of the Complainant's trademark when registering the disputed domain name, particularly bearing in mind the strong similarity between the disputed domain name and the Complainant's domain name <eurazeo.com>.

This is a typo-squatting case of which section 1.9 of the [WIPO Overview 3.0](#) says:

"Under the second and third elements, panels will normally find that employing a misspelling in this way signals an intention on the part of the respondent [...] to confuse users seeking or expecting the complainant."

For all these reasons, 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 <eurazeoo.com> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Adam Samuel/

Adam Samuel

Sole Panelist

Date: January 29, 2026