

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

ALSTOM v. woke mind, woke mind

Case No. D2025-4997

1. The Parties

The Complainant is ALSTOM, France, represented by Lynde & Associates, France.

The Respondent is woke mind, woke mind, United States of America ("US").

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <alstomgrroup.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 December 2, 2025. On December 2, 2025, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On December 3, 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 (Privacy service provided by Withheld for Privacy ehf) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email to the Complainant on December 3, 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 4, 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 5, 2025. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was December 25, 2025. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent's default on December 26, 2025.

The Center appointed Jonathan Turner as the sole panelist in this matter on January 8, 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's group is a global leader in the fields of power generation, power transmission and rail infrastructure, employing around 36,000 staff in over 60 countries. The group was formed from a merger in 1928 and adopted the name ALSTHOM at that time. It adopted the name ALSTOM in 1998.

The Complainant owns registrations of the word mark ALSTOM including:

- French registration no. 98727759 registered on April 10, 1998, in classes 6, 7, 9, 11, 12, 16, 19, 24 and 35-42;
- European Union registration no. 000948729 filed on September 30, 1998, and registered on August 8, 2001, in classes 6, 7, 9, 11, 12, 16, 19, 24 and 35-42; and
- US registration no. 4570546 filed on February 24, 2011, and registered on July 22, 2014, in classes 7, 9, 12, 35, 37, 39 and 42.

The Complainant also owns registered marks for logos comprising the word ALSTOM and multiple domain names in which the second level domain is "alstom" or "alstomgroup", including <alstom.com> (registered on January 20, 1998) and <alstomgroup.com> (registered on November 14, 2000).

The disputed domain name was registered on November 18, 2025, and resolves to a web page with no content other than the statement "The content of the page cannot be displayed".

On November 21, 2025, the Complainant sent letters to the Respondent (using the contact details then available) and to the Registrar, asserting the Complainant's rights in the mark ALSTOM, but did not receive any reply.

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 observes that the disputed domain name consists of its registered mark together with is a miss-spelling of the generic word "group" and the generic top level domain suffix .com. The Complainant submits that Internet users are liable to overlook the extra "r" inserted into the word "group".

The Complainant also states that the Respondent has not shown that it has any rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name, that the Respondent is not commonly known by this name, and that the Respondent is not affiliated with the Complainant or authorized by the Complainant to register or use a domain name incorporating its trademark.

Finally, the Complainant alleges that the disputed domain name was registered and is being used in bad faith. According to the Complainant, in view of the well-known character of the name ALSTOM, the Respondent must have been aware of the Complainant's activities when it registered the disputed domain name.

B. Respondent

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

6. Discussion and Findings

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 that it has registered rights in respect of the word mark ALSTOM for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 1.2.1.

The entirety of this mark is reproduced within the disputed domain name. Accordingly, the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to the Complainant's mark for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 1.7.

The disputed domain name consists of the Complainant's mark, ALSTOM, with the addition of a misspelling of the generic word "group" and the generic top level domain suffix, .com.

Although the addition of other terms may bear on assessment of the second and third elements, the Panel finds that the addition of the above 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.

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.

In particular, there is no evidence of any use or preparations for use of the disputed domain name for a bona fide offering of good or services or of any legitimate noncommercial or fair use of the disputed domain name. Nor is there anything to suggest that the Respondent is commonly known by the disputed domain name or authorized to register and use it.

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

C. Registered and Used 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.

Taking into account the scale of the Complainant's activities and the distinctive character of the ALSTOM mark, the Panel is satisfied on the balance of probabilities that the Respondent knew of the Complainant's mark when he registered the disputed domain name and that he registered it in order to take advantage of its obvious confusing similarity with that mark.

Moreover, it is difficult to conceive of any use of the disputed domain name for any bona fide purpose and none has been suggested by the Respondent.

In all the circumstances, the Panel finds on the balance of probabilities that the disputed domain name was registered and is being used, at least passively, in bad faith.

The Panel concludes 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 <alstomgroup.com> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Jonathan Turner/

Jonathan Turner

Sole Panelist

Date: January 23, 2026