

## **ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION**

Thales Group v. Frederic Julien G Leenen, Dario Olivier marie JR  
Case No. D2025-5172

### **1. The Parties**

The Complainant is Thales Group, France, represented by CSC Digital Brand Services Group AB, Sweden.

The Respondents are Frederic Julien G Leenen, Belgium, and Dario Olivier marie JR, France.

### **2. The Domain Names and Registrars**

The disputed domain names <be-thalesalieniaspaces.com>, and <thalealieniaspace.com> are registered with Tucows Domains Inc. (the “Registrar”).

### **3. Procedural History**

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the “Center”) on December 11, 2025. On December 11, 2025, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain names. On December 11, 2025, the Registrar transmitted by email to the Center its verification response disclosing registrant and contact information for the disputed domain names which differed from the named Respondent (REDACTED FOR PRIVACY) and contact information in the Complaint.

The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on December 12, 2025 with the registrant and contact information of nominally multiple underlying registrants revealed by the Registrar, requesting the Complainant to either file separate complaint(s) 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 an amended Complaint on December 17, 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 Respondents of the Complaint, and the proceedings commenced on December 30, 2025. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was January 19, 2026. The Respondents did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondents' default on January 20, 2026.

The Center appointed Kaya Köklü as the sole panelist in this matter on January 27, 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 aerospace and defense corporation engaged in the manufacture, marketing, and sale of electronic equipment and systems for the aeronautics, naval, and defense sectors. Its roots date back to the year 1893. Today, the Complainant employs more than 81,000 people across five continents and generates annual revenues of more than EUR 18 billion.

The Complainant is the owner of numerous THALES trademark registrations, including the following:

- European Union Trademark Registration No. 002186088, registered on November 9, 2006, for THALES, covering various goods and services in classes 9, 13, 16, 35, 38, 41, and 42; and
- French Trademark No. 1525967, registered on April 25, 1989, for THALES, covering various goods and services in classes 9, 35, 38, 40, 41, and 42.

The Complainant further operates its official website at the domain name <thalesgroup.com>.

In addition, the Complainant holds a majority of shares in a joint venture that is the owner of the Italian Trademark Registration No. 2017000046467, registered on December 10, 2018, for THALES ALENIA SPACE, covering various goods and services in classes 7, 9, 12, and 38. This joint venture of the Complainant is operating its primary website at <thalesalieniaspace.com>.

The Respondents are reportedly located in Belgium and France, respectively.

The disputed domain name <be-thalesalieniaspaces.com> was registered on February 5, 2025. The disputed domain name <thalealieniaspace.com> was registered on April 11, 2025.

According to the case record, both disputed domain names have not yet been actively used and do not resolve to an active website. However, the Complainant has provided un rebutted evidence that the Respondents have configured a Mail Exchange ("MX") server for the disputed domain names, which enables the Respondents to send and receive emails using the disputed domain names.

#### **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 names.

##### **B. Respondents**

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

## **6. Discussion and Findings**

### **6.1. Procedural Issue: Consolidation of Multiple Respondents**

The amended Complaint was filed in relation to nominally different domain name registrants. The Complainant alleges that the domain name registrants are the same entity or mere alter egos of each other, or under common control. The Complainant requests the consolidation of the Complaint against the multiple disputed domain name registrants pursuant to paragraph 10(e) of the Rules.

The registrants of the disputed domain names did not comment on the Complainant's request.

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 Selected UDRP Questions, Third Edition ("[WIPO Overview 3.0](#)"), section 4.11.2.

In light of the criteria set out above, the Panel finds that the Complainant has provided unrebutted indications that both disputed domain names are likely under common control for the following reasons:

The disputed domain names were both registered between a period of only about two months between February 5, and April 11, 2025. Furthermore, the disputed domain names were both registered with the same Registrar. Additionally, the disputed domain names provide for an overall similar nature and composition pattern.

The Panel concludes that the Respondents are more likely than not somehow connected. Hence, the Panel accepts that the disputed domain names are both under common control.

As regards fairness and equity, the Panel sees no reason why a consolidation of the disputes would be unfair or inequitable to any of the involved Parties.

Accordingly, the Panel decides to consolidate the disputes regarding the nominally different registrants of disputed domain names (referred to below as "the Respondent", whenever appropriate) in a single proceeding.

### **6.2. Substantial Issues**

According to paragraph 15(a) of the Rules, the Panel shall decide the Complaint in accordance with the Policy, the Rules and any rules and principles of law that it deems applicable.

In accordance with paragraph 4(a) of the Policy, the Complainant must prove that each of the three following elements is satisfied:

- (i) the disputed domain names are identical or confusingly similar to a trademark in which the Complainant has rights; and
- (ii) the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the disputed domain names; and
- (iii) the disputed domain names have been registered and are being used in bad faith.

As per Paragraph 4(a) of the Policy, the complainant bears the burden of proving that all these requirements are fulfilled, even if a respondent has not substantively replied to the complainant's contentions. *Stanworth Development Limited v. E Net Marketing Ltd.*, WIPO Case No. [D2007-1228](#).

Concerning the uncontested information provided by a complainant, the Panel may, where relevant, accept the provided reasonable factual allegations in a complaint as true. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 4.3.

It is further noted that the Panel has taken note of the [WIPO Overview 3.0](#) and, where appropriate, will decide consistently with the consensus views captured therein.

#### **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 3.0](#), section 1.7.

The Complainant has shown rights in respect of the THALES trademark for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 1.2.1.

The Panel finds the THALES mark is recognizable within the disputed domain names.

As regards the disputed domain name <be-thalesaleniaspaces.com>, the Panel notes that this disputed domain name fully comprises the THALES trademark in its entirety.

As regards the disputed domain name <thalealeniaspace.com>, the Panel refers to section 1.9 of the [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), stating that where the relevant trademark is recognizable within the dispute domain name, misspellings do not prevent a finding of confusing similarity. Here, the Panel notes that the disputed domain name <thalealeniaspace.com> incorporates an apparent misspelling of the Complainant's THALES trademark by simply omitting the letter "s", while the remaining terms used in the disputed domain name fully comply with the trademark THALES ALENIA SPACE of the Complainant's joint venture. The Panel finds this indicative of typosquatting, particularly as it makes the Complainant's THALES trademark still recognizable within the disputed domain name.

Accordingly, the disputed domain names are 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 "be-" as part of the disputed domain name <be-thalesaleniaspaces.com>, respectively "alenia" and "space" in both disputed domain names, may bear on assessment of the second and third elements, the Panel finds the addition of these terms does not prevent a finding of confusing similarity between the disputed domain names and the THALES 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 names. Particularly, the Complainant put forward that the Respondent is neither an authorized business partner of the Complainant nor a licensee of its THALES trademark and that the Respondent is not commonly known by the disputed domain names, its used terms or any other similar terms. 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 names such as those enumerated in the Policy or otherwise.

The Panel further notes the nature of the disputed domain names, which are almost identical to the THALES ALENIA SPACE trademark and at least confusingly similar to the THALES trademark. Considering that the Internet users most likely would not notice the subtle differences between the THALES ALENIA SPACE and the THALES trademarks in comparison to the disputed domain names, the Panel has no doubt that the Respondent’s intent was to create confusion with the Complainant and its business.

Accordingly, 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.

In the present case, the Panel believes that the Respondent was aware of the Complainant and the THALES and THALS ALENIA SPACE trademarks, when registering the disputed domain names. It is obvious to the Panel that the Respondent’s choice of the disputed domain names, which either comprise the THALES trademark in its entirety or constitutes a misspelled version of the THALES ALENIA SPACE and THALES trademarks, demonstrates its knowledge of the Complainant and intention to target the Complainant’s business and mislead Internet users.

With respect to the use of the disputed domain names in bad faith, the Panel notes that the disputed domain names do not resolve to active websites. However, the Panel believes that the subtle misspelling in the disputed domain name <thalealeniaspace.com> as well as the full incorporation of the THALES and THALES ALENIA SPACE trademarks in the disputed domain name <be-thalesaleniaspaces.com>, further supported by the active MX server, create an ongoing threat to the Complainant, since the disputed domain names may be used by the Respondent to mislead customers in the false belief that any future linked website or any email, using the disputed domain names, comes from the Complainant.

In addition, the Panel accepts the failure of the Respondent to submit any response to the Complainant's contentions as an additional indication for bad faith use.

In light of the above and having reviewed the record, the Panel considers that the non-use of the disputed domain names does not prevent a finding of bad faith under the circumstances of the case, and the Panel has no doubts that the Respondent's registration and use of the disputed domain names constitute bad faith under the Policy.

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 names <be-thalesaleniaspaces.com> and <thalealeniaspace.com> be transferred to the Complainant.

*/Kaya Köklü/*

**Kaya Köklü**

Sole Panelist

Date: January 29, 2026