

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

Amadeus IT Group, S.A. v. Jose Cuervo, Amadeus Travel Systems
Case No. D2025-5201

1. The Parties

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

The Respondent is Jose Cuervo, Amadeus Travel Systems, Canada.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <amadeustravelsolutions.com> is registered with Hostinger Operations, UAB (the “Registrar”).

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the “Center”) on December 12, 2025. On December 12, 2025, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On December 15, 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) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on December 15, 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 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 Respondent of the Complaint, and the proceedings commenced on December 18, 2025. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was January 7, 2026. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent’s default on January 8, 2026.

The Center appointed Olga Zalomiy as the sole panelist in this matter on January 12, 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 Spanish provider of technology solutions and services for travel industry. The Complainant has numerous trademark registrations for its AMADEUS trademark, such as:

- the United States of America registration No. 1529969 for the AMADEUS trademark, registered on March 14, 1989;
- the United Kingdom registration No. UK 00001315736 for the AMADEUS trademark, registered on September 14, 1990; and
- the International Registration No. 1321806 for the AMADEUS trademark, registered on June 22, 2016.

The Complainant's trademark has been ranked No. 12 by Brand Finance and found to be well known by several UDRP panels.¹

The Respondent registered the disputed domain name on August 26, 2025. The disputed domain name does not direct 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 confusingly similar to its well-known AMADEUS trademark because the disputed domain name reproduces the Complainant's mark in its entirety. The Complainant argues that the descriptive terms "travel solutions" in the disputed domain name would not prevent a finding of confusing similarity between the disputed domain name and the Complainant's trademark. The Complainant contends that the generic Top-Level Domain ("gTLD") should be disregarded from the assessment of confusing similarity.

The Complainant submits that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name because (i) the Respondent has not been authorized by the Complainant to use its AMADEUS trademark in the disputed domain name; (ii) the Respondent is not using the disputed domain name for offering of goods or services; (iii) the Respondent is not commonly known by the disputed domain name because the disputed domain name does not resolve to an active website; and (iv) the Respondent did not respond to the Complainant's cease and desist letters.

The Complainant asserts that the Respondent registered the disputed domain name in bad faith, because of a variety of factors, such as the Respondent's registration of the disputed domain name incorporating the Complainant's well-known trademark plus a descriptive term; the Respondent's registration of the disputed domain name for the purpose of disrupting the business of a competitor because it is depriving the Complainant of the opportunity to reflect its trademark in a domain name and it is creating a likelihood of confusion among users. The Complainant argues that the Respondent's non-use of the disputed domain name does not prevent a finding of bad faith because there is no good faith use to which the disputed domain name could be put.

¹ See, e.g., *Amadeus IT Group S.A. v. Connect Systems / Hostonik.com Web Hosting*, WIPO Case No. [D2018-0252](#).

B. Respondent

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

6. Discussion and Findings

Pursuant to paragraph 4(a) of the Policy, to succeed in these proceedings, the Complainant must prove each of the following elements with respect to 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;
- (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. The inclusion of the gTLD ".com" is typically disregarded in the context of the confusing similarity assessment, being a technical requirement of registration. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 1.11.1.

Although the addition of other terms here, "travel solutions", 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.

The evidence on record shows that the Respondent is not commonly known by the disputed domain name. The Respondent is not making legitimate noncommercial or fair use of the disputed domain name or use for bona fide offering of goods or services, because at the time of this Decision, the disputed domain name does

not direct to an active website. The Respondent has not been authorized by the Complainant to use the Complainant's trademark in a 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.

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.

In the present case, the Panel notes that the Respondent registered the disputed domain name incorporating the Complainant's well-known AMADEUS trademark and the terms "travel solutions" associated with its business many years after the Complainant's first trademark registration. Therefore, it is more likely than not that the Respondent registered the disputed domain name with the knowledge of the Complainant and targeting its trademark.

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 this case, the composition of the disputed domain name that incorporates the Complainant's well-known mark and the associated terms, absence of rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name, and the Respondent's choice not to submit any arguments in response to the Complaint, support a finding of bad faith.

Panels have found that the non-use of a domain name would not prevent a finding of bad faith under the doctrine of passive holding. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 3.3. Having reviewed the available record, the Panel notes the distinctiveness or reputation of the Complainant's trademark, the composition of the disputed domain name, and the absence of a response, and finds that in the circumstances of this case the passive holding of the disputed domain name does not prevent a finding of 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 name <amadeustravelsolutions.com> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Olga Zalomyi/

Olga Zalomyi

Sole Panelist

Date: January 23, 2026