

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

Mistral AI v. Unlimited Cohen

Case No. D2025-5290

1. The Parties

The Complainant is Mistral AI, France, represented by Blanche Avocats, France.

The Respondent is Unlimited Cohen, Armenia.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <mistralai.net> is registered with MainReg Inc. (the “Registrar”).

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the “Center”) on December 18, 2025. On December 18, 2025, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On December 19, 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 (Whois Protection) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on December 19, 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 19, 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 24, 2025. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was January 13, 2026. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent’s default on January 14, 2026.

The Center appointed Luca Barbero as the sole panelist in this matter on January 23, 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 European leader in generative artificial intelligence (“AI”), specializing in developing and offering large language models (“LLMs”) based on its AI’s models.

Founded in France in early 2023 by three researchers from the AI labs of Meta and Google DeepMind, the Complainant enjoyed a quick and significant success, raising EUR 100 million and EUR 385 million in two funding rounds in 2023 and EUR 600 million in a third funding round in 2024.

In 2025, the Complainant additionally secured EUR 1.7 billion in a fourth funding, marking a historic milestone as France’s first decacorn (startup valued at over 10 billion euros), with a post-money valuation nearly reaching EUR 12 billion.

The Complainant is the owner of several trademark registrations for MISTRAL AI, including the following:

- French trademark registration No. 4970012 for MISTRAL AI (word mark), filed on June 16, 2023, and registered on November 10, 2023, in classes 9, 35 and 42;
- European Union trademark registration No. 018942618 for MISTRAL AI (word mark), filed on October 26, 2023, and registered on February 14, 2024, in class 42;
- International trademark registration No. 1794809 for MISTRAL AI (word mark), registered on December 15, 2023, in classes 9, 35 and 42.

The Complainant is the owner of the domain names <mistral.ai>, registered on May 15, 2019, and used by the Complainant to promote its products and services under the trademark MISTRAL AI. The Complainant also owns, amongst others, the domain names <mistralai.fr>, <mistralai.com> and <mistral-ai.fr> registered on April 14, 2023, and <mistraldev.net>, registered on March 15, 2024.

The disputed domain name <mistralai.net> was registered on October 24, 2025, and is currently not redirected to an active website. According to the screenshots submitted by the Complainant, which have not been contested by the Respondent, the disputed domain name resolved, prior to this proceeding, to a website promoting a platform to generate AI content under the trademark MISTRAL AI, requiring users to create an account providing their names and email addresses.

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 states that the disputed domain name <mistralai.net> is identical to the trademark MISTRAL AI in which the Complainant has rights, as it reproduces the trademark in its entirety with the mere addition of the generic Top-Level Domain (“gTLD”) “.net”.

The Complainant contends that Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name since: i) the Respondent is in no way associated to the Complainant; ii) the Respondent does not own any trademark registration for MISTRAL AI; iii) the Complainant has never authorized the Respondent to register and use the disputed domain name, or to use its MISTRAL AI mark; iv) the disputed domain name has not been used in connection with a bona fide offering of goods or services as the Respondent intentionally copied MISTRAL AI’s well-known trademark, company name and domain name to attract users to its website and to encourage users to purchase its AI services, in order to benefit financially from the Complainant’s reputation and investments.

With reference to the circumstances evidencing bad faith, the Complainant indicates that, considering its prior registrations for MISTRAL AI, its worldwide reputation since 2023, and the fact that Respondent registered the disputed domain name using the Complainant's identical registered mark, the Respondent knew about the Complainant at the time of registration and sought to take unfair advantage of the latter's reputation and investments.

As additional circumstances evidencing bad faith, the Complainant submits that the Respondent: i) created and used additional websites identical to the one displayed at the disputed domain name, altering only the name of the AI company being impersonated (e.g., CryptoNova84, Stabile ObraxPro, DynarisFlex 7.1 AI, etc.); ii) availed itself of a Whois protection service to avoid being notified of the Complaint; and iii) provided fake contact details in the Whois information.

B. Respondent

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

6. Discussion and Findings

According to paragraph 15(a) of the Rules: "A Panel shall decide a complaint on the basis of the statements and documents submitted and in accordance with the Policy, these Rules and any rules and principles of law that it deems applicable." Paragraph 4(a) of the Policy directs that the Complainant must prove each of the following:

- (i) that the disputed domain name registered by the Respondent is identical or confusingly similar to a trademark or service mark in which the Complainant has rights;
- (ii) that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the disputed domain name; and
- (iii) that 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. Indeed, the Complainant is the owner of valid trademark registrations for the word mark MISTRAL AI in several jurisdictions.

The entirety of the mark is reproduced within the disputed domain name, with the mere deletion of the space between the words "mistral" and "ai" in the mark and the addition of the gTLD ".net", which can be disregarded under the first element confusing similarity test. Accordingly, the disputed domain name is identical to the mark for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), sections 1.7 and 1.11.1.

Therefore, 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.

The Panel notes that there is no relation, disclosed to the Panel or otherwise apparent from the record, between the Respondent and the Complainant. The Respondent is not a licensee of the Complainant, nor has the Respondent otherwise obtained an authorization to use the Complainant’s trademark. Moreover, there is no indication before the Panel that the Respondent is commonly known by the disputed domain name.

Furthermore, there is no evidence showing that the Respondent might have used or made preparations to use the disputed domain name in connection with a bona fide offering of goods or services or a legitimate noncommercial or fair use without the intention of misleadingly diverting consumers or tarnish the Complainant’s trademark.

Indeed, according to the records, the Respondent used the disputed domain name prior to this proceeding to promote generative AI services, which are covered by the Complainant’s earlier trademark registrations for MISTRAL AI and are also provided by the Complainant at its website “www.mistral.ai”. The Panel also notes that the trademark MISTRAL AI was repeatedly mentioned on the Respondent’s website, and no disclaimer as to the lack of affiliation with the Complainant was provided. Therefore, it appears that the Respondent attempted to impersonate the Complainant in order to attract users for commercial gain by creating a likelihood of confusion with the Complainant and its trademark.

Panels have held that the use of a domain name for illegal activity such as impersonation/passing off, or other types of fraud, can never confer rights or legitimate interests on a respondent. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 2.13.1.

Moreover, the disputed domain name being identical to the Complainant’s trademark, when considered together with its use, is inherently misleading as it carries a high risk of implied affiliation with the Complainant. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 2.5.1.

Therefore, the Panel finds the second element of the Policy has also 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 finds that, in light of: i) the prior registration and use of the trademark MISTRAL AI by the Complainant; ii) the promotion of the Complainant’s trademark and services online via the website “www.mistral.ai”; and iii) the well-known character of the trademark MISTRAL AI in connection with the Complainant’s generative AI services, the Respondent knew or should have known of the

Complainant and its mark at the time of registration of the disputed domain name. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#) section 3.2.2.

Indeed, considering the identity of the disputed domain name with the Complainant's mark, the multiple references to the trademark MISTRAL AI made on the website to which the disputed domain name resolved prior to this proceeding, and the fact that the website promoted generative AI services, the Panel finds that the Respondent was actually aware of, and intended to target, the Complainant's trademark.

The Panel also finds that the Respondent's use of the disputed domain name in connection with the website described above, promoting generative AI services identical to those covered by the Complainant's earlier trademark under the MISTRAL AI mark, amounts to bad faith under paragraph 4(b)(iv) of the Policy, since the Respondent intentionally attempted to attract Internet users to its website for commercial gain by creating a likelihood of confusion with the Complainant's trademark as to the source, sponsorship, affiliation or endorsement of its website and the products advertised therein.

The disputed domain name does not currently resolve to an active website. 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 and reputation of the Complainant's trademark and the composition of the disputed domain name and, considering i) the failure of the Respondent to submit a Response and to provide any evidence of actual or contemplated good-faith use, ii) the Respondent concealing its identity in the public Whois records and iii) the implausibility of any good faith use to which the disputed domain name may be put in view of the misleading nature of the disputed domain name, 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.

Therefore, the Panel finds that the Complainant has established the third element of the Policy as well.

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 <mistralai.net> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Luca Barbero/

Luca Barbero

Sole Panelist

Date: February 6, 2026