

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

Mistral AI v. Daniel Padron Garcia

Case No. D2026-0118

1. The Parties

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

The Respondent is Daniel Padron Garcia, Spain.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <iamistral.com> is registered with GoDaddy.com, LLC (the “Registrar”).

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the “Center”) on January 12, 2026. On January 13, 2026, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On January 13, 2026, 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 (UNKNOWN) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on January 14, 2026, 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 January 19, 2026.

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 January 20, 2026. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was February 9, 2026. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent’s default on February 10, 2026.

The Center appointed Tobias Malte Müller as the sole panelist in this matter on February 16, 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 describes itself, undisputedly, as the European leader in generative Artificial Intelligence, specializing in developing and offering large language models based on Mistral AI's models. It was founded in early 2023 and raised over EUR 2,7 billion in four founding rounds between 2023 and 2025, marking a historic milestone as France's first startup valued at over 10 billion Euros.

It further results from the Complainant's evidenced allegations, which remained undisputed, that it is the registered owner of several verbal trademarks consisting of the terms "MISTRAL AI". Accordingly, the Complaint is based, amongst others, on the following registered trademarks:

- French trademark MISTRAL AI No. 4970012 filed on June 16, 2023 and registered on November 10, 2023 for goods and services in classes 9, 35 and 42;
- European Union trademark MISTRAL AI No. 018942618 filed on October 26, 2023 and registered on February 14, 2024 for services in class 42;
- International trademark MISTRAL AI No. 1794809 filed and registered on December 15, 2023 for goods and services in classes 9, 35, 42 and, designating several countries (including the United States of America, China, and Russian Federation).

The Respondent registered the disputed domain name on February 9, 2025. The website to which it resolves promotes a platform to generate content thanks to Artificial Intelligence. In addition, the further content of the website available under the disputed domain name refers to the Complainant, its trademarks and products: (i) the marks and product names "MISTRAL AI", "MIXTRAL", "LE CHAT", "Mistral Small", "Mistral Medium", "Le Chat Enterprise", "Le Chat Pro" are prominently reproduced throughout the website; (ii) the website uses a graphic charter identical to that of the Complainant, featuring a palette of orange shades; (iii) the Respondent claims copyright protection for its website including the Complainant's trademarks; (iv) clicking on the hyperlink "Try Mistral le Chat" on the website users are redirected to the Complainant's official website for this product.

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:

- (1) The disputed domain name is composed of the terms "IA" and "MISTRAL". As such, it reproduces almost identically the Complainant's earlier trademarks and company name. The mere inversion of the two letters "AI"/"IA" will go unnoticed by the public as both acronyms refer to the "artificial intelligence";
- (2) The Respondent does not own any "MISTRAL AI" or similar trademark. The Complainant has never authorized the Respondent to register and use the disputed domain name, or to use its "MISTRAL AI" trademarks. The Respondent deliberately registered the disputed domain name being highly confusing to falsely suggest affiliation with the Complainant;
- (3) The Respondent knew about the Complainant and sought to take unfair advantage of the latter's reputation, investments, and Internet referencing by registering a domain name that is highly confusing. This fraudulent intention is corroborated by (i) the timing, since the Respondent registered the disputed domain name only few days after the launch of the "LE CHAT" app by the Complainant was widely relayed by the press; (ii) the fact that the website contains links that redirect to the Complainant's official website,

which confirms that the Respondent perfectly knows the Complainant; (iii) the fact that the Whols does not disclose the holder's identity, which demonstrates that the Respondent attempts to evade detection and legal consequences by hiding his/her identity.

B. Respondent

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

6. Discussion and Findings

Paragraph 15(a) of the Rules instructs this Panel to "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 requires a complainant to prove each of the following three elements in order to obtain an order that the disputed domain name be transferred or cancelled:

- (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.

The Panel will therefore proceed to analyze whether the three elements of paragraph 4(a) of the Policy are satisfied.

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 Select UDRP Questions, (["WIPO Overview 3.1"](#)), section 1.7.

The Panel finds that the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to the Complainant's trademark MISTRAL AI. The distinctive element "MISTRAL" is reproduced in its entirety and remains clearly recognizable within the disputed domain name. The only variation concerns the element "AI", which is descriptive of the Complainant's field of activity, namely Artificial Intelligence. In the disputed domain name, this element has been moved to the beginning and its letters inverted from "AI" to "IA", corresponding to the French abbreviation for "intelligence artificielle". Such modifications do not prevent a finding of confusing similarity. The quantitatively dominant component of the mark, "MISTRAL", remains unchanged and recognizable.

Accordingly, the Panel finds that the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to the mark for the purposes of the Policy, [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.7.

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 3.1](#), 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.

In particular, the Respondent did not submit any evidence of bona fide pre-Complaint preparations to use the disputed domain name. In particular, the Complainant's uncontested allegations demonstrate that it has not authorized or licensed the Respondent's use of the MISTRAL AI trademark for registering the disputed domain name which is confusingly similar to the Complainant's trademark. Furthermore, the Panel notes that there is no evidence showing that the Respondent might be commonly known by the disputed domain name in the sense of paragraph 4(c)(ii) of the Policy.

Finally, it results from the Complainant's non-contested evidence that the disputed domain name resolves to a website that promotes a platform to generate content thanks to artificial intelligence. In addition, the further content of the website available under the disputed domain name refers to the Complainant, its trademarks and products: (i) the marks and product names "MISTRAL AI", "MIXTRAL", "LE CHAT", "Mistral Small", "Mistral Medium", "Le Chat Enterprise", "Le Chat Pro" (at EUR 14,99 / month) are prominently reproduced throughout the website; (ii) the website uses a graphic charter identical to that of the Complainant, featuring a palette of orange shades; (iii) the Respondent claims copyright protection for its website including the Complainant's trademarks; (iv) clicking on the hyperlink "Try Mistral le Chat" on the website users are redirected to the Complainant's official website for this product. Since this use is – in the Panel's view – clearly commercial (considering Le Chat Pro is promoted at a monthly price of EUR 14,99), it cannot be considered a legitimate noncommercial or fair use of the disputed domain name, without intent for commercial gain to misleadingly divert consumers or to tarnish the trademark or service mark at issue pursuant to paragraph 4(c)(iii) of the Policy.

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 from the Complainant's documented allegations that the disputed domain name resolves to a website which promotes a platform to generate content thanks to artificial intelligence. In addition, the further content of the website available under the disputed domain name refers to the Complainant, its trademarks and products. Moreover, as explained in the Rights or Legitimate Interests section, it is evident that the Respondent knew the Complainant's marks and products and has used the disputed domain name for commercial gain which constitutes bad faith under paragraph 4(b)(iv) of the Policy.

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 3.1](#), section 3.2.1.

In addition, the further circumstances surrounding the disputed domain name's registration and use confirm the Panel's findings that the Respondent has registered and is using the disputed domain name in bad faith:

- (i) the nature of the disputed domain name (almost identically incorporating the Complainant's mark);
- (ii) the timing, since the Respondent registered the disputed domain name only few days after the press widely reported on the Complainant's launch of the "LE CHAT" app;
- (iii) a clear absence of rights or legitimate interests coupled with no response for the Respondent's choice of the disputed domain name or evidence of actual or contemplated good faith use;
- (iv) no actual or contemplated bona fide or legitimate use of the domain name can reasonably be inferred, particularly in light of the absence of any license or authorization granted to the Respondent.

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 <iamistral.com> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Tobias Malte Müller/

Tobias Malte Müller

Sole Panelist

Date: March 2, 2026