

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

Ameren Corporation v. Huade Wang
Case No. D2026-0340

1. The Parties

The Complainant is Ameren Corporation, United States of America ("United States"), represented by Greenberg Traurig, LLP, United States.

The Respondent is Huade Wang, China.

2. The Domain Names and Registrars

The disputed domain name <amerenillinoisavings.com> is registered with Dynadot Inc (the "First Registrar").

The disputed domain name <amerenillnoissavings.com> is registered with Sav.com, LLC (the "Second Registrar").

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the "Center") on January 27, 2026. On January 28, 2026, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrars a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain names. On January 28, and January 29, 2026, the Registrars transmitted by email to the Center their verification responses disclosing registrant and contact information for the disputed domain names which differed from the named Respondent (Redacted for Privacy, Super Privacy Service LTD c/o Dynadot / REDACTED FOR PRIVACY) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on January 29, 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 February 4, 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 February 6, 2026. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was February 26, 2026. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent's default on March 2, 2026.

The Center appointed Delia-Mihaela Belciu as the sole panelist in this matter on March 5, 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 Fortune 500 company that trades on the New York Stock Exchange under the symbol AEE. Formed in 1997, through the merger of CIPSCO Incorporated, CILCO Inc., Illinois Power Company, and Union Electric Company of St. Louis, the Complainant combines electric and natural gas utilities serving Missouri, and Illinois, United States. “Ameren” is the combination of the words “American” and “Energy”.

The Complainant operates as an energy holding company with rate-regulated utility subsidiaries that deliver electricity and natural gas to residential, commercial, and industrial customers across approximately 64,000 square miles in central and eastern Missouri, and much of Illinois, United States. The Complainant owns multiple utility subsidiaries, including Ameren Missouri, based in St. Louis, United States, and Ameren Illinois, located in Collinsville, Illinois, United States. Ameren Missouri is the largest electric power provider in Missouri, United States, providing electric and gas service for over 100 years, serving approximately 1.3 million electric customers and 135,000 natural gas customers across central and eastern Missouri, including the greater St. Louis region, United States. Ameren Illinois ranks as Illinois’ third largest natural gas distribution operation in total number of customers.

The Complainant delivers electricity generation capacity on the order of 9,300 megawatts, serving a combined total of more than 2.5 million electric and 900,000 natural gas customers in Missouri, and Illinois, United States.

The Complainant’s business also includes investment in transmission infrastructure and grid reliability projects, renewable energy initiatives, and infrastructure modernization consistent with state and federal policy objectives in the United States.

The Complainant is in particular the owner of the following AMEREN and AMEREN ILLINOIS trademark registrations:

- the United States Registration No. 3914523 for AMEREN, registered on February 1, 2011, for services in class 39;
- the United States Registration No. 2162874 for AMEREN, registered on June 2, 1998, for services in class 39;
- the United States Registration No. 3952591 for AMEREN ILLINOIS, registered on April 26, 2011, for services in class 39.

The Complainant owns the domain name <ameren.com>, registered since October 26, 1995, used by the Complainant in relation to its primary website that provides general information about it and its services, prominently displaying its AMEREN marks.

The disputed domain name <amerenillinoisavings.com> was registered on July 27, 2017, and does not resolve to a webpage with publicly available content. According to the evidence available in the file, a Mail Exchange (“MX”) record was configured for the disputed domain name.

The second disputed domain name <amerenillnoissavings.com> was registered on June 16, 2018, and does not resolve to a webpage with publicly available content. According to the evidence available in the file, a MX record was configured for the disputed domain name.

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.

Notably, the Complainant contends that:

- (i) the disputed domain names are confusingly similar to the Complainant's AMEREN and AMEREN ILLINOIS marks, as it incorporates them in full, changing the marks only by misspelling the geographical term "Illinois", and adding the generic term "savings", and then the generic Top-Level Domain ("gTLD") ".com.";
- (ii) the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the disputed domain names for a number of reasons, among which that; (1) the Respondent is not a licensee of the Complainant; (2) the Complainant has not granted any authorization for the Respondent to make use of its AMEREN and AMEREN ILLINOIS marks, in a domain name or otherwise; (3) the disputed domain names are confusingly similar to Complainant's AMEREN and AMEREN ILLINOIS marks; (4) the Respondent is not commonly known by the disputed domain names; and (5) the Respondent has not used or prepared to use the disputed domain names in connection with a bona fide offering of goods or services;
- (iii) the disputed domain names were registered and are being used in bad faith for a number of reasons, among which that, (1) the Respondent has knowledge about the Complainant's AMEREN and AMEREN ILLINOIS marks; (2) the disputed domain names do not resolve to webpages with publicly available content. In addition, MX records were configured for both disputed domain names; (3) the Complainant's counsel has sent a correspondence to the Respondent using the contact forms provided by the Registrars of the disputed domain names advising the Respondent of Complainant's prior rights in the AMEREN marks, the abusive nature of the disputed domain names, and requesting the Respondent to immediately cease use of the AMEREN marks and to transfer the disputed domain names to the Complainant; and (4) the Respondent used a proxy service to register the disputed domain names to shield its identity and elude enforcement efforts by the legitimate trademark owner.

B. Respondent

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

6. Discussion and Findings

In order for the Complainant to succeed, such must prove, according to paragraph 4(a) of the Policy, that:

- (i) the disputed domain names are 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 with respect to the disputed domain names; and
- (iii) the disputed domain names have been registered and are being used in bad faith.

In case all three elements above have been fulfilled, the Panel is able to grant the remedy requested by the Complainant. Thus, the Panel will deal with each of the requirements in turn.

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 Complainant has shown rights in respect of a trademark or service mark for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.2.1.

The Panel finds that the AMEREN, and AMEREN ILLINOIS marks are reproduced within both disputed domain names, with the misspelling of the term "illinois", and the addition of the term "savings", in both disputed domain names, which does not prevent a finding that the disputed domain names are confusingly similar to the Complainant's AMEREN and AMEREN ILLINOIS marks. Accordingly, both disputed domain names are confusingly similar to the marks for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), sections 1.7 and 1.9.

Although the addition of other terms, in this case here, "savings", may bear on assessment of the second and third elements, the Panel finds the addition of such term does not prevent a finding of confusing similarity between the disputed domain names and the marks for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.8.

In what concerns the addition of the gTLD ".com" in relation to the disputed domain names, such is viewed as a standard registration requirement, and is disregarded under the first element confusing similarity test. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.11.1.

Based on the available record, the Panel finds that 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 that 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 names. 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.

Thus, based on the available evidence, the Respondent does not appear to be commonly known by the name "ameren", nor "amerenillinoisavings", nor "amerenillnoissavings".

The Respondent is not a licensee of the Complainant. The Complainant has never authorised the Respondent to make use of its AMEREN and AMEREN ILLINOIS marks in the disputed domain names.

Based on the available evidence, both disputed domain names do not resolve to webpages with publicly available content, while a MX record was configured in relation to each of the two disputed domain names, which could lead to a possible risk of a fraudulent activity.

Furthermore, the composition of the disputed domain names, incorporating the Complainant's AMEREN and AMEREN ILLINOIS marks within both disputed domain names, with the misspelling of the geographical term "illinois", and the addition of the term "savings", in both disputed domain names, term suggestive for the Complainant's activity, might lead to confusion for Internet users.

All the above does not amount to a bona fide offering of goods or services, or to a legitimate noncommercial or fair use of the disputed domain names.

Based on the available record, the Panel finds that 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 Complainant's rights in the AMEREN and AMEREN ILLINOIS marks predate the registration date of both disputed domain names.

In light of the above, the Panel finds that it is not conceivable that the Respondent registered both disputed domain names without knowledge of the Complainant's AMEREN and AMEREN ILLINOIS marks, which supports a finding of bad faith registration. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 3.2.2.

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 the present case, the Panel notes that, the disputed domain names do not resolve to webpages with publicly available content, while a MX record was configured in relation to each of the two disputed domain names, aspect which could lead to a possible risk of a fraudulent activity. Moreover, both disputed domain names incorporate the Complainant's AMEREN and AMEREN ILLINOIS marks, with the misspelling of the geographical term "illinois", and with the addition of the term "savings", term suggestive for the Complainant's activity, leading thus to confusion and misleading Internet users including into believing that any email which might be sent using the disputed domain names is sent by the Complainant or by an affiliated entity with the Complainant's consent.

Panels have found that the non-use of a domain name would not by itself prevent a finding of bad faith under the doctrine of passive holding. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 3.3. Having reviewed the available record, the Panel notes the distinctiveness of the Complainant's trademark, the composition of the disputed domain names, the failure of the respondent to submit a response or to provide any evidence of actual or contemplated good-faith use, and finds that in the circumstances of this case the passive holding of the disputed domain names does not prevent a finding of bad faith under the Policy.

In addition, cease and desist letters were sent out to the Respondent to which no response was received.

Having reviewed the record, the Panel finds the Respondent's registration and use of the disputed domain names constitutes bad faith under the Policy and 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 <amerenillinoisavings.com> and <amerenillnoissavings.com> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Delia-Mihaela Belciu/

Delia-Mihaela Belciu

Sole Panelist

Date: March 19, 2026