

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

Aéroports de Paris v. Muhammad Azeem

Case No. D2026-0784

1. The Parties

The Complainant is Aéroports de Paris, France, represented by Plasseraud IP Avocats, France.

The Respondent is Muhammad Azeem, United Kingdom.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <extimefoodandbeverageparis.com> (the “Disputed Domain Name”) is registered with IONOS SE (the “Registrar”).

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the “Center”) on February 24, 2026. On February 25, 2026, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the Disputed Domain Name. On February 26, 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 (REDACTED FOR PRIVACY) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on February 27, 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 March 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 March 5, 2026. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was March 25, 2026. On March 11, 2026, the Complainant forwarded an email sent by the Respondent to the Center. The Respondent did not submit any formal response. Accordingly, the Center notified the commencement of the panel appointment process on March 26, 2026.

The Center appointed Mariia Koval as the sole panelist in this matter on March 31, 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, founded in 1945, belongs to Group ADP, a world leader airport operator based in France. The Complainant owns and manages Parisian international airports Charles de Gaulle, Orly, and Le Bourget, all gathered under the brand PARIS AEROPORT since 2016; it also manages and operates a network of 26 airports around the world, either directly or via two major strategic partnerships with complementary geographies: TAV Airports, present in Türkiye, the Middle East and Central Asia, and GMR Airports, present in India and Southeast Asia. In 2024, the Complainant provided its services to 363.7 million passengers, including 103.4 million for Parisian airports alone, employed 29,330 people and generated EUR 6,158 million consolidated revenues.

Also, the Complainant has introduced a variety of services designed to enhance passengers' travel experience and comfort, including catering, hotel accommodations, duty-free retail, and cultural exhibitions. In this context, through its EXTIME and EXTIME FOOD & BEVERAGE brands (collectively, the "EXTIME FOOD & BEVERAGE Trademarks") and its various subsidiaries and affiliated entities, the Complainant provides an extensive portfolio of retail and hospitality services, such as parking reservations, shopping, lounge rentals, hotel bookings, and vehicle rentals.

The Complainant is the owner of the EXTIME FOOD & BEVERAGE Trademarks registrations in different jurisdictions, among which are the following ones:

- International Trademark Registration EXTIME No. 1638149, registered on July 9, 2021, in classes 9, 35, 39, and 43;
- International Trademark Registration EXTIME fig. No. 1666849, registered on March 25, 2022, in classes 9, 35, 39, and 43;
- French Trademark Registration EXTIME FOOD & BEVERAGE fig. No. 4905961, registered on October 18, 2022, in classes 35, and 43.

The Complainant has built up a considerable online presence and is operating the domain name <extime.com> with a monthly average visit rate of approximately 530,000 visitors. The Complainant has also made substantial investments to develop a strong presence online by being active on various social media platforms, in particular on Instagram (with approximately 72,000 followers) and YouTube.

The Disputed Domain Name was registered on August 18, 2025. As at the dates of filing the Complaint and issuing this Decision, the Disputed Domain Name resolves to an active commercial website the core activity of which is providing catering, restaurant operations and wholesale food supply services, with a focus on premium dining and hospitality solutions, particularly in Paris airport environments. The website prominently displays "Extime Food & Beverage Paris". Moreover, according to the evidence presented by the Complainant (Annex 11 to the Complaint) mail exchange ("MX") records are set up.

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 the Complainant's EXTIME FOOD & BEVERAGE Trademarks since the Disputed Domain Name reproduces the Complainant's EXTIME FOOD & BEVERAGE Trademarks in their entirety with the addition of the term "paris" that does not prevent the Complainant's Trademarks from being recognizable within the Disputed Domain Name.

The Complainant further claims that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the Disputed Domain Name in view of the following:

- Searches conducted among the TM View and the WIPO Global Brand trademarks databases show that the Respondent does not hold any trademark corresponding to the Disputed Domain Name (Annex C to the Complaint);
- The Complainant has never granted the Respondent any license or other rights, and has not otherwise authorized the Respondent to register and to use any domain names incorporating the EXTIME FOOD & BEVERAGE Trademarks;
- There is no evidence of any fair or noncommercial or bona fide use of the Disputed Domain Name: on the contrary, the Disputed Domain Name directs to a website that is highly likely to mislead Internet users as to the source of the services provided, if not outright impersonating the Complainant and its joint venture and the related EXTIME FOOD & BEVERAGE Trademarks;
- Indeed, as the Disputed Domain Name consists in the mere reproduction of the Complainant's Trademarks with the addition of the geographical term, it carries a high risk of implied affiliation with the Complainant and its related company Extime Food & Beverage Paris, what prevents any fair use from the Respondent;
- Conditions of use of the Disputed Domain Name coupled with the configuration of MX records, make highly likely that it may be used for abusive purposes – specifically for phishing schemes, the distribution of spam or the propagation of malware. In this respect, the Disputed Domain Name has already been flagged and blacklisted by security vendors maintaining databases indexing domain names used for abusive purposes (Annex 15 to the Complaint).

The Complainant further contends that the Respondent registered and is using the Disputed Domain Name in bad faith based on the following. The Disputed Domain Name reproduces the Complainant's prior EXTIME FOOD & BEVERAGE Trademarks in their entirety, which are inherently highly distinctive and enjoy a reputation on the market. In addition, the Disputed Domain Name completely reproduces the company name Extime Food & Beverage Paris which identifies a company affiliated with the Complainant that was incorporated seven years prior to the registration of the Disputed Domain Name. Moreover, the website under the Disputed Domain Name purportedly promotes an entity which is located at the same address and operates the same kind of business in the field of catering and food services.

The Complainant further highlights that at least two UDRP decisions have decided the transfer of domain names that had been abusively registered and used by the Respondent (Annex E to the Complaint).

B. Respondent

The Respondent did not formally reply to the Complainant's contentions. However, according to the email provided by the Complainant, the Respondent sent an email to the Complainant on March 4, 2026, stating:

"Good afternoon,
Thank you for bringing this to our attention
We are not taking or adding any other company(logo). But if you think that it is conflicting with any company.
Then please take it down
Thank you for understanding in advance".

6. Discussion and Findings

Under paragraph 4(a) of the Policy, for a complaint to succeed must satisfy the panel that:

- (i) the disputed domain name is identical or confusingly similar to a trademark or service mark in which 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 was 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 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 Disputed Domain Name reproduces the Complainant's EXTIME FOOD & BEVERAGE Trademarks (while the ampersand is replaced by "and") in combination with the term "paris" and the generic Top-Level-Domain ("gTLD") ".com". According to the [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.8, where the relevant trademark is recognizable within the disputed domain name, the addition of other terms (whether descriptive, geographical, pejorative, meaningless, or otherwise) would not prevent a finding of confusing similarity under the first element. The addition of the term "paris" to the EXTIME FOOD & BEVERAGE Trademark does not prevent a finding of confusing similarity in this case.

According to the [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.11.1, the applicable gTLD in a domain name (e.g., ".com", ".club", ".nyc") is viewed as a standard registration requirement and as such is disregarded under the first element confusing similarity test.

Accordingly, the Panel finds that the Disputed Domain Name is confusingly similar to the Complainant's EXTIME FOOD & BEVERAGE Trademarks pursuant to paragraph 4(a)(i) of the Policy.

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 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 concludes 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 EXTIME FOOD & BEVERAGE Trademark. Moreover, there is no element from which the Panel could infer the Respondent's right over the Disputed Domain Name under the Policy, or that the Respondent might be commonly known by the Disputed Domain Name.

The Panel is of the opinion that there is no evidence that the Respondent is using the Disputed Domain Name to offer bona fide goods or services or making a legitimate noncommercial or fair use. On the contrary, as on the dates of filing of the Complaint and this Decision the Disputed Domain Name resolved to the website that uses the EXTIME FOOD & BEVERAGE Trademarks and operates culinary enterprise purporting to offer the same products and services as those offered by the Complainant. In the "About Us" section of the Respondent's website, it is stated the following: "Founded in 2018, Extime Food & Beverage Paris was born from a simple yet powerful vision: to create a unified force in the food industry that masters every link in the chain. The name 'Extime' evokes the exceptional and the timeless—principles that guide our every decision. We saw a need for a partner who could offer not just products, but holistic solutions, and we built Extime to fill that void." Moreover, the Respondent's website lists the same address of the Complainant's joint venture Extime Food & Beverage Paris.

As is seen from the circumstances of this case, the website under the Disputed Domain Name does not disclose any relationship between the Complainant and the Respondent. The whole content and design of the Respondent's website creates a false impression that this website is one of the Complainant's official websites or related to the Complainant. Thus, the Respondent does not satisfy the conditions of the Oki Data test.

Also, in accordance with the [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 2.5.1, even where a domain name consists of a trademark plus an additional term, UDRP panels have largely held that such composition cannot constitute fair use if it effectively impersonates or suggests sponsorship or endorsement by the trademark owner. The composition of the Disputed Domain Name – reproducing the EXTIME FOOD & BEVERAGE Trademarks, along with the geographical term "paris" where the Complainant mainly operates and thereby collectively referring to the company name of the Complainant's affiliated company, Extime Food & Beverage Paris, – carries a risk of implied affiliation with the Complainant. The fact that the Respondent has incorporated the Complainant's EXTIME FOOD & BEVERAGE Trademarks in the Disputed Domain Name and has used the Disputed Domain Name for a website offering the same services as the Complainant, is further evidence, that the Respondent was well aware of the Complainant's EXTIME FOOD & BEVERAGE Trademarks and business at the time of registration of the Disputed Domain Name and has done so for the purpose of creating an impression that the Disputed Domain Name is connected with the Complainant.

The Respondent did not file any response to the Complaint and did not participate in this proceeding, as such, the Respondent did not present any evidence for supporting any rights or legitimate interests in the Disputed Domain Name.

In view of the foregoing, the Panel finds that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the Disputed Domain Name and that the Complainant succeeds under the second element of paragraph 4(a) of the Policy.

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 and is using the Disputed Domain Name in bad faith in view of the following. The Complainant obtained the registration of the EXTIME FOOD & BEVERAGE Trademarks at least four years earlier than the Respondent registered the Disputed Domain

Name in 2025. Taking into account all circumstances of this case, the Panel finds that the Respondent was well aware of the Complainant's business and its EXTIME FOOD & BEVERAGE Trademarks when registering the confusingly similar Disputed Domain Name that incorporates the Complainant's EXTIME FOOD & BEVERAGE Trademarks. The Panel considers it is bad faith that the Respondent deliberately chose the Disputed Domain Name to create a likelihood of confusion with the Complainant's EXTIME FOOD & BEVERAGE Trademarks, so as to create a false association or affiliation with the Complainant.

Moreover, the Respondent's knowledge of the Complainant's EXTIME FOOD & BEVERAGE Trademarks is also supported by the use of the Disputed Domain Name for a website purportedly offering the same products and services as those offered by the Complainant. The website under the Disputed Domain Name contains the Complainant's EXTIME FOOD & BEVERAGE Trademarks with geographical term "paris", which collectively refers to one of the Complainant's related companies. In view of the fact that the Disputed Domain Name resolves to the website displaying the Complainant's EXTIME FOOD & BEVERAGE Trademarks, Internet users would most likely be misled into believing that the Disputed Domain Name is related to or authorized by the Complainant. Therefore, the Panel finds that the Respondent intentionally attempts to attract, for commercial gain, Internet users to the Respondent's website by creating a likelihood of confusion with the Complainant's EXTIME FOOD & BEVERAGE Trademarks as to the source, sponsorship, affiliation, or endorsement of the Respondent's website.

Furthermore, taking into account that MX records on the server hosting the Disputed Domain Name have been activated suggests that the Disputed Domain Name may be actively used for email purposes, by means of which the Respondent could solicit personal data (including sensitive personal data) from deceived users of the Complainant's goods and services. Noting the composition of the Disputed Domain Name, the Panel is of the opinion that recipients of any such emails would be under the impression that the emails are associated with or endorsed by the Complainant.

In view of the foregoing, the Panel finds that paragraph 4(a)(iii) of the Policy has been satisfied by the Complainant and accordingly, the Disputed Domain Name was registered and is being used in bad faith.

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 <extimefoodandbeverageparis.com> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Mariia Koval/

Mariia Koval

Sole Panelist

Date: April 14, 2026