

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

AXA SA v. US8 Gacor
Case No. D2026-0898

1. The Parties

The Complainant is AXA SA, France, represented by Plasseraud IP Avocats, France.

The Respondent is US8 Gacor, Cambodia.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <axamotoronline.com> is registered with NameCheap, Inc. (the “Registrar”).

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the “Center”) on March 2, 2026. On March 2, 2026, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On March 2, 2026, the Registrar transmitted by email to the Center its verification response confirming that the Respondent is listed as the registrant and providing the contact details. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on March 3, 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 amendment to the Complaint on March 5, 2026.

The Center verified that the Complaint together with the amendment to the 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 6, 2026. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was March 26, 2026. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent’s default on March 27, 2026.

The Center appointed Enrique Ochoa de González Argüelles as the sole panelist in this matter on April 7, 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 serves as the holding company of the AXA Group, a globally established and well-known leader in insurance, savings, and asset management. The Group maintains operations in approximately 50 countries spanning Europe, Africa, the Middle East, North and South America, as well as the Asia-Pacific region.

Among others, the Complainant holds rights in the following trademark registrations, hereinafter referred to as the "AXA trademarks":

- International trademark AXA No. 490030, registered on December 5, 1984, for classes 35, 36 and 39;
- International trademark AXA (and logo) No. 1519781, registered on May 29, 2019, for classes 35, 36, 37, 39, 44, and 45; and
- European Union trademark AXA (and logo) No. 000373894, registered on July 29, 1998, for classes 35 and 36,

The Panel confirmed information on AXA trademarks at the WIPO Global Brand and European Union Intellectual Property Office (EUIPO) databases.

The disputed domain name was registered on February 7, 2018.

The disputed domain name <axamotoronline.com> redirects to a gambling website, which, as reviewed by the Panel, which does not display AXA trademarks.

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 AXA Group has a strong, long-standing history and its roots go back to the 18th century.
- After a succession of mergers, acquisitions and name changes involving some of the biggest insurance companies around the world, the trade name AXA was introduced in 1985.
- Since 1988, AXA is traded on the Paris Stock Exchange and in 1996 it becomes listed on New York Stock Exchange.
- Employing 154,000 people worldwide, AXA is a world leader in insurance, saving and assets management, serving 95 million customers.
- AXA Group is famous for its numerous activities in three major lines of business: property and casualty insurance, life insurance and savings (retirement products, personal protection and healthcare products), and asset management (involves investing and managing assets), proposed both to individuals and to business companies.
- The group is present in 50 countries and does business in diversified geographic regions and markets across notably Europe, Africa & Middle East, North et South America and Asia-Pacific.

- The awareness of the trademark AXA is wide regarding the worldwide reputation that enjoys the complainant.
- For nine consecutive years and until 2017, the trademark AXA was considered as the leading global insurance brand and in 2025, the Trademark AXA is rank 43th among the 100 best global brands according to the Interbrand ranking and the value of the brand is steadily increasing, representing over USD 18,300 billion. Then the brand value has risen by 9% from 2024 (USD 16.8 B).
- Complainant is the holder of several trademark registrations in various countries.
- In a very recent decision of April 2, 2025, the Paris Court of Appeal has notably recognized the notoriety of this French trademark AXA No.1 270 658.
- The Complainant is the owner of the following domain names, which reproduce identically the AXA trademarks: <axa.com> registered on October 23, 1995, <axa.fr> registered on May 20, 1996, <axa.net> registered on November 1, 1997, and <axa.info> registered on July 30, 2001.
- The disputed domain name <axamotoronline.com> reproduces identically the trademark AXA which as itself has no particular meaning and is therefore highly distinctive.
- The addition of the terms “motor” and “online” does not prevent the likelihood of confusion between the disputed domain name and the Complainant’s trademark as they are generic and non-distinctive terms, in another words terms that Internet users would certainly not remember comparing to the well-known and distinctive mark, AXA.
- The disputed domain name is confusingly identical to the trademarks in which the Complainant has prior rights (sic).
- The Complainant has never licensed or otherwise permitted the Respondent to use its trademarks or to register any domain name including the above-mentioned trademarks and then to register the disputed domain name <axamotoronline.com>.
- There is obviously no relationship whatsoever between the parties involved. For this first reason, the Respondent has no prior rights and/or legitimate interest in justifying the use of the Complainant’s trademarks.
- The Respondent has clearly adopted the Complainant’s trademark, which has acquired a substantial reputation around the world, for its own use and incorporated it into its domain name without the Complainant’s authorization.
- The Respondent has not been commonly known by the domain name or even associated with the mark AXA, whereas the AXA trademark appears to be well-known.
- The Respondent is not making legitimate noncommercial or fair use of the domain name, without intent for commercial gain to misleading divert consumers or to tarnish the trademark or service mark at issue.
- The disputed domain name automatically redirects to a gambling website (“Airbet88”) under the website “www.duevaligieinviaggio.com”. It’s obvious that such a redirection to a gambling site suggests an intent to exploit the Complainant’s marks for commercial gain, which contradicts any claim to noncommercial or bona fide activities.
- The Respondent has no rights or legitimate intertest in respect of the disputed domain name <axamotoronline.com>.

- The Respondent was aware of the Complainant's AXA trademarks at the time that he acquired the disputed domain name.
- The Complainant's well-known trademark, which is indeed distinctive since it has no particular meaning, is entirely reproduced in the disputed domain name, not being the additions made to it sufficient to avoid the likelihood of confusion between the disputed domain name and the Complainant's trademark.
- The Respondent purposely chose and registered the domain name <axamotoronline.com> using the term "axa" from the Complainant's trademark in its entirety.
- The Respondent does not need the disputed domain name but that it chose and registered <axamotoronline.com> in bad faith in order to take predatory advantage of the Complainant's reputation.
- Respondent's bad faith is also evident regarding the use of the disputed domain name <axamotoronline.com> registered on February 7, 2018.
- The disputed domain name automatically redirects to a gambling website ("Airbet88") under the website "www.duevaligieinviaggio.com" and such use undoubtedly demonstrates the Respondent's bad faith.
- The disputed domain name <axamotoronline.com> was registered intentionally and is being used in bad faith by the Respondent without any rights or legitimate interest.

B. Respondent

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

6. Discussion and Findings

Under the Policy, the Complainant is required to prove on the balance of probabilities that:

- (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 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 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 AXA trademarks recognizable within the disputed domain name. Accordingly, the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to the AXA trademarks for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.7.

Although the addition of other terms such as “motor” and “online” 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 3.1](#), section 1.8. *AXA SA v. Cesar Martínez Romero, segurodeimpago*, WIPO Case No. [D2024-1064](#), and *AXA SA v. Damon Nelson, Quantec, LLC/ Novo Point LLC*, WIPO Case No. [D2015-0286](#).

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 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.

Moreover, UDRP Panels have decided cases taking into consideration circumstances like:

- the Respondent is not commonly known by the disputed domain name, which is the case; and
- the Respondent is not using the disputed domain name in connection with a bona fide offering of goods or services, nor a legitimate noncommercial or fair use.

In the present case, the disputed domain name combines the Complainant’s AXA trademarks with the words “motor” and “online”, giving the impression that it will resolve to a website for the Complainant’s customers.

The Panel notes that Respondent has not been authorized to use Complainant’s AXA trademarks, either as domain name or in any other way.

Also, there is no reason to believe that Respondent’s name somehow corresponds with the disputed domain name and the Respondent does not appear to have any rights associated with the AXA trademarks and the terms “motor” and “online” on its own. On the contrary, failure on filing of a formal response amounts to the fact that use of the disputed domain name neither qualifies as bona fide nor as legitimate noncommercial or fair within the meaning of the Policy. For easy reference: *Virgin Enterprises Limited v. Irina Zenenkova*, WIPO Case No. [D2023-3368](#).

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.

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.

It is worth mentioning that, in terms of the evidence of the case:

- The disputed domain name was registered after the AXA trademarks; and
- The composition of the disputed domain name with the aim of misleading cybernauts indicates that the Respondent was aware of the existence of the Complainant and its AXA trademarks.

The Panel finds that the Respondent registered the disputed domain name in bad faith targeting the Complainant.

In the present case, the Panel observes that the disputed domain name automatically redirects Internet users to gambling-related content. Such use constitutes compelling evidence of bad faith registration and use. By employing a domain name that incorporates the Complainant's mark to redirect users to unrelated third-party websites, the Respondent is clearly seeking to attract Internet users by creating a likelihood of confusion as to source, sponsorship, affiliation, or endorsement. This conduct reflects an intent to capitalize on the goodwill associated with the Complainant's mark for commercial gain.

Moreover, the redirection of users to gambling-related websites supports the finding of bad faith, as it exposes the Complainant's mark to content that is wholly unrelated to its business and may be detrimental to its reputation. Panels have consistently held that the association of a complainant's trademark with gambling or other potentially controversial content may constitute brand tarnishment, further supporting a conclusion of bad faith use. For easy reference: *The Kraft Heinz Company v. feng sui*, WIPO Case No. [D2025-2453](#).

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 <axamotoronline.com> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Enrique Ochoa de González Argüelles/
Enrique Ochoa de González Argüelles
Sole Panelist
Date: April 21, 2026