ARBITRATION
AND
MEDIATION CENTER

WIPO
WORLD
INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY
ORGANIZATION

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION
Alstom v. Diana iulia, Hedonova LLC
Case No. D2026-0976

1. The Parties

The Complainant is ALSTOM, France, represented by Lynde & Associes, France.

The Respondent is Diana iulia, Hedonova LLC, United States of America (“United States” or “US”).

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <alstorngroup.net> 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 6, 2026. On March 6, 2026, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On March 9, 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 verified that 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 11, 2026. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was March 31, 2026. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent’s default on April 1, 2026.

The Center appointed Francisco Castillo-Chacón as the sole panelist in this matter on April 8, 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, ALSTOM, is a French company founded in 1928 and incorporated with the French Trade and Companies Register of Nanterre under number 389 058 447. ALSTOM is a global leader in transport infrastructures, employing approximately 34,000 professionals in more than 60 countries. For the fiscal year from April 1, 2024 to March 31, 2025, the Complainant's order intake reached EUR 19.8 billion and its sales reached EUR 18.5 billion. The Complainant's activities span the manufacture, maintenance, and overhaul of rolling stock, metro systems, high-speed trains, and urban transport solutions. ALSTOM has been present in the United States for over 160 years and employs approximately 4,500 people across ten sites in that country, serving more than 20 rail and airport customers.

The Complainant is the owner of extensive trademark rights in the mark ALSTOM across numerous jurisdictions, including, among others: US Trademark Registration No. 2898433, filed on October 9, 1998, registered on November 2, 2004, covering services in classes 35, 37 and 42, duly renewed; US Trademark Registration No. 4236513, filed on January 3, 2012, registered on November 6, 2012, in class 12, duly renewed; US Trademark Registration No. 4570546, filed on February 24, 2011, registered on July 22, 2014, covering goods and services in classes 7, 9, 12, 35, 37, 39 and 42, duly renewed; International Registration No. 706292, registered on August 28, 1998, duly renewed, covering goods and services in classes 1, 2, 4, 6, 7, 9, 11, 12, 13, 16, 17, 19, 24, 35, 36, 37, 38, 39, 40, 41 and 42, and designating numerous jurisdictions; and European Union Trade Mark Registration No. 000948729, filed on September 30, 1998, registered on August 8, 2001, duly renewed, covering goods and services in classes 6, 7, 9, 11, 12, 16, 19, 24, 35, 36, 37, 38, 39, 40, 41 and 42. The ALSTOM mark has been recognized as famous and/or well-known by multiple WIPO UDRP panels.

The Complainant also owns a portfolio of domain names incorporating the ALSTOM mark and the denomination "ALSTOM GROUP", including <alstom.com> (registered January 20, 1998), <alstomgroup.com> (registered November 14, 2000), <alstomgroup.net> (registered June 2, 2017), <alstomgroup.fr> (registered June 2, 2017), and <alstomgroup.eu> (registered November 24, 2018). The denomination "Alstom Group" is used by the Complainant to designate the company and its subsidiaries and appears in the email addresses of the Complainant's employees.

The disputed domain name was registered on January 28, 2026, and at time of this Decision resolves to an inactive parking page. The Complainant, however, provided evidence that at least between February 25 and March 6, 2026, the disputed domain name used to resolve to a website containing pay-per-click ("PPC") links pertaining to the Complainant's business (for example, "Global Sourcing", "Industrial Equipment Supplies", "Industrial Automation Company", "Industrial Equipment Suppliers" etc.). On February 5, 2026, the Complainant sent both a trademark cease-and-desist letter to the Respondent and a trademark claim to the Registrar, asserting its prior rights and requesting the transfer of the disputed domain name. The Registrar's only response was to invite the Complainant to file a UDRP complaint. The Respondent did not reply. The Complainant filed the present Complaint on March 6, 2026.

According to the WhoIs information disclosed by the Registrar, the Respondent is identified as "Diana iulia," associated with the organization "Hedonova LLC," with an address in California, US. The Registrant email address listed under a name that does not correspond to the listed registrant. Hedonova LLC appears to be a US investment fund that has no apparent connection to ALSTOM or to the transport sector. The disputed domain name was originally registered behind the privacy service "Privacy service provided by Withheld for Privacy ehf."

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.

With respect to the first element, the Complainant submits that the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to its ALSTOM trademark. The disputed domain name reproduces the ALSTOM mark in a typosquatted form, substituting the letter "m" with the two-character sequence "rn" – a combination that is visually and typographically nearly indistinguishable from "m," particularly at a glance. The Complainant further observes that the shared prefix "alsto" and the appended term "group" mirror the Complainant's own domain name <alstomgroup.net> and the widely used corporate denomination "Alstom Group." The Complainant argues that Internet users would likely read <alstorngroup.net> as <alstomgroup.net>, the Complainant's own domain name.

With respect to the second element, the Complainant contends that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name. The Respondent is not affiliated with the Complainant in any way and has never been authorized to register or use the ALSTOM mark or any confusingly similar variant thereof. The disputed domain name resolves to an inactive page and has never been used in connection with a bona fide offering of goods or services. The Respondent did not respond to the Complainant's cease-and-desist letter.

With respect to the third element, the Complainant argues that the disputed domain name was registered and is being used in bad faith. Given the worldwide fame of the ALSTOM mark, it is virtually impossible that the Respondent was unaware of the Complainant's activities at the time of registration. The deliberate typographical mimicry of "alstom" and the use of the term "group" – which directly mirrors the Complainant's widely used "Alstom Group" corporate identifier – further evidence intentional targeting. The Complainant additionally points to the Respondent's use of a privacy service to conceal its identity and to the inconsistency between the listed registrant name, the associated organization, and the email address provided, as additional circumstantial indicia of bad faith. The Complainant also relies on the passive holding doctrine articulated in *Telstra Corporation Limited v. Nuclear Marshmallows*, WIPO Case No. D2000-0003, noting that the inactive use of a domain name incorporating a well-known mark does not preclude a finding of bad faith.

B. Respondent

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

6. Discussion and Findings

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 the mark is recognizable within the disputed domain name. Accordingly, the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to the mark for the purposes of the Policy. WIPO Overview 3.1, section 1.7.

The Complainant has demonstrated rights in the ALSTOM mark through multiple trademark registrations in numerous jurisdictions, including the United States and the European Union, as well as through International

Registration No. 706292. These registrations date back to 1998 and cover a broad range of goods and services. The Panel finds that the Complainant has established trademark rights in the ALSTOM mark for the purposes of the Policy. WIPO Overview 3.1, section 1.2.1.

The disputed domain name does not reproduce the ALSTOM mark verbatim. Instead, it substitutes the single letter "m" at the end of the mark with the two-character sequence "rn." This is a classic typosquatting technique: the letter "m" and the sequence "rn" are visually nearly identical in most typefaces, such that a user reading the disputed domain name at a glance is highly likely to perceive it as "alstom" rather than "alstorn." As the Complainant correctly notes, UDRP panels have consistently held that domain names constituting typosquatting are, by definition, confusingly similar to the mark being imitated. See, e.g., *Dell Computer Corporation v. Clinical Evaluations*, WIPO Case No. D2002-0423.

Furthermore, the addition of the term "group" after "alstorn"" does not diminish confusing similarity. The Complainant operates under and widely uses the commercial designation "Alstom Group" to refer to the company and its subsidiaries, and owns a family of "alstomgroup" domain names (including <alstomgroup.net> and <alstomgroup.com>). The disputed domain name is therefore a direct typographical imitation of the Complainant's own domain name <alstomgroup.net>, differing only by the substitution of "m" with "rn." UDRP panels have consistently held that the addition of a generic or descriptive term to a trademark does not prevent a finding of confusing similarity. WIPO Overview 3.1, section 1.8.

The generic Top-Level Domain ".net" is typically disregarded in the confusing similarity assessment, as it is a standard registration requirement. WIPO Overview 3.1, section 1.11.1.

The Panel accordingly finds that the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to the Complainant's ALSTOM trademark and 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 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 record discloses no evidence that the Respondent: (i) is known by the name "alstorn", "alstorngroup" or any similar designation; (ii) has been authorized or licensed by the Complainant to use the ALSTOM mark or to register domain names incorporating it; (iii) is making a legitimate noncommercial or fair use of the disputed domain name; or (iv) has been using the disputed domain name in connection with a bona fide offering of goods or services. To the contrary, the disputed domain name has resolved to a parking page displaying PPC links related to the Complainant's area of business before becoming inactive. Applying UDRP paragraph 4(c), panels have found that the use of a domain name to host a parked page comprising PPC links does not represent a bona fide offering where such links compete with or capitalize on the reputation and goodwill of the complainant's mark or otherwise mislead Internet users. WIPO Overview 3.1, section 2.9.

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.

In the present case, the Panel notes that the ALSTOM mark is well-known internationally and predates the disputed domain name by several decades. Multiple WIPO panels have recognized the ALSTOM mark as famous and/or well-known. See, e.g., *ALSTOM v. Daniel Bailey (Registrant I D: tuuROSvPJbZdd2XO)*, WIPO Case No. D2010-1150; *Alstom S.A. and General Electric Company v. Sichuan Shanghai Electric Power T&D Engineering Co., Ltd*, WIPO Case No. DCO2016-0030. Given the Complainant's global presence – including its prominent operations in the United States, where the Respondent is ostensibly located – it is virtually inconceivable that the Respondent was unaware of the Complainant and its marks at the time of registration. The Panel finds that this awareness is established on the balance of probabilities. As WIPO panels have repeatedly observed, the registration of a domain name incorporating a well-known trademark of which the registrant must reasonably be aware constitutes bad faith registration. See, e.g., *Veuve Clicquot Ponsardin, Maison Fondée en 1772 v. The Polygenix Group Co.*, WIPO Case No. D2000-0163.

Second, the Respondent did not merely incorporate the ALSTOM mark into the disputed domain name – the Respondent crafted a typographical imitation of the Complainant's own domain name <alstomgroup.net> by substituting "m" with "rn". This specific targeting of the Complainant's domain name portfolio is not the product of coincidence. The substitution of "m" with "rn" is a deliberate typographic manipulation that exploits the visual similarity between these characters to deceive users who may mistype or misread the disputed domain name as belonging to the Complainant. This conduct falls squarely within the definition of typosquatting, which WIPO panels treat as inherently indicative of bad faith. See Alstom v. Contact Privacy Inc. Customer 1244065242 / Michelle Chung, Chung Limited Co, WIPO Case No. D2019-2718 (finding bad faith where the domain <alstomgruop.com> was used by a respondent who was aware of the ALSTOM mark); *Alstom v. Asha Patel, Alstom*, WIPO Case No. D2024-2311 (domain name <alstomgroup.info>) and *Alstom v. Name Redacted*, WIPO Case No. D2023-4933 (domain name <alstomegroup.com>); *Alstom S.A. and General Electric Company v. Sichuan Electricity Transmission and Distribution Engineering Co., Ltd*, WIPO Case No. DCO2016-0032 (domain name <gecalsthom.co>).

Third, by using the disputed domain name for a website displaying PPC links related to the Complainant's business, the Respondent has intentionally attempted to attract, for commercial gain, Internet users to its website by creating a likelihood of confusion with the Complainant's mark. Policy, paragraph 4(b)(vi). Currently the disputed domain name resolves to an inactive page. While passive holding of a domain name is not, in itself, indicative of bad faith, it is so when viewed in combination with other indicative circumstances. Panels have long recognized that the "passive holding" or non-use of a domain name can constitute bad faith where the complainant's mark is widely known, where the respondent has taken steps to conceal its identity, and where the respondent has failed to respond to communications. *Telstra Corporation Limited v. Nuclear Marshmallows*, WIPO Case No. D2000-0003; WIPO Overview 3.1, section 3.3. These factors are present here and the Panel finds that the current passive holding of the disputed domain name does not prevent a finding of bad faith.

Fourth, the disputed domain name was originally registered through a privacy service ("Privacy service provided by Withheld for Privacy ehf"), shielding the Respondent from identification. When the Registrar disclosed the underlying registrant details to the Center, those details themselves raise serious questions of authenticity: the listed registrant name does not correspond to the name of an individual contained in the

Respondent's contact email and the listed organization is a US investment fund with no connection to the Complainant or the transport sector. This pattern of inconsistency and concealment, taken together, strongly supports an inference of bad faith.

Fifth, the Respondent failed to reply to the Complainant's pre-complaint cease-and-desist letter of February 5, 2026, or to the present administrative proceedings. While silence is not itself determinative, it reinforces the inference of bad faith drawn from the totality of the circumstances.

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 <alstorngroup.net> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Francisco Castillo-Chacón/
Francisco Castillo-Chacón
Sole Panelist
Date: April 17, 2026