

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

Safran v. Tom Ten

Case No. D2026-1000

1. The Parties

The Complainant is Safran, France, represented by Ebrand France, France.

The Respondent is Tom Ten, United States of America.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <safran--group.com> is registered with Hostinger Operations, UAB (the "Registrar").

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the "Center") on March 9, 2026. On March 10, 2026, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On March 10, 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 March 11, 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 11, 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 27, 2026. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was April 16, 2026. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent's default on April 17, 2026.

The Center appointed Taras Kyslyy as the sole panelist in this matter on April 23, 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 an international high-technology group, operating in the aviation, defense and space markets. The Complainant has a global presence, with more than 95,000 employees and sales of EUR 16,5 billion in 2020. The Complainant is listed on NYSE Euronext Paris. Its share is part of the French stock market index, CAC 40, and of the European market index.

The Complainant is the owner of numerous trademarks composed of SAFRAN, including for instance international trademark registration No. 884321, registered on August 5, 2005.

The Complainant is also the holder of numerous domain names composed of the SAFRAN trademark and the term “group”, for instance <safran-group.com>, <safran-group.fr>, and <safrangroup.com>. These domain names are resolving or redirecting to the website at “www.safran-group.com”, which promotes the activities of the Complainant.

The disputed domain name was registered on January 27, 2026 and resolves to a Registrar parking page suggesting to “Verify your email to get your website back online”. The disputed domain name was used to send fraudulent emails to impersonate the Complainant.

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 identical or confusingly similar to the Complainant’s trademark. The combination “safran group” refers directly to the Complainant and its activities. The Complainant’s domain name portfolio contains domain names composed of “safran” and “group”. If the term “safran group” is searched on the Internet, the results we get concern all, and without exception, the Complainant’s trademark. The Respondent necessarily chose to register the disputed domain name in reference to the Complainant’s trademark and that the term “safran group” is not used in everyday language. The disputed domain name closely resembles the official domain name of the Complainant with only the addition of an extra hyphen. This highly strong similarity is characteristic of typosquatting practices.

The Complainant also contends that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name. The sole use made of the disputed domain name by the Respondent was to send fraudulent emails to partners of the Complainant. The Complainant and its trademark are internationally known. The Respondent ought to have been aware of it and cannot reasonably evidence having any legitimate purpose to register the disputed domain name. Given the composition of the disputed domain name which exactly matches the Complainant’s trademark with the term “group”, there is no doubt that the Respondent wanted to refer to the Complainant.

Finally, the Complainant contends that the disputed domain name was registered and is being used in bad faith. The mail server was configured for the disputed domain name. This configuration indicates that the disputed domain name was registered for the purpose of sending emails that appear to originate from the Complainant. Such deceptive use is intended to mislead recipients into disclosing confidential information or carrying out malicious instructions. This conduct creates a genuine risk of phishing and other fraudulent behavior, thereby posing a significant cybersecurity threat. An Internet user searching for information about

the Complainant is very likely to assume, incorrectly, that the disputed domain name belongs to the Complainant. This risk of confusion is substantial and unjustified. There is no legitimate reason for the Respondent to incorporate the Complainant's well-known trademark into the disputed domain name, particularly for sending emails. The Respondent's registration and use of the disputed domain name is intended to divert Internet users, undermine the Complainant's business, and operate against its legitimate interests. Such actions are detrimental to the Complainant.

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 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 entirety of the mark is reproduced 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.

Although the addition of other terms here, two hyphens and "group", 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.

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.

Panels have held that the use of a domain name for illegal activity here, claimed sending fraudulent emails, can never confer rights or legitimate interests on a respondent. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 2.13.1.

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 that the Respondent registered the disputed domain name confusingly similar to the Complainant's trademark and also mimicking the Complainant's respective domain names, and used it to send fraudulent emails falsely pretending to be sent by the Complainant. The Panel finds this confirms the Respondent was aware of and targeted the Complainant and its trademark while registering the disputed domain name, which is bad faith.

Panels have held that the use of a domain name for illegal activity here, claimed sending fraudulent emails constitutes bad faith. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 3.4. Having reviewed the record, the Panel finds the Respondent's registration and use of the disputed domain name constitutes bad faith under the Policy.

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 <safran--group.com> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Taras Kyslyy/

Taras Kyslyy

Sole Panelist

Date: May 7, 2026