

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

ATOS S.E. v. Meghasyam Madineni, Quantivier Business Line Private Limited

Case No. D2026-1312

1. The Parties

The Complainant is ATOS S.E., France, represented by CSC Digital Brand Services Group AB, Sweden.

The Respondent is Meghasyam Madineni, Quantivier Business Line Private Limited, India.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <atos.one> is registered with GoDaddy.com, LLC (the “Registrar”).

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the “Center”) on March 26, 2026. On March 27, 2026, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On March 27, 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 (Registration Private / Domains By Proxy, LLC) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on March 30, 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 31, 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 April 8, 2026. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was April 28, 2026. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent’s default on April 29, 2026.

The Center appointed Estela Mariel de Luca as the sole panelist in this matter on May 1, 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

Founded in 1997 and headquartered in Bezons, France, the Complainant is an international information technologies services company operating in 54 countries. The Complainant specializes in cybersecurity, cloud, and high-performance computing solutions for clients across multiple industries.

The Complainant is the owner of various trademark registrations including:

- International trademark No. 1089066 for ATOS, registered on July 11, 2011, in international classes 9, 35, 38 and 42.
- International trademark No. 1088736 for **AtoS**, registered on July 20, 2011, in international classes 9, 35, 38 and 42.
- United Kingdom trademark No. UK00900497016 for ATOS, registered on February 15, 2000, in international classes 9, 16, 35, 36, 37, 38, 41 and 42.

The Complainant is also the registrant of the domain name <atos.net>, registered on June 6, 1997.

The disputed domain name was registered on January 22, 2026, and redirects users to the Complainant's official website at "www.atos.net". The Complainant has also provided evidence indicating that the Respondent has configured mail exchange ("MX") records for the disputed domain name to enable its potential usage to send emails associated with the 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 name.

Notably, the Complainant contends that the disputed domain name wholly incorporates its ATOS trademark and is therefore identical to the mark for purposes of the Policy. The Complainant further submits that the ".one" generic Top-Level Domain ("gTLD") is a standard registration requirement and should be disregarded for purposes of the confusing similarity assessment.

The Complainant further contends that the Respondent is neither sponsored by nor affiliated with the Complainant and has not been granted any license, permission, or authorization to use the ATOS trademark, including in connection with a domain name. The Complainant submits that there is no evidence that the Respondent is commonly known by the disputed domain name.

The Complainant further contends that the disputed domain name has not been used in connection with a bona fide offering of goods or services or a legitimate noncommercial or fair use, but instead redirects Internet users to the Complainant's official website.

The Complainant submits that the Respondent was necessarily aware of the Complainant's well-known prior ATOS trademark at the time of registration, given that the disputed domain name wholly incorporates the mark, and that such use creates a likelihood of confusion as to source, sponsorship, affiliation, or endorsement.

The Complainant further contends that the configuration of MX records indicates a risk that the disputed domain name may be used for fraudulent email communications, including possible phishing activity impersonating the Complainant. The Complainant also contends that the Respondent's use of privacy service and failure to respond to cease-and-desist communications constitute additional evidence of bad faith.

B. Respondent

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

6. Discussion and Findings

Under paragraph 4(a) of the Policy, the Complainant carries the burden of proving:

- (i) that the disputed domain name is identical or confusingly similar to a trademark or service mark in which the Complainant has rights;
- (ii) that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the disputed domain name;
- (iii) that the disputed domain name has been registered and is being used in bad faith.

The Respondent's default in the case at hand does not automatically result in a decision in favor of the Complainant, however, paragraph 5(f) of the Rules provides that if the Respondent does not submit a Response, in the absence of exceptional circumstances, the Panel shall decide the dispute based upon the Complaint.

Further, according to paragraph 14(b) of the Rules, the Panel may draw such inferences from the Respondent's failure to submit a Response as it considers appropriate.

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 without any additions. Accordingly, the disputed domain name identical to the mark for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.7.

Further, it is well established that the gTLD ".one" may be disregarded for the purpose of assessing confusing similarity under the first element of the Policy. See section 1.11 of the [WIPO Overview 3.1](#).

In light of the above, the Panel finds that the disputed domain name is identical to the Complainant's ATOS trademark for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.7.

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.

The evidence shows that the disputed domain name redirects to the Complainant’s official website and has been configured with active MX records, creating a risk of deceptive email communications impersonating the Complainant. Panels have consistently found that such conduct cannot confer rights or legitimate interests on a respondent. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), sections 2.5.3.

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 Respondent was aware of the Complainant’s ATOS trademark at the time of registration, given that the disputed domain name wholly incorporates the mark. The Panel further notes that the disputed domain name redirects to the Complainant’s official website and has been configured with active MX records, creating a risk of fraudulent or deceptive email activity. Such conduct supports a finding that the Respondent intentionally sought to create a likelihood of confusion with the Complainant’s mark within the meaning of paragraph 4(b)(iv) of the Policy.

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 <atos.one> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Estela Mariel de Luca/

Estela Mariel de Luca

Sole Panelist

Date: May 15, 2026