ARBITRATION
AND
MEDIATION CENTER

WIPO
WORLD
INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY
ORGANIZATION

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

Vueling Airlines v. Ruslan Alexandrev
Case No. D2026-1352

1. The Parties

The Complainant is Vueling Airlines, Spain, represented by ZeroFox, United States of America.

The Respondent is Ruslan Alexandrev, Kyrgyzstan.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <vuelingfly.com> is registered with Sav.com, LLC (the "Registrar").

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the "Center") on March 30, 2026. On March 30, 2026, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On March 30, 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 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 amendment to the Complaint on April 8, 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 April 10, 2026. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was July 1, 2026.

The Respondent sent informal communication to the Center on April 10, 2026. On April 15, 2026, the proceedings were suspended until May 15, 2026. The suspension was extended on May 18, 2026, to June 14, 2026. The proceedings were reinstituted on June 16, 2026, upon the Complainant's request. The due date for Response was July 1, 2026. The Respondent did not submit any formal Response.

The Center appointed Ganna Prokhorova as the sole panelist in this matter on July 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 is a low-cost Spanish airline headquartered in Barcelona, Spain. Founded in 2004, the Complainant is the largest airline in Spain, operating a fleet of over 100 passenger planes and 122 destinations.

The Complainant is the owner of numerous trademark registrations incorporating the mark VUELING, including, inter alia:

- European Union trademark registration VUELING (word), No. 003190576, registered on April 29, 2004, in class 39;

- European Union trademark registration VUELING (word), No. 004532834, registered on May 23, 2009, in classes 35 and 36; and

- International Trademark Registration VUELING (word), No. 1011739, registered on June 26, 2009, in classes 35, 39 and 43.

The Complainant owns the domain name <vueling.com> since 2003.

The disputed domain name was registered on November 28, 2025. As of the date of this Decision, the disputed domain name resolves to a third-party domain parking page displaying a “coming soon” notice together with apparent pay-per-click (“PPC”) category links, including links relating to style and fashion, business and finance, films, music and audio, and video games. The Complainant contends that it previously redirected to the Complainant’s official website at the domain name <vueling.com>.

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:

1. The disputed domain name is confusingly similar to the Complainant’s trademark, since it incorporates the VUELING mark in its entirety. The addition of the word “fly”, which happens to be descriptive of the Complainant’s services, does not prevent the finding of confusing similarity;

2. The Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the disputed domain name. The Respondent is not affiliated with the Complainant, has no license or authorization to use the VUELING mark, and is not commonly known by “VUELING”. The disputed domain name redirected to the Complainant’s official domain name, and there is no evidence or archive of any legitimate content being hosted in the past, which is not a bona fide offering of goods or services; and

3. The disputed domain name was registered and is being used in bad faith. The disputed domain name was registered on November 28, 2025. The disputed domain name redirected Internet users to the Complainant’s official website, without any independent content capable of distinguishing the disputed

domain name from the Complainant or its services. Such redirection demonstrates that the Respondent was fully aware of the Complainant and its VUELING trademark at the time of registration and deliberately sought to take advantage of the reputation for its own benefit. The Respondent's use of a privacy service to conceal its identity and contact details further supports a finding of bad faith.

B. Respondent

The Respondent did not substantively reply to the Complainant's contentions. In its email communication of April 10, 2026, it stated that the website at the disputed domain name was created solely for informational purposes, and each page of the website included a statement indicating that the site is informational and not affiliated with the Complainant. He further indicated that he had no objection to the cancellation of the disputed domain name.

6. Discussion and Findings

Paragraph 15(a) of the Rules provides that the Panel is to decide the Complaint on the basis of the statements and documents submitted in accordance with the Policy, the Rules, and any rules and principles of law that it deems applicable.

The onus is on the Complainant to make out its case, and it is apparent, both from the terms of the Policy and the decisions of past UDRP panels, that the Complainant must show that all three elements set out in paragraph 4(a) of the Policy have been established before any order can be made to transfer the disputed domain name. In UDRP cases, the standard of proof is the balance of probabilities.

To succeed in a UDRP complaint, the Complainant has to demonstrate that all the elements listed in paragraph 4(a) of the Policy have been satisfied, namely:

(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 respect of the disputed domain name; and

(iii) the disputed domain name has been registered and is being used in bad faith.

The Panel has reviewed the entire case file and the evidence provided. The Panel is also guided, where pertinent, by the WIPO Overview of WIPO Panel Views on Select UDRP Questions ("WIPO Overview 3.1"), which reflects consensus positions of UDRP panels on many common issues. The Panel will make reference to these consensus views in the analysis below as applicable.

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 mark and the disputed domain name. WIPO Overview 3.1, section 1.7.

Based on the evidence submitted by the Complainant, the Panel finds that the Complainant has shown rights in respect of its VUELING mark for the purposes of the Policy. WIPO Overview 3.1, section 1.2.1.

The Panel finds that the Complainant's mark is recognizable within the disputed domain name. The disputed domain name incorporates the Complainant's VUELING mark in its entirety, with the only differences being the addition of the term "fly". In accordance with WIPO Overview 3.1, section 1.8, addition of other terms, whether descriptive, geographical, pejorative, meaningless, or otherwise, would not prevent a finding of confusing similarity under the first element, as the Complainant's mark remains clearly recognizable within the disputed domain name.

The Panel further notes that the generic Top-Level Domain ("gTLD") ".com" is required only for technical reasons and is generally disregarded for the purposes of comparison of the Complainant's mark to the disputed domain name. WIPO Overview 3.1, section 1.11.1.

Accordingly, the Panel concludes that the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to the Complainant's mark and that the first element of paragraph 4(a) of the Policy is satisfied.

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 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 record, the Panel finds that the Complainant has made a prima facie showing that the Respondent lacks rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name.

The Panel notes that the Complainant is a Spanish airline providing air transportation services. Therefore, in the Panel's view the Respondent's inclusion of the term "fly" in the disputed domain name signals that the Respondent was targeting the Complainant when registering the disputed domain dame.

Further, the Complainant submits that, at the time of filing of the Complaint, the disputed domain name redirected to the Complainant's official website. However, the Panel has not been provided with supporting evidence of such redirection that would show a source domain name, and was unable to verify it through its own research. Similarly, the Respondent has not provided any evidence to support its contention that the website had displayed informational content and included a disclaimer as to its lack of affiliation with the Complainant. In any event, as of the date of this Decision, the disputed domain name resolves to a parking page displaying apparent PPC links.

Such parking of the disputed domain name does not constitute a bona fide offering of goods or services under paragraph 4(c)(i) of the Policy in the circumstances of this case. Nor does the Respondent's conduct qualify as a legitimate noncommercial or fair use of the disputed domain name under paragraph 4(c)(iii) of the Policy. Accordingly, the Respondent has failed to demonstrate rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name. WIPO Overview 3.1, section 2.9.

The Panel further notes that the Complainant has established trademark rights in VUELING trademark and has confirmed that it has no relationship with the Respondent. The Respondent has not been authorized, licensed, or otherwise permitted to use the Complainant's trademarks. There is also no evidence that the Respondent is commonly known by the disputed domain name within the meaning of paragraph 4(c)(ii) of the Policy.

In view of the above, the Panel concludes that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name. Accordingly, the Complainant has satisfied the requirement of paragraph 4(a)(ii) 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 finds that the Respondent both registered and is using the disputed domain name in bad faith under paragraph 4(b) of the Policy.

The Complainant is a low-cost Spanish airline established in 2004 and is the largest airline in Spain. The Complainant has operated under and become widely known by the VUELING mark and currently serves 122 destinations with a fleet of more than 100 passenger aircraft.

The disputed domain name was registered on November 28, 2025, many years after the Complainant's rights in the trademark VUELING had been established. Given the Complainant's reputation internationally and the distinctive nature of its VUELING mark, the Panel finds it implausible that the Respondent was unaware of the Complainant's rights. The composition itself, mirroring the Complainant's trademark in full and the addition of the term "fly", demonstrates clear targeting. Such composition inherently suggests an association with the Complainant and constitutes an intentional attempt to exploit the goodwill of the Complainant's trademark. WIPO Overview 3.1, section 3.2.1.

The Panel further finds that the Respondent's conduct falls within paragraph 4(b)(iv) of the Policy. By registering the disputed domain name that wholly incorporates the Complainant's well-known VUELING trademark together with the term "fly", the Respondent has attempted to attract Internet users to its site by creating a likelihood of confusion as to the source, sponsorship, affiliation, or endorsement of the disputed domain name.

The Respondent has not provided any explanation as to which informational purpose the website was supposed to serve, nor any evidence of such claimed use. The Panel notes that the Complainant, by contrast, contends that the disputed domain name previously redirected to its official website. At the date of this Decision, it resolves to a page displaying PPC links.

Considering the totality of the circumstances, including the Complainant's established trademark rights, the Respondent's reproduction of the Complainant's VUELING mark, and the clear absence of any rights or legitimate interests, the Panel concludes that the disputed domain name was registered and is being used in bad faith under paragraph 4(a)(iii) of the Policy.

Accordingly, the third element of paragraph 4(a) of the Policy has been established.

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 <vuelingfly.com> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Ganna Prokhorova/
Ganna Prokhorova
Sole Panelist
Date: July 20, 2026