

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

Mistral AI v. jiang zhongbo
Case No. D2026-1398

1. The Parties

The Complainant is Mistral AI, France, represented by Blanche Avocats, France.

The Respondent is jiang zhongbo, China.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <devstral2.com> is registered with CloudFlare, Inc. (the “Registrar”).

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the “Center”) on April 1, 2026. On April 2, 2026, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On April 2, 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 (N/A) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on April 7, 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 April 9, 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 13, 2026. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was May 3, 2026. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent’s default on May 4, 2026.

The Center appointed Edoardo Fano as the sole panelist in this matter on May 18, 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.

The Panel has not received any requests from the Complainant or the Respondent regarding further submissions, waivers, or extensions of deadlines, and the Panel has not found it necessary to request any further information from the Parties.

Having reviewed the communication records in the case file provided by the Center, the Panel finds that the Center has discharged its responsibility under the Rules, paragraph 2(a), “to employ reasonably available means calculated to achieve actual notice to [the] Respondent”. Therefore, the Panel shall issue its Decision based upon the Complaint, the Policy, the Rules, and the Supplemental Rules and without the benefit of a response from the Respondent.

The language of the proceeding is English, being the language of the Registration Agreement, as per paragraph 11(a) of the Rules.

4. Factual Background

The Complainant is Mistral AI, a French company created in 2023 and operating in the generative artificial intelligence field, “devstral” being an open-source AI model for coding agents based on Mistral AI’s LLMs. The Complainant developed and released it under the unregistered trademarks DEVSTRAL and DEVSTRAL2 on December 9, 2025.

The Complainant also operates on the Internet, its official website being “mistral.ai”.

The Complainant provided evidence in support of the above.

According to the Whois records, the disputed domain name was registered on December 10, 2025, that is on the day after the Complainant’s released its “devstral” open-source AI model for coding agents, and it resolves to a website in which the Complainant’s unregistered trademark DEVSTRAL2 is reproduced, often associated with the Complainant’s registered trademarks MISTRAL and MISTRAL AI as well as the Complainant’s figurative trademark M, a platform providing access to an open-source AI model for coding agents is promoted, that is the same service as the Complainant, and there is a link to the Complainant’s official website.

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 states that it has unregistered trademark rights in the DEVSTRAL and DEVSTRAL2 trademarks. The Complainant developed and released the open-source AI model for coding agents under the trademarks on December 9, 2025. The Complainant also argues that the disputed domain name, wholly incorporating the Complainant’s unregistered trademark DEVSTRAL2, and the website resolves therefrom, directly imitate the Complainant’s trademarks, often associated with the Complainant’s registered trademarks MISTRAL and MISTRAL AI as well as the Complainant’s figurative trademark M, and promote a platform providing access to an open-source AI model for coding agents.

The Complainant asserts that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the disputed domain name since it has not been authorized by the Complainant to register the disputed domain name or to use its unregistered trademark DEVSTRAL2 within the disputed domain name, and it is not making either a bona fide offering of goods or services or a legitimate noncommercial or fair use of the disputed domain name. The disputed domain name resolves to a website in which the Complainant’s unregistered trademark DEVSTRAL2 is reproduced and the same AI services as the Complainant are promoted, creating the illusion of a Complainant’s official website and trying to impersonate the Complainant.

The Complainant submits that the Respondent has registered the disputed domain name in bad faith, since the Complainant has been enjoying a worldwide reputation since its creation in 2023, widely relayed by the media, in the generative artificial intelligence field. Therefore, the Respondent targeted the Complainant's unregistered trademark DEVSTRAL2 related to the launch of its "devstral" service at the time of registration of the disputed domain name and the Complainant contends that the use of the disputed domain name, trying to impersonate the Complainant, to intentionally attract, for commercial gain, Internet users to the Respondent's website, creating a likelihood of confusion with the Complainant's unregistered trademark DEVSTRAL2 as to the source, sponsorship, affiliation, or endorsement of the Respondent's website and unfairly benefitting from the Complainant's reputation, qualifies as bad faith registration and use.

B. Respondent

The Respondent has made no reply to the Complainant's contentions and is in default. In reference to paragraphs 5(f) and 14 of the Rules, no exceptional circumstances explaining the default have been put forward or are apparent from the record.

A respondent is not obliged to participate in a proceeding under the Policy, but if it fails to do so, reasonable facts asserted by a complainant may be taken as true, and appropriate inferences, in accordance with paragraph 14(b) of the Rules, may be drawn. WIPO Overview of WIPO Panel Views on Select UDRP Questions ("[WIPO Overview 3.1](#)"), section 4.3.

6. Discussion and Findings

Paragraph 4(a) of the Policy lists three elements, which the Complainant must satisfy in order to succeed:

- (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.

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 3.1](#), section 1.7.

The Panel finds the Complainant has established unregistered trademark or service mark rights for the purposes of the Policy. The fact that a respondent is shown to have been targeting the complainant's mark (e.g., based on the manner in which the related website is used) may support the complainant's assertion that its mark has achieved significance as a source identifier. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.3.

The entirety of the mark is reproduced within the disputed domain name. Accordingly, the disputed domain name is identical to the Complainant's unregistered trademark DEVSTRAL2 for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.7.

It is also well accepted that a generic Top-Level Domain ("gTLD"), in this case ".com", is typically ignored when assessing the similarity between a trademark and a domain name. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.11.1.

Based on the available record, 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.

While 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 often impossible 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. 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.

The Complainant in its Complaint, and as set out above, has established a prima facie case that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name. It asserts that the Respondent, who is not currently associated with the Complainant in any way, is not using the disputed domain name for a legitimate noncommercial or fair use or in connection with a bona fide offering of goods or services.

The prima facie case presented by the Complainant is enough to shift the burden of production to the Respondent to demonstrate that it has rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name. However, the Respondent has not presented any evidence of any rights or legitimate interests it may have in the disputed domain name such as those enumerated in the Policy or otherwise.

The disputed domain name resolves to a website in which the Complainant’s unregistered trademark DEVSTRAL2 is reproduced and the same AI services as the Complainant are promoted, with a link to the Complainant’s official website, creating the illusion of a Complainant’s official website and trying to impersonate the Complainant. Panels have held that the use of a domain name for illegal activity, here impersonation/passing off, can never confer rights or legitimate interests on a respondent. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 2.13.1.

The Panel therefore concludes that the disputed domain name is not being used in connection with a bona fide offering of goods or services.

Moreover, the Panel finds that the composition of the disputed domain name carries a high risk of implied affiliation as it effectively impersonates or suggests sponsorship or endorsement by the Complainant. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 2.5.1.

Based on the available record, 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, regarding the registration in bad faith of the disputed domain name, based on the fact that the latter was registered on the day after the Complainant’s released its “devstral” open-source AI model for coding agents, the Panel finds that the Respondent knew more likely than not of the Complainant, and deliberately registered the disputed domain name in bad faith, especially because in the website at the disputed domain name the Respondent is promoting the same AI services as the Complainant, providing a link to the Complainant’s official website.

The Panel further notes that the disputed domain name is also being used in bad faith since on the website at the disputed domain name a platform providing access to an open-source AI model for coding agents is promoted, that is the Complainant's business activity. Therefore, the Panel finds that under the circumstances of this case the Respondent is trying to attract Internet users to its website by creating likelihood of confusion with the Complainant's unregistered trademark DEVSTRAL2 as to the disputed domain name's source, sponsorship, affiliation or endorsement, an activity clearly detrimental to the Complainant's business. In this regard, the Panel also refers to [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 3.8, and finds that the Respondent registered the disputed domain name to unfairly capitalize on the Complainant's nascent trademark rights.

The above suggests to the Panel that the Respondent more likely than not intentionally registered and is using the disputed domain name in order both to disrupt the Complainant's business, and to attract Internet users to its website in accordance with paragraph 4(b)(iv) of the Policy.

Furthermore, panels have held that the use of a domain name for illegal activity, here impersonation/passing off, constitutes bad faith. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 3.4.

Finally, the Panel considers that the nature of the inherently misleading disputed domain name, which is identical to the Complainant's unregistered trademark DEVSTRAL2, further supports a finding of bad faith. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 3.2.1.

Based on the available record, the Panel finds the third element 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, <devstral2.com>, be transferred to the Complainant.

/Edoardo Fano/

Edoardo Fano

Sole Panelist

Date: May 20, 2026