

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

AMUNDI ASSET MANAGEMENT v. Sandra ALLO

Case No. D2026-1982

1. The Parties

The Complainant is AMUNDI ASSET MANAGEMENT, France, represented by Nameshield, France.

The Respondent is Sandra ALLO, France.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <amundicredit.info> is registered with Register SPA (the “Registrar”).

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the “Center”) on May 7, 2026. On May 8, 2026, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On May 11, 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 May 15, 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 May 18, 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 May 18, 2026. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was June 7, 2026. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent’s default on June 8, 2026.

The Center appointed Benjamin Fontaine as the sole panelist in this matter on June 12, 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 Amundi Asset Management. It is one of Europe's leading asset managers by assets under management. With over 100 million retail, institutional and corporate clients, it ranks among the top ten asset managers worldwide.

The Complainant is the owner of the international trade mark AMUNDI registered under No. 1024160 since September 24, 2009, and duly renewed.

The disputed domain name <amundicredit.info> was registered on May 6, 2026.

At the time of the filing of the Complaint, the disputed domain name resolved to a blank page.

When drafting this decision, the disputed domain name is resolving to a parking page of a registrar.

A mail exchange ("MX") server has been set up in relation to the disputed domain name, enabling the Respondent to create email addresses.

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 similar to its earlier trade mark AMUNDI to the point of creating confusion as the disputed domain name contains said trade mark in its entirety and the addition of the generic term "credit" is not sufficient to avoid the likelihood of confusion.

Then, the Complainant claims that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the disputed domain name. The Complainant asserts that the Respondent is not known by the disputed domain name. The Complainant also submits that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the disputed domain name and that she is not authorized in any way to use the trade mark AMUNDI. Besides, as the disputed domain name is inactive, the Complainant argues that this further demonstrates the Respondent's absence of legitimate interest in the disputed domain name.

Third, the Complainant submits in substance that the disputed domain name was registered and is being used in bad faith under the passive holding doctrine.

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 "credit", may bear on assessment of the second and third elements, the Panel finds the addition of such term 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.

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.

The Panel finds that the disputed domain name is confusingly similar with the Complainant's prior trade mark AMUNDI, which is intrinsically distinctive and known in the market. Besides, the element "credit" within the disputed domain name refers to the Complainant's activities.

In view of these elements, the Panel considers that the Respondent could not reasonably be unaware of the

Complainant's rights when it registered the disputed domain name.

Besides, the disputed domain name appears not used.

However, panels have found that the non-use of a domain name (including a blank or "coming soon" page) would not by itself prevent a finding of bad faith under the doctrine of passive holding. In fact, looking at the totality of circumstances in each case, panels have found that the registration and non-use of a domain name can still constitute bad faith for purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 3.3.

Having reviewed the available record, the Panel notes the distinctiveness and the reputation of the Complainant's trade mark, the composition of the disputed domain name, and the Respondent's failure to participate in this procedure, and finds that in the circumstances of this case the passive holding of the disputed domain name does not prevent a finding of bad faith under the Policy.

Further, bearing in mind the composition of the disputed domain name, the configuration of an MX server in connection with it, and the fact that the Complainant operates in the field of finance, which is particularly exposed to frauds, notably phishing, the Panel cannot conceive any good faith use of the disputed domain name that would not interfere with the Complainant's rights.

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 <amundicredit.info> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Benjamin Fontaine/

Benjamin Fontaine

Sole Panelist

Date: June 26, 2026