

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

ALSTOM v. Haley Bain

Case No. D2026-2064

1. The Parties

The Complainant is ALSTOM, France, represented by Lynde & Associates, France.

The Respondent is Haley Bain, Germany.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

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

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the “Center”) on May 13, 2026. On May 15, 2026, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On May 18, 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 (Privacy service provided by Withheld for Privacy ehf) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on the same day, 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 20, 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 26, 2026. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was June 15, 2026. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent’s default on June 23, 2026.

The Center appointed Andrew F. Christie as the sole panelist in this matter on June 30, 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 French company created in 1928. It is a global leader in power generation, power transmission and rail infrastructure, employing 36,000 professionals in more than 60 countries. It develops and markets a complete range of systems, equipment, and services in the railway industry, and has activities around the world, including in Germany, Sweden, Netherlands (Kingdom of the), Germany, Iceland, the United Kingdom, Ireland, the United States of America ("United States"), and Canada.

The Complainant holds trademark registrations for word marks and figurative marks consisting of or containing ALSTOM, including European Union Trade Mark No. 000948729 (registered on August 8, 2001) and United States Trademark No. 4570546 (registered on July 22, 2014), both for the word mark ALSTOM. The Complainant is also the registrant of numerous domain names under various generic Top-Level Domains ("gTLDs") and country-code Top-Level Domains ("ccTLDs"), including <alstom.com>, <alstom.net>, <alstom.org>, <alstom.de> and <alstom.fr>.

The disputed domain name was registered on April 16, 2026. The Complainant provided a screenshot dated May 5, 2026, showing the disputed domain name did not resolve to an active site. On April 24, 2026, the Complainant's representative sent an email to the Registrar requesting that it cut off access to all content accessible at the Uniform Resource Locator ("URL") "www.alstomsgroup.com". On the same date, the Complainant also sent an email to the registrant's contact email address provided in the public Whois information, requesting immediate transfer of the disputed domain name. No satisfying response was received to either email.

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.

The Complainant contends that the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to a trademark in which it has rights on the following grounds, among others. The disputed domain name results from the combination of: (i) the elements "alstom", which reproduces the Complainant's prior trademarks, and the "s" letter; (ii) the element "group", which is a clear misspelling of the term "group" and only refers to a group of companies; and (iii) the suffix ".com", which only indicates that the disputed domain name is registered in the gTLD ".com". The denomination "group" and the "s" letter will be directly perceived by the Internet users as referring to the Complainant's group of companies. Given that the ALSTOM name is reproduced and associated with a misspelled term, there is no doubt that there is a risk of confusion.

The Complainant contends that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name on the following grounds, among others. The Respondent has failed to prove its rights or legitimate interests in respect of the disputed domain name under Paragraph 4(a)(ii) of the Policy. The Respondent is not affiliated in any way with the Complainant. The Complainant has not authorized, licensed or permitted the Respondent to register or use a domain name incorporating its trademark. The Respondent has not applied for or obtained any trademark registrations related to the sign ALSTOM, and is not commonly known under the name ALSTOM. The Respondent's name ("Haley Bain") does not contain the name "Alstom" in any way. The Respondent therefore cannot have any rights or legitimate interests in this regard.

The Complainant contends that the Respondent has registered and is using the disputed domain name in bad faith on the following grounds, among others. The disputed domain name incontestably reproduces the Complainant's trademark, and was acquired long after the ALSTOM trademark became well-known. In view of the well-known character of the name ALSTOM, it is virtually impossible that the Respondent was not aware of the Complainant's activities at the time it registered the disputed domain name. The Respondent remained silent and did not reply to the Complainant's claim in order to put forward its legitimacy or rights to the disputed domain name, while it had the opportunity to do so. The Respondent attempts by any means to conceal its identity, namely by registering the disputed domain name via an anonymization company. The registrant contact information provided by the Center did not allow for the identification of the Respondent, and is likely to be false. The disputed domain name is a clear case of deliberate typo-squatting. The Respondent does not use the disputed domain name in relation to a bona fide offering of goods or services, as it reverts to a page displaying an error message. The registration and use of the disputed domain name take unfair advantage of the Complainant's reputation. The disputed domain name, which imitates the reputed mark ALSTOM, will most likely be used to send credulous emails, pretending to be the Complainant. This registration and this use are likely to lead the public to assume that the disputed domain name is associated with the Complainant and thus will result in confusion as to who owns and operates under the disputed domain name.

B. Respondent

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

6. Discussion and Findings

A. Identical or Confusingly Similar

The Complainant has shown rights in respect of a trademark or service mark for the purposes of the Policy. WIPO Overview of WIPO Panel Views on Select UDRP Questions (["WIPO Overview 3.1"](#)), section 1.2.1. It is the owner of a registration for the word trademark ALSTOM.

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 entirety of the Complainant's ALSTOM word trademark is reproduced within the disputed domain name, with only the addition of the letter "s", the string "gruop", and the gTLD ".com". The Complainant's word trademark is recognizable within the disputed domain name. Although the addition of other terms may bear on assessment of the second and third elements, the Panel finds the addition of the letter "s" and the string "gruop" does not prevent a finding of confusing similarity between the disputed domain name and the trademark 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.

The Respondent is not a licensee of the Complainant, is not otherwise affiliated with the Complainant, and has not been authorized by the Complainant to use its ALSTOM word trademark. The Respondent has not provided any evidence that it has been commonly known by, or has made a bona fide use of, the disputed domain name, or that it has, for any other reason, rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name. The composition of the disputed domain name carries a risk of implied affiliation with the Complainant. The evidence provided by the Complainant shows that the disputed domain name does not resolve to an active website. The Complainant has put forward a prima facie case that the Respondent lacks rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name, and the Respondent has not rebutted this. Accordingly, the Panel finds that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name.

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.

As section 3.3 of the [WIPO Overview 3.1](#) explains, since the inception of the UDRP panelists have found that the non-use of a domain name does not prevent a finding of use in bad faith under the doctrine of passive holding. The factors that panels have considered relevant in determining if a passive holding of a domain name amounts to use in bad faith include the degree of distinctiveness or reputation of the complainant’s mark, the failure of the respondent to submit a response or to provide any evidence of actual or contemplated good faith use, and the implausibility of any good faith use to which the domain name might be put in light of the composition of the domain name in relation to the relevant mark.

The disputed domain name was registered many decades after the Complainant first used, and more than two decades after the Complainant first registered, its ALSTOM word trademark. It is inconceivable that the Respondent registered the disputed domain name ignorant of the existence of the Complainant’s trademark, given that the Complainant’s trademark is highly distinctive and has been heavily used, and that the disputed domain name consists of that trademark with the mere addition of the letter “s” (a pluralization of the Complainant’s name) and the string “gruop” (a misspelling of “group”), which alludes to a group associated with the Complainant. Given the Respondent’s lack of rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name, and the confusing similarity of the disputed domain name to the Complainant’s word trademark, any use of the disputed domain name by the Respondent almost certainly would imply an affiliation with the Complainant that does not exist, and so would be a use in bad faith. Furthermore, given the above and that the Respondent has not submitted a Response to the Complaint, it is not possible to conceive of any good faith use to which the Respondent could put the disputed domain name. Therefore, even if the Respondent has not actually used the disputed domain name to engage in a bad faith activity, its passive holding of the disputed domain name is in bad faith. Accordingly, the Panel finds that the disputed domain name has been registered and is being used in bad faith.

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 <alstomsgroup.com> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Andrew F. Christie/

Andrew F. Christie

Sole Panelist

Date: July 14, 2026