

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

Aviapartner Holding NV v. Global Hub

Case No. D2026-2484

1. The Parties

The Complainant is Aviapartner Holding NV, Belgium, represented by Timelex, Belgium.

The Respondent is Global Hub, India.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <aviapartner.net> is registered with Dynadot Inc (the “Registrar”).

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the “Center”) on June 9, 2026. On June 9, 2026, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On June 10, 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 (Name Redacted / Registrant of aviapartner.net (c/o Dynadot) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on June 10, 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 June 15, 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 June 17, 2026. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was July 7, 2026. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent’s default on July 13, 2026.

The Center appointed Frank Schoneveld as the sole panelist in this matter on July 24, 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 provider of airport ground-handling services in Europe and Africa, operates across 75 airports in Angola, Belgium, Estonia, France, Germany, Italy, the Netherlands (the Kingdom of), Spain, South Africa and Switzerland, employing nearly 18,000 professionals and serving over 500 passenger and cargo airlines.

The Complainant is the registrant in a number of countries worldwide, including the following registrations, of the trademark AVIAPARTNER:

<u>Jurisdiction</u>	<u>Registration Number</u>	<u>Date of Registration</u>	<u>Registrant</u>
Benelux	489436	September 1, 1991	Aviapartner Holding
WIPO International Registration with designations in (amongst others): China, Japan, Singapore and Turkey.	572863	June 5, 1991	Aviapartner Holding
India	3084308	October 21, 2015	Aviapartner Holding

The Complainant is the registrant of, and operates through, the domain name <aviapartner.aero> which was created on July 10, 2002 and is used by the Complainant for its commercial activities. The disputed domain name redirects Internet users to the Complainant's own official website at <aviapartner.aero>.

The disputed domain name <aviapartner.net>, was created on December 15, 2025 by the Respondent as registrant of the disputed domain name.

The disputed domain name is configured with an active mail exchange (MX) record routing email through the Registrar's mail-host and a SPF record authorising the Registrar's mail-out servers to send email on behalf of "@aviapartner.net". While it is not clear whether it was the Respondent or another actor who set up this mechanism, it is reasonably clear that the domain is technically capable of sending emails on behalf of "@aviapartner.net".

The Respondent has provided the Registrar with a postal address in India and a Belgian mobile telephone number. The Complainant has made numerous attempts to contact the Respondent through the dedicated contact form maintained by the Registrar for that purpose, however, the Respondent has not responded to any of these attempts to make contact.

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 identical to a trademark or service mark in which the Complainant has rights since the Complainant has had trademark rights in AVIAPARTNER that predate registration of the disputed domain name, having used this trademark since 1949.

The Complainant contends that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the disputed domain name, and that the Complainant has never authorised, licensed or otherwise permitted the Respondent to register or use the Complainant's AVIAPARTNER mark or any domain name incorporating it, and there is no relationship between the two parties. The Complainant asserts that the Respondent's only use of the disputed domain name consists of redirecting Internet users to the Complainant's own official website at <aviapartner.aero>.

The Complainant submits that:

- The Respondent has not used, and has made no demonstrable preparations to use, the disputed domain name in connection with a bona fide offering of goods or services, asserting that the domain name does not resolve to any independent website of the Respondent and instead redirects Internet users to the Complainant's own official website. The Complainant argues that use of a domain name identical to the Complainant's mark to redirect users does not constitute a bona fide offering and confers no legitimate interest, since it serves only to trade on the Complainant's AVIAPARTNER mark while leaving the registrant in unauthorised control of a domain name that is identical to it.
- The Respondent is not commonly known by the disputed domain name, noting that neither the publicly available registration data nor the registrant data subsequently disclosed by the Registrar (which identifies the registrant only as "Global Hub") discloses any name or identifier bearing any relation to AVIAPARTNER, which the Complainant asserts is a distinctive term exclusively associated with the Complainant.
- The Respondent is not making any legitimate non-commercial or fair use of the disputed domain name. The Complainant submits that a domain name identical to a distinctive mark such as the AVIAPARTNER mark of the Complainant, carries a high risk of implied affiliation and cannot constitute fair use, since such an identical mark forecloses any informational, fan-site or comparable defence. The Complainant argues that this is because such use impermissibly impersonates the mark owner (the Complainant) and prevents the Complainant from managing its own Internet presence and corresponding emails under the Complainant's AVIAPARTNER mark. The Complainant notes that the Respondent is not itself offering any goods or services at the disputed domain name but merely redirects internet users to the Complainant's own website, and therefore cannot benefit from any reseller-type defence. The Complainant also contends that the registration and retention of a domain name identical to the Complainant's mark by an undisclosed registrant who has not responded to the Complainant's attempts to make contact demonstrates that the purpose is to exploit the Complainant's AVIAPARTNER mark rather than to make any legitimate non-commercial or fair use of the disputed domain name.

The Complainant contends that the disputed domain name was registered and is being used in bad faith. The Complainant argues that because of the alleged distinctiveness and reputation of the AVIAPARTNER mark, and that the disputed domain name is identical to it, it is inconceivable that the Respondent chose the disputed domain name without knowledge of the Complainant so that the Respondent plainly had the Complainant's mark in mind when registering the disputed domain name, and that this establishes registration in bad faith.

The Complainant contends that the disputed domain name creates an intentional confusion with the Complainant's registered mark since the disputed domain name resolves, by way of redirection, to the Complainant's own official website at <aviapartner.aero>. The Complainant submits that by using the disputed domain name identical to the Complainant's AVIAPARTNER mark to redirect Internet users to the Complainant's genuine site, the Respondent has intentionally created a likelihood of confusion as to the source, sponsorship, affiliation or endorsement of the disputed domain name, thereby falsely suggesting that the disputed domain name is operated or authorised by the Complainant when it is not. The Complainant contends that this is squarely within Policy paragraph 4(b)(iv) arguing that redirecting the disputed domain name to the Complainant's website is evidence supporting a finding of bad faith under that paragraph. The Complainant submits that such redirection does not cure the bad faith but reinforces a finding of bad faith as it lends to the disputed domain name an appearance of legitimacy while the Respondent retains full control to redirect at any time the destination of the website to which the disputed domain name resolves. The

Complainant argues that such use by the Respondent of the Complainant's trademark without its consent is use in bad faith and that this would be the case even if the Respondent were never to direct the disputed domain name away from the Complainant's website, concluding that the concept a party other than the owner of a trademark can control use of a disputed domain name incorporating that trademark, is contrary to the principles of the UDRP.

The Complainant contends also that the Respondent has concealed its identity and failed to respond to the Complainant's correspondence and that concealment of identity and failure to respond reinforces a finding of bad faith. The Complainant submits that the Respondent has affirmatively employed a privacy/proxy registration service to conceal its identity and has not responded to any of the Complainant's repeated attempts to make contact through the dedicated contact form maintained by the Registrar for that purpose, and that while the mere fact of redirection by the Registrar is not in itself evidence of bad faith, where the surrounding circumstances suggest that a respondent is using the concealment of its identity to avoid being contacted in connection with an anticipated complaint, then this supports an inference of bad faith.

B. Respondent

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

6. Discussion and Findings

A. Identical or Confusingly Similar

The Complainant's trademark "AVIAPARTNER" is a mark in which the Complainant has had trademark rights, e.g. in India, the jurisdiction where the Respondent has its address, for more than ten years before the Respondent registered the disputed domain name. The Complainant has also had trademark rights in the Benelux in the mark "AVIAPARTNER" for over 70 years before registration by the Respondent of the disputed domain name.

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 entirety of the Complainant's registered trademark AVIAPARTNER is reproduced within the disputed domain name. Accordingly, the disputed domain name is identical to the mark 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 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 Policy at paragraph 4(b)(iv) provides that, if the Panel finds that the Respondent has intentionally attempted to attract, for commercial gain, Internet users to the Respondent's web site or other on-line location, by creating a likelihood of confusion with the complainant's mark as to the source, sponsorship, affiliation, or endorsement of the web site or location or of a product or service on the web site or location, this shall be evidence of the registration and use of a domain name in bad faith.

In the present case the disputed domain name redirects an Internet user to the Complainant's website at <aviapartner.aero>. By using a domain name identical to the AVIAPARTNER mark to redirect Internet users to the Complainant's official website at <aviapartner.aero>, the Panel accepts that in the circumstances set out in the Complaint (to which the Respondent does not respond) the Respondent has created a likelihood of confusion with the Complainant's AVIAPARTNER mark as to the source or endorsement of the location to which the disputed domain name resolves prior to being redirected to the Complainant's website at <aviapartner.aero>.

The redirection, from the location to which an Internet user is initially directed at the disputed domain name, to the Complainant's official site at <aviapartner.aero>, creates confusion as to the source of any emails using the disputed domain name. An Internet user would assume that the origin of any email using the disputed domain name was the Complainant when that would not be correct. This is because the email address would integrate the entirety of the Complainant's AVIAPARTNER mark and the email recipient would have previously been redirected to the Complainant's official commercial website. This would clearly lead to at least confusion, and more likely a false belief as to the source or endorsement of the location to which the disputed domain name initially resolves (prior to being redirected to the Complainant's official commercial website at <aviapartner.aero>).

In the absence of any response to the Complaint, the Panel concludes that the Respondent has registered and is using the disputed domain name involving a mechanism that:

- (a) using the Complainant's mark without permission, attracts Internet users to the Respondent's on-line location at the disputed domain name;
- (b) redirects such Internet users from such on-line location to the Complainant's official commercial website; and
- (c) has the capability to send emails to such Internet users from the disputed domain name's on-line location which uses the Complainant's mark (without permission).

The Panel finds that such a mechanism is an intentional attempt to attract, for commercial gain, Internet users to the on-line location at the disputed domain name, by creating a likelihood of confusion with the Complainant's mark as to the source or endorsement of that on-line location, within the meaning of the Policy paragraph 4(b)(iv). Accordingly, the Panel finds that such a mechanism is evidence of bad faith registration and use of the disputed domain name.

In view of the above, and in the absence of any response from the Respondent, 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 <aviapartner.net> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Frank Schoneveld/

Frank Schoneveld

Sole Panelist

Date: August 8, 2026