

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

GIE AG2R v. Fleurette patricia, ADIQ

Case No. D2026-2740

1. The Parties

The Complainant is GIE AG2R, France, represented by Scan Avocats AARPI, France.

The Respondent is Fleurette patricia, ADIQ, United States of America.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <ag2rlarnondiales.fun> is registered with Hostinger Operations, UAB (the "Registrar").

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the "Center") on June 24, 2026. On June 24, 2026, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On June 25, 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 (Not disclosed) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on June 28, 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 July 1, 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 July 3, 2026. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was July 23, 2026. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent's default on July 24, 2026.

The Center appointed Petra Pecar as the sole panelist in this matter on July 29, 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 GIE AG2R, known as the Group AG2R LA MONDIALE (hereinafter: the “Complainant”), a French Economic Interest Group active in the fields of social protection, insurance and pension management. The Complainant’s group has a history dating back to 1905.

The Complainant has provided evidence of various trademark registrations relating to AG2R LA MONDIALE, including the following trademarks owned by members of the Complainant’s group, LA MONDIALE and AG2R PREVOYANCE:

- European Union figurative trademark registration **AG2R LA MONDIALE** No. 008376551, registered on January 12, 2010 in International Classes 16, 18, and 25; and
- European Union figurative trademark registration **AG2R LA MONDIALE** No. 008261166, registered on March 1, 2010 in International Classes 35, 36, 39, 41, 43, 44, and 45.

LA MONDIALE and AG2R PREVOYANCE are members of the AG2R LA MONDIALE group represented by the Complainant.

The Complainant operates several domain names incorporating the AG2R LA MONDIALE mark, including <ag2rlamondiale.fr>, <ag2rlamondiale.com>, <ag2rlamondiale.org>, <ag2rlamondiale.net>, <ag2rlamondiale.info>, <ag2rlamondiale.tv>, and <ag2rlamondiale.eu>.

The Complainant, through its representatives, sent a formal notice to the Registrar concerning the disputed domain name and requested the suspension of the related services.

The disputed domain name was registered on June 1, 2026, and at the time of the Complaint filing it did not resolve to an active website but a Registrar’s parking webpage. MX records had been configured for the disputed domain name, enabling its use for email services.

The Respondent is Fleurette patricia, ADIQ, United States.

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 confusingly similar to its AG2R LA MONDIALE marks and domain names, differing only by the substitution of the letter “m” with “rn” and the addition of the letter “s”.

The Complainant further contends that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name, as the Respondent is not affiliated with or authorized by the Complainant and has not been permitted to use the AG2R LA MONDIALE marks.

Finally, the Complainant submits that the disputed domain name was registered and is being used in bad faith, relying in particular on the reputation of the AG2R LA MONDIALE marks, the Respondent's use of a privacy service, the configuration of MX records, and the resulting risk of phishing and impersonation.

B. Respondent

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

6. Discussion and Findings

Even if the Respondent did not file a Response to the Complainant's contentions, the Panel shall consider the issues present in the case based on the statements and documents submitted by the Complainant. "A Panel shall decide a complaint on the basis of the statements and documents submitted and in accordance with the Policy, these Rules and any rules and principles of law that it deems applicable", as indicated in paragraph 15(a) of the Rules.

Under paragraph 4(a) of the Policy, the Complainant is required to prove each of the following three elements:

- (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 of WIPO Panel Views on Select UDRP Questions ("[WIPO Overview 3.1](#)"), section 1.7.

The Complainant has shown rights in respect of the AG2R LA MONDIALE mark for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.2.1.

The Panel notes that LA MONDIALE and AG2R PREVOYANCE, the registered owners of the marks relied upon in this proceeding, are members of the Complainant's group. Accordingly, the Panel finds that the Complainant has standing to rely on these marks for purposes of the Policy.

The Panel finds the mark is recognizable 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](#), sections 1.7 and 1.9.

The disputed domain name incorporates the AG2R LA MONDIALE mark with only minor typographical alterations. In particular, the letter "m" in "mondiale" has been replaced by the visually similar sequence "rn", and the letter "s" has been added at the end. These changes amount to a minor misspelling and do not prevent the AG2R LA MONDIALE mark from remaining clearly recognizable within the disputed domain name.

Furthermore, it is well accepted practice by UDRP panels that a generic Top-Level Domain ("gTLD"), such as ".fun", is typically disregarded when assessing whether a domain name is identical or confusingly similar to a trademark (see section 1.11.1 of the [WIPO Overview 3.1](#)). Accordingly, the Panel disregards the gTLD ".fun" for purposes of the comparison under the first element.

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.

According to the Complainant’s uncontested statements, the Respondent is not affiliated with, connected to, or otherwise authorized by the Complainant to use the AG2R LA MONDIALE mark or to register a domain name incorporating that mark or a variation thereof. The Respondent has never been commonly known by the disputed domain name and has no business relationship with the Complainant.

The disputed domain name does not resolve to an active website, and there is no evidence before the Panel that the Respondent has used, or made demonstrable preparations to use, the disputed domain name in connection with a bona fide offering of goods or services, or for any legitimate noncommercial or fair use. The record further shows that MX records had been configured for the disputed domain name. In view of these circumstances, and taking into account that the disputed domain name consists of a minor misspelling of the Complainant’s AG2R LA MONDIALE mark, the Panel finds that the Respondent has failed to demonstrate any 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.

In the present case, the Panel notes that the disputed domain name was registered approximately 16 years after the registration of the Complainant’s AG2R LA MONDIALE marks. The disputed domain name consists of a minor misspelling of the AG2R LA MONDIALE mark, namely the substitution of the letter “m” in “mondiale” with the visually similar sequence “rn”, together with the addition of the final letter “s”, resulting in a plural form. The evidence on record further shows that a simple Internet search for “AG2R LA MONDIALE” would have readily revealed the existence of the Complainant and its marks. The distinctive nature of the mark and the composition of the disputed domain name therefore support the inference that the Respondent was aware of the Complainant and its rights at the time of registration.

The Panel also notes that the Respondent is involved in another UDRP proceeding brought by the same Complainant concerning domain names alleged to infringe the Complainant's AG2R LA MONDIALE marks. These circumstances provide further support for the inference that the Respondent was aware of the Complainant and its marks when registering the disputed domain name. In the absence of any explanation from the Respondent for its choice of the disputed domain name, the Panel finds that its registration was unlikely to have been coincidental.

The Panel further notes that the disputed domain name does not resolve to an active website. The record nevertheless shows that MX records had been configured for the disputed domain name, enabling its use for email services.

Panels have found that the non-use of a domain name would not by itself prevent a finding of bad faith under the doctrine of passive holding. To the contrary, in 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 of the Complainant's AG2R LA MONDIALE mark, the composition of the disputed domain name, the configuration of MX records, and the absence of any apparent good-faith use of the disputed domain name, 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.

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 <ag2rlarnondiales.fun> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Petra Pecar/

Petra Pecar

Sole Panelist

Date: August 12, 2026