

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

Airbus SAS v. Airbus booking, Shree Balaji enterprise
Case No. D2026-2758

1. The Parties

The Complainant is Airbus SAS, France, represented by CSC Digital Brand Services Group AB, Sweden.

The Respondent is Airbus booking, Shree Balaji enterprise, India.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <airbusbooking.com> is registered with GoDaddy.com, LLC (the “Registrar”).

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the “Center”) on June 24, 2026. On June 25, 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 (Registration Private, Domains By Proxy, LLC) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on June 26, 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 29, 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 30, 2026. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was July 20, 2026. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent’s default on July 21, 2026.

The Center appointed Christopher J. Pibus as the sole panelist in this matter on July 23, 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 an aerospace company incorporated in France. The Complainant has designed, manufactured and delivered commercial aircraft, helicopters, military transports, satellites and launch vehicles for over 50 years. The Complainant's history dates back to the formation of the Airbus Industrie GIE consortium in 1970, and over the course of its existence it has sold thousands of aircraft and helicopters to customers around the world. The Complainant has global operations in more than 180 locations across Europe, the Americas, Africa, the Middle East and Asia, with more than 150,000 employees.

The Complainant owns a large portfolio of trade mark registrations for AIRBUS in multiple jurisdictions, including International Trade Mark Registration Nos. 1112012 (registered June 24, 2011 in classes 3, 6-9, 12-14, 16-18, 21, 24-25, 28, 35-43, and 45); and 1247403 (registered June 18, 2014 in classes 3-4, 6-9, 11-14, 16-19, 21, 24-25, 28-43, and 45). The Complainant's principal domain name <airbus.com> was registered on May 23, 1995.

The Respondent did not submit any response. The disputed domain name was registered on June 5, 2025. At the time of filing of the Complaint, the disputed domain name resolved to a website operating as "Airbus booking" which claimed to offer travel services, including flight tickets. The disputed domain name currently resolves to a parking page.

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 Respondent has deliberately targeted the well-known and distinctive AIRBUS mark and associated business, by replicating the mark in the disputed domain name, and adding the word "booking" which is suggestive of a link to airline travel. The Respondent has used the disputed domain name to host a website offering travel services in association with the AIRBUS brand, with the aim of fooling unsuspecting visitors into believing its business is authorized by or affiliated with the Complainant.

B. Respondent

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

6. Discussion and Findings

According to paragraph 4(a) of the Policy, in order to succeed, the Complainant must establish each of the following elements:

- (i) the disputed domain name is identical or confusingly similar to the 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 a trademark or service mark for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.2.1.

The entirety of the AIRBUS mark is reproduced within the disputed domain name in combination with the term "booking". 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](#), section 1.7.

Although the addition of other terms here, "booking", 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.

The Panel notes that the Respondent is not commonly known by the disputed domain name, which evinces a lack of rights or legitimate interests. The Complainant's evidence also establishes that the Respondent is not sponsored by or affiliated with the Complainant in any way, nor has the Complainant given the Respondent a license, authorization or permission to use the Complainant's trademark in any manner, including in domain names. Further, the Panel notes that the registrant name identified in the registration details of the disputed domain name is "Airbus booking", however, as noted, there is no evidence before the Panel that the Respondent is actually commonly known as "Airbus booking". Rather, it appears most likely that such details were specifically chosen to falsely suggest an affiliation with the Complainant.

The Complainant has also provided evidence that the Respondent has used or is using the disputed domain name to direct users to an unauthorized website claiming to offer travel services, which directly targets the Complainant's business; and it currently resolves to the Registrar-affiliated directory used for parking domain names. Prior UDRP decisions have held that respondents who monetize domain names using links and paths to third-party websites have not made a bona fide offering of goods or services that would give rise to rights or legitimate interests in a disputed domain name where such links compete with or capitalize on the reputation and goodwill of the complainant's mark or otherwise mislead Internet users. As such, neither the prior use for offering travel-related services under "Airbus booking" nor the current monetization of the disputed domain name is a bona fide offering of goods or services, nor a legitimate noncommercial or fair use as allowed under the Policy. See [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 2.9.

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.

Paragraph 4(b) of the Policy sets out a list of non-exhaustive circumstances that may indicate that a domain name was registered and used in bad faith, but other circumstances may also be relevant in assessing whether a respondent's registration and use of a domain name is in bad faith. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 3.2.1.

The Policy provides that bad faith can be established by evidence demonstrating that the Respondent has “intentionally attempted to attract, for commercial gain, Internet users to [Respondent's] website...by creating a likelihood of confusion with the complainant's mark as to the source, sponsorship, affiliation, or endorsement of the website or location of a product or service on [Respondent's] web site or location.” See Policy paragraph 4(b)(iv). Here, the Panel finds that the Respondent has created a likelihood of confusion with the Complainant and its trademarks by registering a domain name that incorporates the well-known AIRBUS trademark in its entirety with the addition of the term “booking”, which, coupled with its use, demonstrates that the Respondent is using the disputed domain name to confuse unsuspecting Internet users looking for the Complainant's services, and to mislead Internet users as to the source of the disputed domain name and website. By creating this likelihood of confusion, leading to misperceptions as to the source, sponsorship, affiliation, or endorsement of the disputed domain name, the Respondent has demonstrated a nefarious intent to capitalize on the fame and goodwill of the AIRBUS trademark in order to increase traffic to the associated website for pecuniary gain, as evidenced by its initial link to a website offering travel services, and by its subsequent direction to a “lander” page featuring multiple third-party links. See *Airbus SAS v. Klaus Braun*, WIPO Case No. [D2023-1294](#) (“The website at the disputed domain name offers transportation services under the brand AIRBUS and does not disclose the lack of relationship with and endorsement by the Complainant [...] the Respondent must have been aware of the Complainant and its AIRBUS trademark when registering the disputed domain name, and is likely to have targeted the Complainant through its registration and use for a website offering services included in the scope of protection of the AIRBUS trademark and related to the Complainant's activities”). Previous panels have found bad faith under Policy paragraph 4(b)(iv) where a respondent uses a confusingly similar domain name to resolve to a website featuring links to third-party websites that likely create revenue for the respondent. See [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 3.5. The disputed domain name and the use to which it has been put can only be taken as intending to cause confusion among Internet users as to source; there is no other plausible good-faith reason or logic which would support a different conclusion and this was not defended by 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 <airbusbooking.com> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Christopher J. Pibus/

Christopher J. Pibus

Sole Panelist

Date: August 6, 2026