ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION
Alstef Group SAS v. olivia banks, ellisaadamsgroup
Case No. D2026-2903

1. The Parties

The Complainant is Alstef Group SAS, France, represented by MIIP MADE IN IP, France.

The Respondent is olivia banks, ellisaadamsgroup, United States of America.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

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

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the “Center”) on July 2, 2026. On July 3, 2026, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On July 3, 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 July 6, 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 9, 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 10, 2026. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was July 30, 2026. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent’s default on September 7, 2026.

The Center appointed Francine Tan as the sole panelist in this matter on September 9, 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, established in France, is widely known as “Alstef” or “Alstef Group”. It specializes in automated material handling systems for baggage, air cargo, parcels, and intralogistics. The Complainant operates in 18 jurisdictions, and its systems are installed in 94 jurisdictions. The Complainant has worked with several international airports and well-known flight companies such as Air France, KLM, and Emirates; and has also worked with well-known companies in other industries, such as L’Oréal, and Heineken. The Complainant employs over 1,000 people, and in 2025, generated revenue of over EUR 235 million.

The Complainant and its subsidiaries are the registered owners of trade marks which contain the word “Alstef” including:

- French trade mark No. 4689201 for ALSTEF, registered on March 12, 2021; and

- International trade mark No. 1579194 for ALSTEF, registered on November 4, 2020.

The Complainant also owns domain names comprising the word “Alstef”, including: <alstef.com>, registered on July 26, 2000; and <alstefgroup.com>, registered on April 6, 2020.

The disputed domain name was registered on July 21, 2025. It was used to create email addresses and send emails falsely purporting to originate from the Complainant.

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:

1. The disputed domain name is identical or confusingly similar to a trade mark in which the Complainant has rights. The disputed domain name identically reproduces the Complainant’s ALSTEF trade mark and its business name “Alstef Group”. The addition of the term “group” to the Complainant’s trade mark ALSTEF in the disputed domain name does not avoid confusion. Instead, the addition of the term “group” is more likely to increase confusion for customers and commercial partners as the term describes the Complainant’s business structure and forms part of its business name.

2. The Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name. The Respondent has no business relationship with the Complainant; and it has not been authorized, licensed or permitted by the Complainant to use any of its trade marks or to apply to register a domain name incorporating the ALSTEF trade mark. The disputed domain name has been used exclusively for phishing purposes. Mail servers were configured for the disputed domain name and used to create email addresses, from which fraudulent emails were circulated to the Complainant’s clients. In particular, on July 22, 2025, the disputed domain name was used to intercept an email exchange between the Complainant and one of its business partners. The Respondent sent an invoice containing altered financial information in order to receive payment for services provided. (“The Fraudulent Email.”)

3. The disputed domain name was registered and is being used in bad faith. The fact that the Respondent registered the disputed domain name reproducing the identical ALSTEF trade mark of the Complainant is in itself evidence of bad faith registration. ALSTEF has no meaning in French or English, and is not a dictionary word or common word. There is no reasonable explanation for the Respondent choosing this name. There is no doubt that the Respondent was targeting the Complainant when registering the disputed domain name. The Respondent’s use of the privacy service taken together with the other factors, namely the well-known nature of the ALSTEF trade mark

and the addition of the word "group", are indicators of bad faith, showing the Respondent's intention to create a confusion with the Complainant's activities. This is confirmed by the fact that mail servers were configured for the disputed domain name and used to create email addresses for fraudulent email purposes.

4. On August 28, 2025, the Complainant's representative contacted the Registrar, the website host and the mail server host to request the deactivation of the disputed domain name and mail server associated. There was no response from the Respondent who ought to have been contacted by the Registrar or the mail server host. The circumstances show that the Respondent was not unaware of the Complainant and its activities, and of its ALSTEF trade mark at the time the disputed domain name was registered.

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 trade mark 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 trade mark or service mark for the purposes of the Policy. WIPO Overview 3.1, section 1.2.1.

The entirety of the mark is reproduced and recognizable within the disputed domain name. The addition of the term "group" does not prevent a finding of confusing similarity with the Complainant's ALSTEF trade mark. 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 1.8.

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.

Panels have held that the use of a domain name for illegitimate or illegal activity here, claimed as applicable to this case: phishing/identity theft or other types of fraud can never confer rights or legitimate interests on a respondent. WIPO Overview 3.1, section 2.13.1.

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, it is evident that the Respondent knew of and specifically targeted the Complainant and its business, by using the disputed domain name for deceptive means. Someone purporting to be a "Spare Parts Specialist" from "Alstef Canada Inc." provided a customer of the Complainant an invoice for a purchase order and sent the Fraudulent Email.

Panels have held that the use of a domain name for illegitimate or illegal activity here, claimed as applicable to this case: phishing/identity theft, or other types of fraud constitutes bad faith. WIPO Overview 3.1, section 3.4. Having reviewed the record, the Panel finds the Respondent's registration and use of the disputed domain name constitutes 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 <alstefgroup.org> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Francine Tan/
Francine Tan
Sole Panelist
Date: September 18, 2026