

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

Airbus SAS v. Vinay kumar, airbussas.net
Case No. D2026-2948

1. The Parties

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

The Respondent is Vinay kumar, airbussas.net, India.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <airbussas.net> is registered with Squarespace Domains II LLC (the "Registrar").

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the "Center") on July 9, 2026. On July 10, 2026, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On July 10, 2026, the Registrar transmitted by email to the Center its verification response confirming that the Respondent is listed as the registrant and providing the contact details.

The Center verified that the 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 paragraphs 2 and 4 of the Rules, the Center formally notified the Respondent of the Complaint, and the proceedings commenced on July 14, 2026. In accordance with paragraph 5 of the Rules, the due date for Response was August 3, 2026. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent's default on August 5, 2026.

The Center appointed Yuji Yamaguchi as the sole panelist in this matter on August 12, 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 paragraph 7 of the Rules.

4. Factual Background

The Complainant has designed, manufactured and delivered industry-leading commercial aircraft, helicopters, military transport aircraft, 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. Since then, the Complainant has delivered over 13,500 aircraft to airlines worldwide, as of September 2021, and over 12,000 helicopters operated by over 3,000 customers. Additionally, the Complainant is one of the world's leading space companies and is recognized as a top 10 defense company. The Complainant has a wide global presence, through roughly 180 locations across Europe, the Americas, Africa and the Middle East and Asia. More than 157,000 employees make up the Complainant's workforce, reflecting the diversity of the world itself as well as the customers that the Complainant serves.

The Complainant is the owner of the registered AIRBUS trademarks (the "AIRBUS Trademark") across various jurisdictions, including Indian Trademark No. 2116495 (registered on March 16, 2011), and International Trademark Nos. 1112012 (registered on June 24, 2011) and 1247403 (registered on June 18, 2014).

Further, the Complainant maintains a strong Internet presence, communicating with its range of customers through its primary domain name <airbus.com>, registered since May 23, 1995.

The disputed domain name was registered on April 25, 2026, and resolves to a webpage which is under construction.

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's contentions may be summarized as follows:

In creating the disputed domain name, the Respondent has added the term "sas" to the Complainant's AIRBUS Trademark, thereby making the disputed domain name confusingly similar to the Complainant's AIRBUS Trademark. The fact that such term is closely linked and associated with the Complainant's AIRBUS Trademark only serves to underscore and increase the confusing similarity between the disputed domain name and the Complainant's AIRBUS Trademark. More specifically, "sas" is an abbreviation of "Société par actions simplifiée" (a French business entity type). This term forms part of the Complainant's full entity name, "Airbus SAS".

Neither the Complainant nor its affiliates have licensed, authorized, or permitted the Respondent to register domain names incorporating the Complainant's AIRBUS Trademark. In the instant case, the pertinent Whois information identifies the Registrant as "Vinay kumar", which does not resemble the disputed domain name in any manner. Thus, where no evidence suggests that the Respondent is commonly known by the disputed domain name, then the Respondent cannot be regarded as having acquired rights to or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name within the meaning of paragraph 4(c)(ii) of the Policy. The Respondent has failed to make use of the disputed domain name's website and has not demonstrated any attempt to make legitimate use of the disputed domain name and website, which evinces a lack of rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name. While no evidence has been found that the disputed domain name was actively used as part of a fraud, the presence of mail exchanger ("MX") records on the disputed domain name, coupled with the fact that it comprises the Complainant's AIRBUS Trademark with the mere addition of the related, business abbreviation "sas", strongly implies that the disputed domain name could be used as part of an email phishing scheme in the future.

The Complainant and its AIRBUS Trademark are known internationally, with trademark registrations across numerous countries. The Complainant has marketed and sold its goods and services using the AIRBUS Trademark since 1970, which is well before the Respondent's registration of the disputed domain name. The composition of the disputed domain name makes it illogical to believe that the Respondent registered the disputed domain name without specifically targeting the Complainant. The disputed domain name can only be taken as intending to cause confusion among Internet users as to the source of the disputed domain name, and thus, the disputed domain name must be considered as having been registered and used in bad faith pursuant to paragraph 4(b)(iv) of the Policy. Although the disputed domain name is not used to host any active content, it has been set up with MX records. This shows that the disputed domain name may be actively used for email purposes. Emails emanating from the disputed domain name could not reasonably be used for any good faith purpose given the close similarity of the disputed domain name with the Complainant's AIRBUS Trademark that would be difficult to discern in an email. Therefore, it is more likely that the disputed domain name may be actively used to facilitate fraudulent activity such as phishing, impersonating, or passing off as the Complainant.

B. Respondent

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

6. Discussion and Findings

Pursuant to paragraph 4(a) of the Policy, the Complainant must show the following three elements to obtain the transfer of the disputed domain name:

- (i) the disputed domain name is identical or confusingly similar to a trademark or service mark in which the Complainant has rights; and
- (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 in paragraph 4(a) of the Policy 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. See section 1.7 of the WIPO Overview of WIPO Panel Views on Select UDRP Questions ("[WIPO Overview 3.1](#)").

The Complainant has shown rights in respect of the AIRBUS Trademark for the purposes of the Policy. See section 1.2.1 of the [WIPO Overview 3.1](#).

The disputed domain name consists of the Complainant's AIRBUS Trademark in its entirety followed by the term "sas" and the generic Top-Level Domain ("gTLD") ".net".

The entirety of the AIRBUS Trademark is reproduced within the disputed domain name. The addition of the term "sas" does not prevent a finding of confusing similarity between the disputed domain name and the Complainant's AIRBUS Trademark for the purposes of the Policy. See section 1.8 of the [WIPO Overview 3.1](#). See also *Airbus SAS v. Rosenber fabian Quintero quintero, Amsitek Soluciones*, WIPO Case No. [D2023-1641](#); and *CGE Distribution SAS v. Jacky Norbert Durand, CGED*, WIPO Case No. [D2017 1004](#).

Further, the gTLD ".net" is viewed as a standard registration requirement and as such is disregarded in assessing confusing similarity under the first element in paragraph 4(a) of the Policy. See section 1.11.1 of the [WIPO Overview 3.1](#).

Therefore, the Panel finds that the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to the Complainant's AIRBUS Trademark and the first element in paragraph 4(a) 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.

As the Complainant asserts, the Respondent is not sponsored by or affiliated with the Complainant in any way. The Complainant has not given the Respondent permission to use the Complainant's AIRBUS Trademark in any manner, including in domain names. Although revealed Whois data indicates "airbussas.net" as the Respondent's organization, the Respondent does not appear to be commonly known by the disputed domain name pursuant to paragraph 4(c)(ii) of the Policy. See *LEGO Juris A/S v. Tim Andersson, Lego World*, WIPO Case No. [D2024-4902](#).

Considering that the disputed domain name resolves to a webpage which is under construction the record does not support a bona fide or legitimate use of the disputed domain name within the meaning of paragraphs 4(c)(i) and (iii) of the Policy.

Although the overall burden of proof in the proceedings is on the complainant, where a complainant makes out a prima facie case that the respondent lacks rights or legitimate interests, the burden of production on the second element in paragraph 4(a) of the Policy shifts to the respondent to come forward with relevant evidence demonstrating rights or legitimate interests in the disputed 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 in paragraph 4(a) of the Policy. See section 2.1 of the [WIPO Overview 3.1](#).

Having reviewed the available record, the Panel finds that 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.

Accordingly, the Panel finds that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the disputed domain name and the second element in paragraph 4(a) of the Policy has been established.

C. Registered and Used in Bad Faith

The Panel finds that the Complainant's AIRBUS Trademark is distinctive and widely known and has established a worldwide reputation in the aerospace sector. The Respondent must have registered the disputed domain name with knowledge of the Complainant and its AIRBUS Trademark and with the intention of taking unfair advantage of the goodwill attaching to the AIRBUS Trademark. See *Airbus SAS v. Privacy service provided by Withheld for Privacy ehf / Greatness Achunike*, WIPO Case No. [D2022-1808](#).

As the Complainant contends, there is an appreciable risk that the disputed domain name is being or could be used in connection with a fraudulent email scheme considering that the disputed domain name has been set up with MX records. See *Airbus SAS v. mike wayne*, WIPO Case No. [D2025-0155](#); *Airbus SAS v. Carolina Rodrigues, Fundacion Comercio Electronico*, WIPO Case No. [D2024-5289](#); and *Airbus SAS v. Privacy Service Provided by Withheld for Privacy ehf / Mark Jones*, WIPO Case No. [D2022-0303](#).

The Respondent's failure to respond to the Complainant's cease and desist letters sent to the Respondent on May 20, 2026, May 27, 2026, and June 4, 2026, further supports the finding of bad faith use. See *Airbus SAS v. ALVIN AFIFUL AMRULLOH AMRULLOH*, WIPO Case No. [D2026-0952](#); *Airbus SAS v. Whois Privacy Protection Foundation / Fabien Filopis, Armand Pertier, and Julien Pertin*, WIPO Case No. [D2022-0585](#); and *Airbus SAS v. Privacy service provided by Withheld for Privacy ehf / Wolfgang Kuster*, WIPO Case No. [D2021-3501](#).

Finally, the Panel finds that the "coming soon" webpage does not prevent a finding of bad faith under the doctrine of passive holding. See section 3.3 of the [WIPO Overview 3.1](#).

Consequently, the Panel finds that the Respondent both registered and used the disputed domain name in bad faith and the third element in paragraph 4(a) of the Policy has been established.

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 <airbussas.net> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Yuji Yamaguchi/

Yuji Yamaguchi

Sole Panelist

Date: August 26, 2026