ARBITRATION
AND
MEDIATION CENTER

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

ALSTOM v. Name Redacted, alstomqroups
Case No. D2026-3119

1. The Parties

The Complainant is ALSTOM, France, represented by Lynde & Associes, France.

The Respondent is Name Redacted[1], alstomqroups, United States of America ("United States").

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <alstomqroups.com> is registered with Tucows Domains Inc. (the "Registrar").

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the "Center") on July 17, 2026. On July 17, 2026, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On July 17, 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 (Redacted for Privacy) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on July 20, 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 24, 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").

[1] The Respondent appears to have used the name of a third party when registering the disputed domain name. In light of the potential identity theft, the Panel has redacted the Respondent's name from this decision. However, the Panel has attached as Annex 1 to this decision an instruction to the Registrar regarding transfer of the disputed domain name, which includes the name of the Respondent. The Panel has authorized the Center to transmit Annex 1 to the Registrar as part of the order in this proceeding and has indicated Annex 1 to this decision shall not be published due to the exceptional circumstances of this case. See *Banco Bradesco S.A. v. FAST 12785241 Attn. Bradescourgente.net / Name Redacted*, WIPO Case No. D2009-1788.

In accordance with the Rules, paragraphs 2 and 4, the Center formally notified the Respondent of the Complaint, and the proceedings commenced on July 27, 2026. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was August 16, 2026. On July 28 and 29, and on August 6, 2026, a third party sent email communications to the Registrar copying the Center, from the registrant's email address. The Respondent did not submit any formal response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent's default on August 18, 2026.

The Center appointed Anita Gerewal as the sole panelist in this matter on August 20, 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 French company founded in 1928 and a global leader in transport infrastructure, with approximately 34,000 employees across more than 60 countries. For the financial year 2024'2025, the Complainant recorded around EUR 19.8 billion in orders and around EUR 18.5 billion in sales. It has an established international presence and significant commercial reputation in the transport sector.

The Complainant owns numerous companies including ALSTOM Transport Technologies, ALSTOM Power Systems, ALSTOM Holdings, ALSTOM Shipworks, and ALSTOM APTIS and the designation "ALSTOM GROUP" is widely used by the Complainant to refer to itself and its various subsidiaries.

The Complainant owns numerous trademark registrations for the word ALSTOM in many jurisdictions throughout the world, including the following:

- United States Trademark Registration No. 85507365 for ALSTOM in classes 1, 6, 7, 8, 9, 12, 13, 17, 19 and 24, registered on November 6, 2012

- European Union Trademark Registration No. 000948729 for ALSTOM in classes 6, 7, 9, 11, 12, 16, 19, 24, 35, 36, 37, 38, 39, 40, 41 and 42, registered on September 30, 1998

- International Registration No. 706292 for ALSTOM in classes 1, 2, 4, 6, 7, 9, 11, 12, 13, 16, 17, 19, 24, 35, 36, 37, 38, 39, 40, 41 and 42, registeredon August 28, 1998

The Complainant is also the registrant of numerous domain names under various generic and country code Top-Level-Domains ("TLDs") that comprise its ALSTOM trademark, such as <alstom.com> registered since January 20, 1998 and <alstomgroup.com> registered on November 14, 2000, both redirecting to the ALSTOM group's website.

The disputed domain name was registered on July 15, 2026, and on the date of filing of the Complaint, resolved to an inaccessible page with a security warning. The disputed domain name was also used to send emails impersonating employees of 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 the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to its ALSTOM trademarks. The disputed domain name closely imitates the Complainant's trademark and domain name <alstomgroup.com> by reproducing them with minor spelling variations, namely replacing the letter "g" with "q" and adding an "s" at the end. These changes are visually subtle, while the elements "alstom" and "roup" remain recognisable, making it likely that Internet users may mistakenly read the disputed domain name as <alstomgroup.com>, including in connection with the Complainant's email addresses. The Complainant therefore characterises the disputed domain name as typo-squatting, which is inherently confusingly similar because such similarity makes the disputed domain name attractive to users. In addition, the Complainant's ALSTOM mark is clearly recognisable at the beginning of the disputed domain name, while the term "group" is descriptive when used in connection with a company name.

The Complainant also contends that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name. The Respondent has no affiliation with the Complainant and was never authorised to register or use a domain name incorporating the ALSTOM or ALSTOM GROUP marks. The disputed domain name redirects to a security warning indicating that the website may be unsafe, and the Respondent's identity and contact details appear to be inaccurate or concealed. The Respondent also allegedly impersonated employees of the Complainant by using their names in the registration details and fraudulent email communications. In addition, the Respondent provided a fictitious or inaccurate address and registered the disputed domain name under the non-existent organisation name "alstomqroups.com." These circumstances, together with the use of the disputed domain name to send fraudulent emails to ALSTOM's clients requesting changes to bank details and payment of substantial invoices, demonstrate that the Respondent was aware of the Complainant and is using the disputed domain name for fraudulent purposes rather than for any bona fide or legitimate interest.

The Complainant further contends that the disputed domain name was registered and is being used in bad faith. Given the longstanding and well-known nature of the ALSTOM trademark, the Respondent was or should have been aware of the Complainant and deliberately registered a typosquatted disputed domain name designed to imitate <alstomgroup.com>, consistent with prior UDRP findings concerning the Complainant. The Respondent also concealed or falsified its identity and contact information by using a privacy service, a third party's email account, an inaccurate address, the name of an ALSTOM employee, and the non-existent organisation name "alstomqroups.com", while allegedly impersonating the Complainant's employees. The disputed domain name was further used to send fraudulent emails to the Complainant's clients and providers, falsely requesting changes to bank account details and seeking confidential financial information, demonstrating an intention to impersonate the Complainant and facilitate fraud. The deliberate substitution of "g" with visually similar "q" further supports the inference that the disputed domain name was created to deceive users. In addition, the disputed domain name has been flagged as unsafe and is closely connected in structure, registration details and alleged fraudulent use to another domain name, <alstomgrouqs.com>, which was the subject of a separate UDRP complaint. Taken together, these circumstances demonstrate that the disputed domain name was registered with knowledge of the Complainant and solely to exploit its reputation, impersonate the Complainant, and facilitate fraudulent activities, thereby establishing bad faith registration and use.

B. Respondent

The Respondent did not formally reply to the Complainant's contentions. Some communications were sent on July 28 and 29, and on August 6, 2026, from the registrant's email address as confirmed by the Registrar, but signed with a third party's name. Those emails were notably requesting the Registrar to "delete the fraudulent account".

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 the ALSTOM trademark for the purposes of the Policy. WIPO Overview 3.1, section 1.2.1.

The Panel finds the mark is recognizable within the disputed domain name. The disputed domain name incorporates the Complainant's trademark and the word "group" with a minor spelling alteration by replacing the letter "g" with the letter "q" and adding the letter "s" at the end. The misspellings and additions do not prevent a finding of confusing similarity. 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 the other term here, "qroups", a misspelling of the term "groups", 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 finds that there is no evidence before the Panel that the Respondent is affiliated with, licensed by, or otherwise authorized by the Complainant to use the ALSTOM trademark, nor is there any evidence that the Respondent is commonly known by the disputed domain name. The disputed domain name redirects to an inaccessible page with a security warning indicating that the associated website may be unsafe. Moreover, the Respondent appears to have provided inaccurate contact information, including a fictitious or inaccurate address and the non-existent organisation name "alstomqroups.com". The Respondent also impersonated employees of the Complainant by using their names in the registration details and in fraudulent email communications. In addition, the disputed domain name was used to send fraudulent emails to the Complainant's clients, requesting changes to bank details and payment of substantial invoices. In the Panel's view, such circumstances demonstrate that the Respondent was aware of the Complainant and its ALSTOM mark and that the disputed domain name was not used in connection with any bona fide offering of goods or services, but rather for fraudulent and deceptive purposes. Such unauthorized and fraudulent use cannot confer rights or legitimate interests upon the Respondent.

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 illegal activities such as phishing/identity theft, 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.

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 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.

In the present case, the Panel notes that the Complainant's ALSTOM trademark has a longstanding presence and reputation, and the disputed domain name constitutes a deliberate typographical variation of the Complainant's domain name <alstomgroup.com>, replacing the letter "g" with the visually similar letter "q" and adding the letter "s" at the end of the word "group", such that it is highly unlikely that the Respondent registered the disputed domain name without knowledge of the Complainant or its trademark. The Respondent's apparent falsification of its identity and contact information the use of a third party's email account, an inaccurate address, the name of an employee of the Complainant, and the fictitious organisation name together with the alleged impersonation of the Complainant's employees, further supports a finding of bad faith. The Panel also notes that there is the use of the disputed domain name in fraudulent email communications directed at the Complainant's clients and providers, requesting changes to bank account details and seeking confidential financial information, which demonstrates an intent to impersonate the Complainant and facilitate fraud. Taken together, these circumstances demonstrate that the Respondent registered and used the disputed domain name with knowledge of the Complainant and its ALSTOM trademark, with the intention of misleading Internet users and exploiting the Complainant's reputation for fraudulent purposes.

Panels have held that the use of a domain name for illegal activity such as phishing/identity theft 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 <alstomqroups.com> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Anita Gerewal/
Anita Gerewal
Sole Panelist
Date: September 3, 2026