

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

Alstom v. Rehan Khan, Rehan Khan
Case No. D2026-3193

1. The Parties

The Complainant is Alstom, France, represented by Lynde & Associates, France.

The Respondent is Rehan Khan, Rehan Khan, India.

2. The Domain Names and Registrars

The disputed domain name <alstomind.com> is registered with BigRock Solutions Pvt Ltd. and the disputed domain name <alstomind.info> is registered with PDR Ltd. d/b/a PublicDomainRegistry.com (collectively, the “Registrars”).

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the “Center”) on July 21, 2026. On July 21, 2026, the Center transmitted by email to each of the Registrars a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain names. On July 21, 2026 and July 22, 2026, each of the Registrars 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 the Rules, paragraphs 2 and 4, the Center formally notified the Respondent of the Complaint, and the proceedings commenced on July 29, 2026. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was August 18, 2026. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent’s default on August 20, 2026.

The Center appointed Teruo Kato as the sole panelist in this matter on August 26, 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 contends that the Complainant is a French company created in 1928 and that it is a global leader in the world of transport infrastructures, employing 34.000 professionals in more than 60 countries and operates worldwide and that it plays a significant role in the manufacture and overhaul of rolling stock.

The Complainant submitted certain documentary evidence indicating that it owns a portfolio of trademark registrations, including in particular:

- Indian Trademark Registration No. 1806682 for ALSTOM (word and figure combined) registered on April 15, 2009 in classes 9 and 12;
- Indian Trademark Registration No. 1798988 for ALSTOM (word) registered on March 24, 2009 in classes 37, 39, 40 and 42.

The disputed domain names were both registered on July 7, 2026. The Complainant contends with documentary evidence that each of the disputed domain names currently resolves to an inactive site, displaying a message “Ce site est inaccessible”.

Each of the Registrars confirmed the identity of the Respondent as Rehan Khan, Rehan Khan, India.

On July 15, 2026, the Complainant sent a cease-and-desist letter to the Respondent for the two disputed domain names. The Respondent replied on July 16, 2026, stating among others that “We would like to clarify that the domain names ... were not intended to infringe upon or misuse the ALSTOM trademark or brand. We have not used the domains for any commercial purpose, not have we developed any website, offered any products or services, or attempted to create any association with your client, ALSTOM.”

This reply further stated that “In the interest of resolving this matter amicably and without dispute, we are willing to transfer both domain names to your client. However, we kindly request reimbursement of the actual out-of-pocket expenses incurred for the domain registrations. We are not seeking any profit or additional compensation – only the recovery of the registration fees that we have already paid to the registrar. A transfer free of cost would unfortunately not be feasible as we have already borne these expenses.”

However, the subsequent correspondence between the Complainant and the Respondent has not reached an agreed settlement between them.

The Complainant submitted certain documentary evidence that a number of emails were sent between July 14, 2026 and July 17, 2026 to third parties by “Human Resource, Talent Acquisition | Alstom Transport India Limited”, with the email address of [...]@alstomind.com, purporting to offer job opportunities with “Alstom Transport India Limited”. Most of these emails use the Complainant’s logo where the sender’s contact details are stated at the end. The Complainant contends that the Respondent is using the disputed domain name <alstomind.com> to engage in fraudulent practices.

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 names.

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 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 Panel finds the mark is recognizable within the disputed domain names. Accordingly, the disputed domain names are confusingly similar to the mark for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.7.

Although the addition of other term here, "ind", 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 names 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.

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 names. 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 names such as those enumerated in the Policy or otherwise.

Panels have held that the use of a domain name for illegal activity, as claimed by the Complainant here for the disputed domain name <alstomind.com>, namely, phishing, passing off, 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, the Panel holds that by using the disputed domain name <alstomind.com>, the Respondent has intentionally attempted to attract, for commercial gain, Internet users to its on-line location (i.e. the email address [...]@alstomind.com in this case), by creating a likelihood of confusion with the Complainant's mark as to the source, sponsorship, affiliation, or endorsement of its location. Policy, paragraph 4(b)(iv).

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.

Panels have found that the non-use of a domain name (including a blank or "coming soon" page) 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 or reputation of the Complainant's trademark, and the composition of the disputed domain name <alstomind.info>, and finds that in the circumstances of this case the passive holding of the disputed domain name <alstomind.info> does not prevent a finding of bad faith under the Policy.

Panels have held that the use of a domain name for illegal activity here, as claimed by the Complainant for the disputed domain name <alstomind.com>, namely, phishing, passing off, or other types of fraud, constitutes bad faith. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 3.4. In particular, the Panel notes that the Respondent's statement that "We have not used the domains for any commercial purpose, not have we developed any website, offered any products or services, or attempted to create any association with your client, ALSTOM." contradicts with the evidence submitted by the Complainant as stated in section 4 (Factual Background) above, which the Panel accepts. Having reviewed the record, the Panel finds the Respondent's registration and use of both of the disputed domain names 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 names <alstomind.com> and <alstomind.info> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Teruo Kato/

Teruo Kato

Sole Panelist

Date: September 1, 2026