

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

Altaroc Partners v. Klaus Becker

Case No. D2026-3200

1. The Parties

The Complainant is Altaroc Partners, France, represented by ipSO, France.

The Respondent is Klaus Becker, Germany.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <alta-roc.com> is registered with Hostinger Operations, UAB (the “Registrar”).

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 the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On July 21, 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 (Unknown) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on July 22, 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 22, 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 23, 2026. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was August 12, 2026. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent’s default on August 13, 2026.

The Center appointed Anne-Virginie La Spada as the sole panelist in this matter on August 13, 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 asset management and private equity firm founded in 1972 and based in France. The Complainant has a branch office in Munich, Germany.

The Complainant owns the following trademark registrations:

- International trademark registration No. 1730704 for ALTAROC, registered on January 12, 2023, in classes 35, and 36; and
- European Union trademark registration No. 018825643 for ALTAROC (stylized), registered on May 30, 2023, in classes 35, and 36.

The Complainant owns the domain name <altaroc.pe>, under which the Complainant operates its official website since at least October 15, 2021.

Late in the year 2025, the Complainant became aware of a website operated under the domain name <alta-roc.de>, impersonating the Complainant and purporting to present the Complainant's team in Germany. Such website displayed the Complainant's trademark prominently and featured statements reproducing or paraphrasing statements present on the Complainant's official website. The "information section" indicated a street address in Düsseldorf, Germany. On February 9, 2026, the Complainant sent a cease-and-desist notice to the email address provided on such website and concurrently reported it to BAFIN, the Federal Financial Supervisory Authority in Germany. This led BAFIN to issue a warning on its website on June 11, 2026, whereby BAFIN informed the public about the identify theft committed on such website and the suspicion that the operators of the website offered financial services without the required authorization.

The disputed domain name was registered on April 17, 2026.

At the time of filing of the Complaint, the disputed domain name resolved to a website available in German and English, with a layout and content identical or nearly identical to the layout and content of the website operated under the <alta-roc.de> domain name.

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 almost identical, and therefore confusingly similar, to its trademark ALTAROC. The Complainant observes that both are written practically the same way, according to an identical sequence of letters. Punctuation marks should not be considered as an element of differentiation and the generic Top-Level Domain ".com" is a descriptive and functional element.

The Complainant further contends that it has not authorized the Respondent to use its trademark. According to the Complainant, the Respondent is passing itself off as being the Complainant, with the purpose of obtaining commercial gain by misleadingly diverting consumers from the Complainant's official website. This does not constitute noncommercial or fair use.

The Complainant finally contends that the disputed domain name has been registered and used in bad faith. The content of the website site connected to the disputed domain name shows that the Respondent was cognizant of the Complainant and of its activities. The Complainant is of the view that the Respondent's activity is deliberately illegal in many ways. Namely, the Respondent uses the Complainant's trademark without its authorization, which amounts to trademark infringement, it is passing itself off as an establishment of the Complainant, it is using Complainant's reputation and trust to divert investors and therein disrupt the business of the Complainant, and it is conducting a regulated activity as an investment company, seemingly without any authorization from the financial bodies that regulate such activity.

B. Respondent

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

6. Discussion and Findings

According to paragraph 4(a) of the Policy, a complainant must assert and prove each of the following:

- (i) the domain name registered by the respondent is identical or confusingly similar to a trademark or service mark in which the complainant has rights;
- (ii) the respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the domain name; and
- (iii) the domain name registered by the respondent 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 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.

Indeed, the sole difference between the Complainant's trademark and the disputed domain name lies with the hyphen between "alta" and "roc" in the disputed domain name, whereas the Complainant's mark is spelled in one word. The presence of a hyphen does not prevent a finding of confusing similarity.

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.

On the contrary, the record shows that the disputed domain name resolved to a website displaying the Complainant trademark and impersonating the Complainant.

Panels have held that the use of a domain name for illegitimate activity, such as passing off, 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.

Given that, several months before the registration of the disputed domain name, another domain name with an identical second-level domain had already been used to impersonate the Complainant (namely, through the website available under the domain name <altar-roc.de>), the Panel finds it is more likely than not that Respondent had the Complainant’s trademark in mind when it registered the disputed domain name. The Panel therefore holds that the disputed domain name was registered in bad faith.

Under paragraph 4(b)(iv) of the Policy, the use of a disputed domain name to intentionally attempt to attract, for commercial gain, Internet users to a website or other online location, by creating a likelihood of confusion with the complainant’s mark as to the source, sponsorship, affiliation, or endorsement of a website or location or of a product or service on the website or location, amounts to evidence of registration and use in bad faith.

In the present case, the Respondent used the disputed domain name in connection with a website displaying the Complainant’s trademark, paraphrasing statements from the Complainant’s official website and purporting to be an official website of the Complainant. Such use was apt to create the false impression that the Respondent’s website was operated or endorsed by the Complainant. Consequently, by using the disputed domain name in such manner, the Panel finds that the Respondent intentionally attempted to attract Internet users to its website by creating a likelihood of confusion with the Complainant’s mark as to the source and affiliation of its website. Such behavior constitutes use in bad faith under paragraph 4(b)(iv) of 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 <alta-roc.com> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Anne-Virginie La Spada/

Anne-Virginie La Spada

Sole Panelist

Date: August 14, 2026