

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

ABEILLE ASSURANCES HOLDING v. Manus AI / Aboubakar Abdelaziz Case No. D2026-3503

1. The Parties

The Complainant is ABEILLE ASSURANCES HOLDING, France, represented by Novagraaf France, France.

The Respondents are Manus AI, Singapore, and Aboubakar Abdelaziz, France.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <abeilleoptique.com> is registered with Global Domain Group LLC (the “Registrar”).

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the “Center”) on August 7, 2026. On August 7, 2026, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On August 10, 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 (BUTTERFLY EFFECT PTE. LTD., AZAD OPTIQUE, Mr Sid-Ali DARDAR, Mr Aboubakar ABDELAZIZ) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on August 11, 2026, providing the registrant and contact information disclosed by the Registrar, and inviting the Complainant to submit an amendment to the Complaint. A third party sent an email communication to the Center on August 11, 2026. The Complainant filed an amended Complaint on August 21, 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 Respondents of the Complaint, and the proceedings commenced on August 25, 2026. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was September 14, 2026. The Respondents did not submit any formal response. The Center informed the Parties that it would proceed to panel appointment on September 18, 2026.

The Center appointed Andrea Mondini as the sole panelist in this matter on September 23, 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 major French insurance group with approximately three million clients and 1,000 general agents. The Complainant is the former Aviva France insurance and was renamed as “Abeille Assurances” in 2021 as a return to the name under which the company was founded in 1856 as “L’Abeille”.

The word “abeille” means “bee” in French.

The Complainant owns several trademark registrations, including:

TRADEMARK	JURISDICTION	REGISTRATION NUMBER	REGISTRATION DATE	INTERNATIONAL CLASSES
ABEILLE	France	4837150	May 20, 2022	36
ABEILLE ASSURANCES (and device)	France	4800909	January 7, 2022	9, 16, 35, 36, 38, 39, 42, 45
Bee device (logo)	France	4800912	January 7, 2022	9, 16, 35, 36, 38, 39, 42, 45

The Complainant holds the domain name <assuranceabeille.com> which redirects to its main website at “www.abeille-assurances.fr”.

The Respondent Manus AI operates an artificial intelligence platform enabling users to register domain names and build and publish websites, whereby the domain names are held by the Respondent Manus AI.

The Respondents did not file a formal Response. On August 11, 2026, the Center received an email from Mr. Aboubakar Abdelaziz, claiming to be the beneficial holder of the disputed domain name (“Beneficial Holder”). The Beneficial Holder and its affiliated party operate in France an optician business that was named “Abeille Optique”.

The disputed domain name was registered on March 8, 2026.

According to the evidence submitted with the Complaint, the disputed domain name previously resolved to a website displaying the sign “Abeille Optique” which was the name of the optician’s business operated by the Beneficial Holder and its affiliated party.

On March 13, 2026, the Complainant sent a cease and desist letter to Abeille Optique and its President. On April 8, 2026, the President of Abeille Optique signed an undertaking inter alia to deactivate the site posted under the disputed domain name and to relinquish it. Currently, the disputed domain name is inactive.

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 as follows:

The Complainant's trademarks have been extensively used to identify the Complainant and its insurance services.

The disputed domain name is confusingly similar to the ABEILLE trademark in which the Complainant has rights, because it incorporates this trademark in its entirety, and the addition of the descriptive term "optique" is not sufficient to prevent a finding of confusing similarity, considering in particular that the Complainant markets insurance policies that expressly cover optical and eyewear expenses.

The Respondents have no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the disputed domain name. Neither the Respondent Manus AI nor the Beneficial Holder have been authorized by the Complainant to use its trademarks. The Respondent Manus AI registered the disputed domain name for the Beneficial Holder and its affiliated party who, upon receipt of a cease and desist letter, has undertaken in writing to relinquish the disputed domain name and has meanwhile taken down its website and changed its company name. The Respondent 1, however, did not respond to the Complainant's subsequent communications.

The disputed domain name was registered in bad faith because it is obvious that the Beneficial Holder had knowledge of both the Complainant and its well-known trademark ABEILLE at the time it obtained the registration of the disputed domain name through the Respondent Manus AI, considering in particular that it also adopted a logo similar to the Complainant's bee device trademark.

The disputed domain name was used in bad faith for the website previously posted under the disputed domain and is still being used in bad faith because of the Respondent Manus AI passive holding of the disputed domain name.

B. Respondents

Neither Respondent submitted a formal Response.

On August 11, 2026, the Center received an email from the Beneficial Holder, stating in essence that it had initially acquired the disputed domain name through the Respondent Manus AI, which is an artificial intelligence platform, and had launched its website. Following the requests and concerns raised by the Complainant, the Beneficial Holder had immediately taken down its website. Subsequently, the Beneficial Holder repeatedly requested the Respondent to Manus AI "release or transfer" the disputed domain name, but was unable to do so because the Respondent Manus AI, which is the registrant, did not react to its requests. The Beneficial Holder reaffirmed that it is "fully willing to surrender the domain name".

6. Discussion and Findings

According to paragraph 4(a) of the Policy, in order to succeed, a complainant must establish each of the following elements:

- (i) the disputed domain name 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 disputed domain name; and
- (iii) the disputed domain name has been registered and is being used in bad faith.

6.1. Preliminary Issue: Identity of the Respondent

The Panel notes that paragraph 1 of the Rules defines respondent as “the holder of a domain-name registration against which a complaint is initiated” and that the appointed panel retains discretion to determine the respondent against which the case should proceed (see [section 4.4.5](#) of the [WIPO Overview of WIPO Panel Views on Select UDRP Questions](#) (“[WIPO Overview 3.1](#)”)).

In exercising their discretions in similar circumstances, previous UDRP panels generally considered, among others, (i) whether the identity of the beneficial holder is disclosed, (ii) whether the beneficial holder submits arguments explaining its position, or (iii) whether the relationship between the registrant of the domain name and the beneficial holder is clear (see *Bryan Cave Leighton Paisner LLP v. Job*, [WIPO Case No. D2020-0592](#)).

In the present case, the listed registrant has not come forward during the course of the present proceedings. On the other hand, the beneficial holder explained in his email to the Center of August 11, 2026, that he had initially acquired the disputed domain name together with his affiliated party through the Respondent Manus AI, and that he is now fully willing to surrender the domain name.

Considering the beneficial holder’s involvement, both the registrant and the beneficial holder will be treated as Respondents in this matter (*FIL Limited v. Fidelity Capital Trade / Christia Brown*, [WIPO Case No. D2019-2169](#)). Hereinafter, the registrant will be referred to as “Respondent 1” and the Beneficial Holder as “Respondent 2”.

6.2 Substantive Issues

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 entirety of the ABEILLE mark is reproduced within the disputed domain name.

Although the addition of other terms such as here “optique” may bear on assessment of the second and third elements, the Panel finds that in the present case 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 addition of the generic Top-Level Domain (“gTLD”) “.com” in the disputed domain name is a standard registration requirement and as such may be disregarded under the confusing similarity test under the Policy, paragraph 4(a)(i). [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.11.1.

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 for a complainant to prove 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 Respondent 1 operates an artificial intelligence platform enabling users to register domain names and build and publish websites, whereby the domain names are held by the Respondent 1. The record shows that the Respondent 1 registered the disputed domain name for the Respondent 2 and his affiliated party.

The Panel finds that the Respondents do not have own rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name. Furthermore, the Respondent 2 contends, credibly, that it requested the Respondent 1 to release or transfer the disputed domain name, but that the Respondent 1 did not react. The record further shows that the disputed domain name was previously used for a website promoting the optician business then operating under the name “Abeille Optique” and displaying a bee logo highly similar to the Complainant’s figurative trademarks. Following the Complainant’s cease-and-desist letter, that business acknowledged the Complainant’s prior rights, undertook to cease using the “Abeille Optique” name and to relinquish the disputed domain name, and subsequently changed its corporate name to “Azad Optique.” In these circumstances, neither the former use of the disputed domain name in connection with the “Abeille Optique” business nor its current inactive status gives rise to rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name.

Having reviewed the available record, the Panel finds the Complainant has established a prima facie case that the Respondents lack rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name.

The Respondents have not rebutted the Complainant’s prima facie showing and have 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.

Based on the available record, 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. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 3.2.1.

In the view of the Panel, noting that the Complainant’s trademark registration predates the registration of the disputed domain name and considering that the disputed domain name resolved to a website featuring the Complainant’s ABEILLE trademark and a highly similar logo, it is unlikely that the Respondent 2 could have obtained through the Respondent 1 the registration of the disputed domain name without knowledge of the Complainant’s well-known trademark. In the circumstances of this case, this is evidence of registration in bad faith.

Because the disputed domain name resolved to a website featuring not only the Complainant’s ABEILLE trademark but also a highly similar logo, the impression given by the website previously posted under the disputed domain name would have caused Internet users to believe that the website is somehow associated with the Complainant when, in fact, it is not. The Panel holds that the disputed domain name has been used to intentionally attempted to attract, for commercial gain, Internet users to the web site of Abeille Optique, by creating a likelihood of confusion with the Complainant’s mark as to the source, sponsorship, affiliation, or endorsement of its web site in the sense of Policy, paragraph 4(b)(iv).

The disputed domain name is currently inactive. From the inception of the UDRP, panelists 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, panelists have found that the registration and non-use of a domain name can still constitute bad faith for purposes of the Policy.

Factors that have been considered relevant in applying the passive holding doctrine include: (i) the degree of distinctiveness or reputation of the complainant’s mark, (ii) the failure of the respondent to submit a response or to provide any evidence of actual or contemplated good-faith use, (iii) the respondent’s taking active steps to conceal its identity or (iv) the use of false or inaccurate contact details (noted to be in breach of the respondent’s registration agreement). [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 3.3.

Taking the above factors into consideration, panels assess the overall plausibility of any (claimed) good faith use to which the domain name may be put in light of the composition of the domain name in relation to the relevant mark, such that, the more arbitrary or distinctive a mark the less plausible a claimed non-infringing good faith use is likely to be, and vice versa.

Having reviewed the available record, the Panel notes the distinctiveness and reputation of the Complainant’s trademark, the composition of the disputed domain name, the surrounding circumstances and the Respondent 1’s failure to comply with the instructions of the Respondent 2 to cancel or transfer the disputed domain name.

Therefore, although the disputed domain name is no longer active, the Panel finds that the Complainant has established the third element of the Policy with regard to the disputed domain name.

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 <abeilleoptique.com> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Andrea Mondini/

Andrea Mondini

Sole Panelist

Date: October 7, 2026