

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

American Airlines, Inc. v. Aman choudhary
Case No. D2026-3565

1. The Parties

The Complainant is American Airlines, Inc., United States of America ("U.S." or "United States"), represented by Greenberg Traurig, LLP, U.S.

The Respondent is Aman choudhary, India.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <americanairlines.com> ("xn--americanairlines-rob.com") is registered with Hosting Concepts B.V. d/b/a Registrar.eu. (the "Registrar").

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the "Center") on August 11, 2026. On August 12, 2026, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On August 14, 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 (Whois Privacy Protection Foundation, Whois Privacy Protection Foundation) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on August 17, 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 August 17, 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 August 21, 2026. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was September 10, 2026. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent's default on September 11, 2026.

The Center appointed Theda König Horowicz as the sole panelist in this matter on September 21, 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 international air carrier headquartered in Fort Worth, Texas where its main hub, Dallas/Fort Worth International Airport is located. For many decades, the Complainant has used the AMERICAN and AMERICAN AIRLINES trademarks in connection with a variety of services including travel and transportation, travel agency, and travel reservation.

The Complainant owns many trademark registrations worldwide for AMERICAN AIRLINES including U.S. Trademark Registration No. 514,294 registered on August 23, 1949, and Indian trademark registration No. 1245961 of October 21, 2005.

The Complainant also owns and uses a variety of domain names including <americanairlines.com>, which redirects to <aa.com> where the Complainant's primary official website has been hosted and used since January 2, 1998.

The Complainant is also active on social media including Facebook and X (previously known as "Twitter").

The disputed domain name is an Internationalized Domain Name ("IDN") which was registered on December 29, 2025. The registered ASCII Compatible Encoding (Punycode string) "xn--amercanairlines-rob.com" resolves to and is displayed to Internet users as <americanairlines.com>.

At the time of the filing of the Complaint, the disputed domain name resolved to a website prominently using the AMERICAN AIRLINES trademark and logo. The website gives the impression to be an official AMERICAN AIRLINES platform pretending to provide a help desk and using the term "American Airlines Support Phone Numbers".

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 to be the owner of the trademark AMERICAN AIRLINES which has been registered worldwide for decades, and which has been actively used in relation notably to travel and transportation services. The IDN disputed domain name is displayed to Internet users as <americanairlines.com>. The only difference with the Complainant's trademark is the letter "i" in "american" instead of the letter "I". The disputed domain name is thus nearly identical and confusingly similar to the Complainant's trademark.

The Complainant further alleges that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name. The disputed domain name was registered without the Complainant's authorization and misappropriates the Complainant's AMERICAN AIRLINES trademark. The Respondent is not commonly known by the disputed domain name, has not used or prepared to use the disputed domain name in connection with a bona fide offering of goods or services, and has not been authorized, licensed, or otherwise permitted by the Complainant to register and/or use the disputed domain name. The Respondent has never operated any bona fide or legitimate business under the disputed domain name and is not making protected noncommercial or fair use of the disputed domain name. Instead, the Respondent is using the

disputed domain name to divert Internet traffic to a website that purports to be Complainant's official customer support website. This website is displaying and is prominently using the AMERICAN AIRLINES trademark and logo thus impersonating the Complainant to mislead the Internet users.

Finally, the Complainant underlines that the disputed domain name was registered and is used in bad faith. The disputed domain name has been used to divert Internet traffic to a website that purports to be the website for the Complainant's support phone resources, which at best confuses consumers, and at worst is used to engage in fraudulent transactions with, and harvest personal and financial information from, consumers who think they are engaging with the Complainant. The Respondent's very selection of an IDN homograph of the Complainant's mark is itself compelling evidence of bad faith. In addition, the disputed domain name incorporates the famous AMERICAN AIRLINES trademark to take advantage of its reputation is evidence of bad faith registration and use. The Respondent thus obviously knew about the Complainant's trademark when registering the disputed domain name. Use of a privacy or proxy registration service to shield its identity and elude enforcement efforts by the legitimate trademark owner also demonstrates the Respondent's bad faith use and registration of the disputed domain name.

B. Respondent

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

6. Discussion and Findings

Under paragraph 4(a) of the Policy, the Complainant carries the burden of proving that:

- (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.

The Respondent's default in the case at hand does not automatically result in a decision in favor of the Complainant, however, paragraph 5(f) of the Rules provides that if respondents do not submit a response, in the absence of exceptional circumstances, the Panel shall decide the dispute solely based upon the complaint. Further, according to paragraph 14(b) of the Rules, the Panel may draw such inferences from respondents' failure to submit a response as it considers appropriate.

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 trademark AMERICAN AIRLINES for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.2.1.

The disputed domain name "xn--amercanairlines-rob.com" is an IDN. The IDN system permits a domain name to contain Unicode characters which are encoded and which bear the "xn—" prefix. In the present case, "xn--amercanairlines-rob.com" resolves to, and is displayed to Internet users as, "americanairlines.com". The only difference with the Complainant's trademark resides in the character "i" which is visually nearly indistinguishable from the ordinary letter "l". The disputed domain name is therefore essentially identical to Complainant's trademark. Accordingly, the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to the mark for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.7.

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.

There is no evidence that the Respondent has been authorized, licensed, or otherwise permitted by the Complainant to use the AMERICAN AIRLINES trademark or to register a domain name incorporating it. Nor is there any indication that the Respondent is commonly known by the disputed domain name or by the name AMERICAN AIRLINES. Furthermore, the disputed domain name which is essentially identical to the Complainant’s trademark does not appear to have been used in connection with a bona fide offering of goods or services. Rather, it redirects to a website that purports to be the Complainant’s official customer support website. This website is displaying and is prominently using the AMERICAN AIRLINES trademark and logo thus impersonating the Complainant to mislead Internet users. Such use of a domain name identical to a brand which has a high reputation worldwide creates a misleading impression of affiliation with or endorsement by the Complainant, and cannot confer rights or legitimate interests on the Respondent. Nor is there any evidence of any legitimate noncommercial or fair use of the disputed domain name.

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 notes that the Respondent registered the disputed domain name which almost entirely corresponds to the Complainant’s famous trademark. Given the composition of the disputed domain name and its use there is no doubt that the Respondent was aware of the Complainant and its trademark rights when registering the disputed domain name. The disputed domain name redirects to a website purporting to be a helpdesk operated by the Complainant and which prominently uses the Complainant’s AMERICAN AIRLINES trademark and logo. Considering the nature of the website, it is obvious that the disputed domain name is being used in bad faith. The Respondent’s failure to submit a Response or otherwise communicate in this proceeding is indicative of bad faith.

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 <americanairlines.com> (“xn--amercanairlines-rob.com”) be transferred to the Complainant.

/Theda König Horowicz/

Theda König Horowicz

Sole Panelist

Date: October 13, 2026