

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

ALSTOM v. PETER SCHELFHOUT, TKDC

Case No. D2026-3731

1. The Parties

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

The Respondent is PETER SCHELFHOUT, TKDC, Australia.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <alstomgrovps.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 August 20, 2026. On the same day, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On August 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 August 24, 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 25, 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 26, 2026. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was September 15, 2026. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent's default on September 16, 2026.

The Center appointed Gill Mansfield 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 a French company created in 1928. It is one of the global leaders in power generation, power transmission and rail infrastructure, employing around 36,000 people in more than 60 countries.

The Complainant develops and markets a range of systems, equipment and services in the railway industry, with commercial operations around the world, namely across Europe, the United States of America, Canada, Australia, and New Zealand. By way of example, the Complainant has provided rail solutions in Australia and New Zealand for more than 100 years. It employs around 2,500 people across more than 20 sites and has been involved in multiple high profile rail projects across the region such as the Sydney Metro and Light Rail, VLocity, Xtrapolis 2.0 and Next Generation Trams in Victoria, and Gold Coast Light Rail and New Generation Trains in Queensland.

The Complainant holds registrations for trademarks comprising the word “alstom” in numerous jurisdictions around the world, including (inter alia):

International trademark registration number 706292 for ALSTOM (figurative mark) registered on August 28, 1998, in classes 6, 7, 9, 11, 12, 16, 19, 24, 35, 36, 37, 38, 39, 40, 41, and 42;

Australian trademark registration number 814613 for ALSTOM (word mark) registered on October 15, 2001, with a priority date of November 19, 1999 in classes 6, 7, 9, 11, 12, 19, 37, 39, 40, and 42;

European Union trademark registration number 948729 for ALSTOM (word mark) registered on August 8, 2001, in classes 6, 7, 9, 11, 12, 16, 19, 24, 35, 36, 37, 38, 39, 40, 41, and 42.

The Complainant also holds multiple registered domain names incorporating the ALSTOM mark, including (inter alia):

<alstom.com> registered since January 20, 1998;
<alstomgroup.fr> registered since June 2, 2017;
<alstomgroup.com> registered since November 14, 2000.

Those domain names are redirected to the Complainant’s group website at “www.alstom.com”. The Complainant operates a number of companies within the ALSTOM group including ALSTOM Transport Technologies, ALSTOM Transport, ALSTOM Holdings, ALSTOM Management.

The disputed domain name was registered on August 10, 2026. The Complainant addressed a claim to the Registrar on August 13, 2026, following which, the Complainant states, all services related to the disputed domain name were suspended. The disputed domain name resolve to an error page.

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 trademark. The Complainant states that the disputed domain name combines the whole of the Complainant's ALSTOM mark with the term "grovps". It submits that the term "grovps" relates to the term "groups" but with the letter "u" replaced with the letter "v". It also submits that these letters are visually similar and that the term "grovps" is hence a generic term used in business. The Complainant contends that the combination of ALSTOM and the generic word "grovps" will lead people to think that the disputed domain name redirects towards a page owned and managed by the Complainant, and dedicated to its activities.

The Complainant also contends that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the disputed domain name. It states that the Respondent is not affiliated with the Complainant in any way, and that the Complainant has not authorised, licensed or permitted the Respondent to register or use a domain name incorporating the ALSTOM mark. The Complainant further contends that the Respondent has not applied for or obtained any registration related to the ALSTOM mark, is not commonly known under the name ALSTOM, and is not using the disputed domain name in relation to a bona fide offering of goods or services.

Finally, the Complainant contends that the disputed domain name was registered and is being used in bad faith. It states that the disputed domain name reproduces that Complainant's trademark and was registered long after the Complainant's ALSTOM marks became well-known. It argues that, in view of this, it is virtually impossible that the Respondent was not aware of the Complainant's activities at the time that the disputed domain name was registered.

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:

- (i) that the disputed domain name is identical or confusingly similar to a trademark or service mark in which the Complainant has rights;
- (ii) that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the disputed domain name; and
- (iii) that 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 a trademark or service mark for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.2.1.

The entirety of the ALSTOM mark is reproduced 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.

Although the addition of other terms (here, the addition of the term "grovps") 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 applicable Top-Level Domain (TLD) in a domain name is a standard registration requirement and as such the TLD “.com” in the disputed domain name is disregarded under the first element confusing similarity test. [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 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.

In particular, the Respondent is not affiliated with the Complainant in any way, and the Complainant has not authorised, licensed or permitted the Respondent to register or use a domain name incorporating the ALSTOM mark. There is no evidence that the Respondent is commonly known by the disputed domain name. The name of the registrant of the disputed domain name as disclosed by the Registrar is “Peter Schelfhout”. There is also no evidence of use, or demonstrable preparations to use, the disputed domain name for a bona fide offering of goods or services, or of any legitimate noncommercial or fair use of the disputed domain name without intent for commercial gain to misleadingly divert customers.

The disputed domain name consists of the Complainant’s ALSTOM mark in its entirety with the addition of the term “grovps”. This additional term mimics the term “groups” but with the letter “u” replaced with the letter “v”. The Panel accepts that these two letters are visually similar and finds that the term “grovps” is likely to be read as “groups” and, therefore, likely to be associated by Internet users with a group corporate structure. The Panel notes that the Complainant operates as a group of companies under the ALSTOM mark and that the Complainant also uses the configuration “alstomgroup” in some of its own domain names which redirect to its corporate website. As such the disputed domain name is likely to be perceived as a domain name of the Complainant, or in some way associated with the Complainant.

The Panel finds that the composition of the disputed domain name is such as to carry a risk of implied affiliation with the Complainant’s trademark which cannot constitute fair use as it effectively impersonates the Complainant, or suggests affiliation with or sponsorship or endorsement by the Complainant. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 2.5.1.

In addition, according to paragraph 14(b) of the Rules, the Panel may draw from the lack of response of the Respondent such inferences as it considers appropriate. The Panel is of the view that the lack of a substantive response to the Complainant’s contentions from the Respondent further corroborates the absence of any rights or legitimate interests of the Respondent in 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.

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 disputed domain name was registered many years after the Complainant's first registration of the ALSTOM trademark. Having reviewed the available record, the Panel finds that the Complainant's mark has achieved significant goodwill and reputation, and is well-known worldwide including in Australia where, according to the details provided to the Registrar, the Respondent is located. In view of the reputation in the Complainant's trademark, it is inconceivable that the Respondent did not have knowledge of the mark at the time the disputed domain name was registered.

Panels have consistently found that the mere registration of a domain name that is identical or confusingly similar (particularly domain names comprising typos or incorporating the mark plus a descriptive term) to a well-known trademark, and particularly in the case of coined or fanciful marks, can by itself create a presumption of bad faith. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 3.1.4.

The Panel notes that the disputed domain name resolves to an error page.

Panels have consistently 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 and reputation of the Complainant's trademark, and the composition of the disputed domain name, and finds that in the circumstances of this case the passive holding of the disputed domain name does not prevent a finding of 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 <alstomgrovps.com> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Gill Mansfield/

Gill Mansfield

Sole Panelist

Date: October 5, 2026