

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

NATIXIS v. ALIX SUNGGIN

Case No. D2026-3826

1. The Parties

The Complainant is NATIXIS, France, represented by MIIP MADE IN IP, France.

The Respondent is ALIX SUNGGIN, Malaysia.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <natixisbank.com> is registered with Atom.com Domains LLC (the “Registrar”).

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the “Center”) on August 26, 2026. On August 27, 2026, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On August 27, 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 (Registrant Unknown) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on August 31, 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 September 1, 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 September 3, 2026. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was September 23, 2026. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent’s default on September 26, 2026.

The Center appointed Aaron Newell as the sole panelist in this matter on October 2, 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.

While the Respondent did not submit a formal Response, it did on October 10, 2026, send email communications to the Center indicating it was willing to transfer the disputed domain name.

On October 19, 2026, upon the Panel's instructions, the Center invited the Complainant to indicate by October 22, 2026, whether it wished to explore settlement pursuant to this correspondence and, in that event, to suspend the proceedings.

The Complainant declined to suspend the proceedings, and the Center notified the Panel accordingly. The Panel then proceeded to render the Decision herein.

4. Factual Background

The Complainant is a French multinational financial services firm specializing in asset and wealth management, corporate and investment banking, insurance and payment services. The Complainant asserts that it employs over 16,000 people across 36 countries around the world. It is part of the Groupe BPCE group of companies, which the Complainant asserts is the second largest banking group in France (employing approximately 100,000 people who serve approximately 35 million customers in France) and is responsible for financing 21% of the French economy.

The Complainant has used the trademark NATIXIS in respect of its services since at least as early as 2007, including online at its website at "www.natixis.com".

The Complainant has protected its NATIXIS trademark with a number of trademark registrations in multiple jurisdictions, including:

- i) French Trademark Registration No. 3416315 NATIXIS, registered on August 18, 2006, in classes 9, 16, 35, 36, and 38;
- ii) European Union Trademark Registration No. 5129176 NATIXIS registered on June 21, 2007, in classes 9, 16, 35, 36, and 38; and
- iii) International Trademark Registration No. 1071008, NATIXIS (figurative) registered on April 21, 2010, in classes 9, 16, 35, 36, and 38.

The disputed domain name was registered on August 25, 2026.

At the time of filing the Complaint, the disputed domain name redirected to a landing page featuring a stylized version of the Complainant's NATIXIS trademark and an offer to sell the disputed domain name for a one-time cost of USD 9,800 or to lease for USD 423 per month for 24 months. At the time of writing this Decision, the website had changed moderately; the stylized trademark and specific offers had been removed, and replaced with a message advising visitors that "natixisbank.com may still may be available. If you're interested, try our brokerage service".

The Respondent appears to be an individual based in Malaysia. As noted above, it did not file a formal Response to the Complaint but did assert that it registered the disputed domain name in order to sell it, and not for "business purposes". Consistent with this, the Respondent offered to transfer the disputed domain name to the Complainant in exchange for payment of USD 1,000. The Respondent stated:

"Hello,
I have just read this email.
I am simply selling this domain name; it is not for business purposes.
I am willing to release this domain name to the claimant, but I require compensation of USD1,000.

Thank you,
Alix"

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:

- i) the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to its registered trademark rights in the name NATIXIS because NATIXIS is wholly contained in the disputed domain name, which only differs from the NATIXIS trademark by the inclusion of the descriptive term "bank";
- ii) the Respondent does not have rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name because the Respondent does not own any trademark rights in the name NATIXIS, there is no business or legal relationship between the Complainant and the Respondent, there is no evidence available through online research that the Respondent is connected with the names "natixisbank" or "natixis bank" and the disputed domain name has resolved to a website offering it for sale or lease; and
- iii) the disputed domain name was registered and is being used in bad faith because the Complainant is a well-known entity, the disputed domain name was registered and used in order to take advantage of the Complainant and its NATIXIS trademark, and there has been no active use of the disputed domain name aside from its offer for sale or lease.

B. Respondent

The Respondent did not file a formal Response. As noted above, the Respondent did however email the Center and asserted that it registered the disputed domain name for the purposes of selling it, rather than for "business purposes".

The Respondent proposed to transfer the disputed domain name to the Complainant for USD 1,000.

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 it 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.

The Respondent's default does not automatically result in a decision in favor of the Complainant.

Paragraph 5(f) of the Rules does however provide that if the Respondent does not submit a response, in the absence of exceptional circumstances, the Panel shall decide the dispute based upon the Complaint.

Further, according to paragraph 14(b) of the Rules, the Panel may draw such inferences from the Respondent's 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 a trademark or service mark for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.2.1.

The entirety of the 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 the word "bank" may bear on assessment of the second and third elements, the Panel finds the addition of this 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 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.

Rather, the Respondent has stated that it registered the disputed domain name not for any "business purposes" but rather for the purpose of selling the disputed domain name to a third party. Given the inclusion of the trademark NATIXIS and the term "bank" in the disputed domain name, the Panel finds that the disputed domain name was registered to target the Complainant. The registration of a domain name containing a known party's registered trademark solely for the purposes of profiting from the value of that trademark cannot give rise to rights or legitimate interests under the Policy.

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 disputed domain name is a clear and obvious reference to the Complainant's NATIXIS trademark, and the Respondent registered the disputed domain name for the purposes of selling it.

UDRP paragraph 4(b) provides that the following scenario constitutes evidence of a respondent's bad faith:

(i) circumstances indicating that the respondent has registered or acquired the domain name primarily for the purpose of selling, renting, or otherwise transferring the domain name to the complainant who is the owner of the trademark or service mark or to a competitor of that complainant, for valuable consideration in excess of the respondent's documented out-of-pocket costs directly related to the domain name.

The Respondent has not provided any evidence of its out-of-pocket costs. However, noting the composition of the disputed domain name, that the disputed domain name has been registered for under three months and that there is no evidence of any substantive content associated website, rather just a landing page offering the disputed domain name for sale or lease, and that the Respondent has admitted that it has in fact registered the disputed domain name primarily for the purpose of selling or renting it, the Panel finds that the Respondent's conduct meets the description in paragraph 4(b)(i) of the Policy, and as such has registered and used the disputed domain name in bad faith. The Panel notes that there is nothing in the case file indicating facts to the contrary.

The Panel finds the third element of the Policy has been established.

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 <natixisbank.com> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Aaron Newell/

Aaron Newell

Sole Panelist

Date: October 23, 2026