

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

ALSTOM v. Paul Stanfield

Case No. D2026-3889

1. The Parties

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

The Respondent is Paul Stanfield, United States of America ("U.S." or "United States").

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <alztomgroup.com> is registered with Wild West Domains, LLC (the "Registrar").

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the "Center") on August 31, 2026. On August 31, 2026, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On the same day, 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 (Registration Private, Domains by Proxy, LLC) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on September 1, 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 3, 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 7, 2026. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was September 27, 2026. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent's default on September 28, 2026.

The Center appointed José Pio Tamassia Santos 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.

4. Factual Background

The Complainant ALSTOM is a French company created in 1928.

The Complainant is one of the global leaders in the world of power generation, power transmission and rail infrastructure, employing 36,000 professionals in more than 60 countries.

The Complainant transfers technology and localizes manufacturing to create new, sustainable, high-tech engineering and industrial jobs across the country to serve a growing list of customers that includes major American cities, transit agencies, railroads, and airport transit systems (present in 16 U.S. airports).

The Complainant holds trademark registrations comprising the word “Alstom” in numerous jurisdictions around the world, including the following trademark registrations:

- U.S. registration No. 2898433 ~~ALSTOM~~, registered on November 2, 2004;
- European Union trademark registration No. 948729 ALSTOM, registered on August 8, 2011; and
- International Registration No. 706292 ALSTOM, registered on August 28, 1998.

Moreover, the Complainant is globally renowned and operates in the U.S., United Kingdom, Ireland, Sweden, France, Netherlands (Kingdom of the), Germany, and Canada and is also the registrant of numerous domain names under various generic and country code Top-Level Domains (“TLD”) that reflect its trademark, such as:

- <alstom.com> registered since January 20, 1998;
- <alsthom.com> registered since June 20, 2000;
- <alstom.net> registered since April 1, 2000;
- <alstom.info> registered since July 31, 2001;
- <alstom.cn> registered since July 7, 2004;
- <alstom.org> registered since April 1, 2000;
- <alstom.fr> registered since May 10, 2010;
- <alstom.careers> registered since April 30, 2018;
- <alstomgroup.com> registered since November 14, 2000;
- <alstomgroup.fr> registered since June 2, 2017; and
- <alstomgroup.eu> registered since November 24, 2018.

The disputed domain name was registered on August 14, 2026, and it does not resolve to any active website.

5. Parties’ Contentions

A. Complainant

The Complainant contends that the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to its ALSTOM mark, that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the disputed domain name, and that the Respondent registered and is using the disputed domain name in bad faith within the meaning of paragraph 4(b)(iv) of the Policy.

The Complainant also contends that it has satisfied each of the elements required under the Policy for a transfer of the disputed domain name.

B. Respondent

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

6. Discussion and Findings

For this Complaint to succeed in relation to the disputed domain name the Complainant must prove that: the disputed domain name is identical or confusingly similar to a trademark or service mark in which the Complainant has rights; and the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the disputed domain name; and 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 disputed domain name results in the combination of the elements "alztom" (which reproduces ALSTOM mark, only that the letter "s" has been replaced by the letter "z"), the term "group", and of the TLD ".com".

The addition of term "group" does not prevent a finding of confusing similarity with the mark ALSTOM. As for the suffix ".com", it is not to be taken into consideration when examining the identity or similarity between the relevant mark and disputed domain name.

In this context, the Panel finds that the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to the mark ALSTOM.

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.

While the overall burden of proof in UDRP proceedings is on the complainant, panels have recognized that proving a respondent lacks rights or legitimate interests in a domain name may result in the often-impossible 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. If the respondent fails to come forward with such relevant evidence, the complainant is deemed to have satisfied the second element.

The Respondent has failed to prove its rights or legitimate interests in respect of the domain name under paragraph 4(a)(ii) of the Policy.

The Respondent is not affiliated in any way with the Complainant. The Complainant has not indeed authorized, licensed or permitted the Respondent to register or use a domain name incorporating its trademarks.

Nothing on the record indicates that the Respondent is commonly known by the disputed domain name.

The Respondent also did not provide any response to the Complainant's contentions.

Accordingly, the Complainant has established that the Respondent does not have any right or legitimate interest in the disputed domain name and has therefore satisfied the conditions of Paragraph 4(a)(ii) of 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.

The disputed domain name reproduces the misspelled version of Complainant's trademark, and was registered long after the registration of the Complainant's well-known ALSTOM marks. The Panel is of the view that it is virtually impossible that the Respondent was not aware of the Complainant's mark at the time of the registration of the disputed domain name. See *Veuve Clicquot Ponsardin v. The Polygenix Group co.*, WIPO Case No. [D2000-0163](#); and *Alstom S.A. and General Electric Company v. Sichuan Electricity Transmission and Distribution Engineering*, WIPO Case No. [DCO2016-0032](#).

Besides, in the very similar *Alstom S.A. and General Electric Company v. Sichuan Shanghai Electric Power T&D Engineering Co. Ltd.*, WIPO case No. [DCO2016-0030](#), the panel recognized that ALSTOM's Trademark was widely known and would have "any meaning in commerce other than to refer to the Complainants' trademarks (...) The Panel is unable in the circumstances to conceive of any legitimate use that the Respondent could make of the disputed domain names and infers that the Respondent registered and has maintained the disputed domain names in the knowledge of the Complainant's trademark and with the intention of impersonating the Complainants or otherwise taking unfair advantage of the Complainants' goodwill attaching to their trademarks."

As regards use, prior UDRP panels have found that the non-use of a domain name 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. See [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 3.3. Having reviewed the available record, the Panel notes the reputation of the Complainant's ALSTOM trademark, and the composition of the disputed domain name, which is best explained as a misspelling of that mark. Accordingly, the Panel 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.

Additionally, the Respondent remained silent and did not reply to the claim in order to put forward its legitimacy or rights to the contested domain name, while it had the opportunity to do so; attempts by any means to conceal its identity, namely by registering the disputed domain name by using a privacy service; and does not use the disputed domain name in relation to a bona fide offering of goods or services.

Accordingly, based on the facts above, the Panel finds that the Respondent constitutes bad-faith registration and use of the disputed domain name 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 <alztomgroup.com> be transferred to the Complainant.

/José Pío Tamassia Santos/

José Pío Tamassia Santos

Sole Panelist

Date: October 16, 2026