

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

MIROVA v. Richard Brown

Case No. D2026-3896

1. The Parties

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

The Respondent is Richard Brown, United States of America (“United States”).

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <mirova.world> is registered with Dynadot Inc (the “Registrar”).

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the “Center”) on August 31, 2026. On September 1, 2026, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On September 2, 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 (“Dynadot Privacy Service, Super Privacy Service LTD c/o Dynadot”) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on September 2, 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 2, 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 4, 2026. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was September 24, 2026. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent’s default on September 25, 2026.

The Center appointed Reyes Campello Estebaranz as the sole panelist in this matter on September 30, 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 asset management company affiliated with NATIXIS and specializing in sustainable finance. The Complainant has operated under the corporate name MIROVA since at least 1994.

The Complainant holds multiple trademark registrations for or comprising the term “MIROVA” across various jurisdictions, including:

- French Trademark Registration No. 3897500, MIROVA (word), registered on June 8, 2012;
- European Union Trade Mark Registration No. 10787307, MIROVA (word), registered on September 10, 2012;
- European Union Trade Mark Registration No. 11123726, MIROVA (figurative), registered on January 14, 2013; and
- International Trademark Registration No. 1146522, MIROVA (word), registered on August 14, 2012;

(collectively referred to hereinafter as the “MIROVA Mark”).

The Complainant also uses domain names incorporating its MIROVA Mark for its primary online activities, including <mirova.com> (registered on October 14, 2009), which is held by its parent company, NATIXIS.

The disputed domain name was registered on July 22, 2026. At the time of this Decision, it is apparently inactive and resolves to an Internet browser error page indicating that the site cannot be reached.

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 identical to its highly distinctive MIROVA Mark, as it incorporates the trademark in its entirety. The generic Top-Level Domain (“gTLD”) “.world” should be disregarded under well-established UDRP practice.

The Complainant further asserts that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the disputed domain name. The Respondent is not affiliated with, licensed, or otherwise authorized by the Complainant. Furthermore, the Respondent is not commonly known by the disputed domain name or the term “mirova”, and is passively holding the disputed domain name without engaging in any bona fide offering of goods or services or legitimate noncommercial or fair use. The Complainant submits evidence of searches conducted across trademark databases and Internet search engines to support these assertions.

Finally, the Complainant contends that its MIROVA Mark is well-known in the international financial sector, as recognized by various prior decisions under the Policy. Given the highly distinctive and coined nature of the term “mirova”, the Respondent registered the disputed domain name with full knowledge of the Complainant’s prior rights. The Complainant argues that any Internet search easily reveals the Complainant and its mark. Consequently, the initial concealment of the registrant’s identity via a privacy service, combined with the passive holding of a distinctive mark, constitutes registration and use in bad faith under the Policy.

B. Respondent

The Respondent did not reply to the Complainant’s contentions and remains in default.

6. Discussion and Findings

Paragraph 4(a) of the Policy requires the Complainant to prove each of the following three elements to obtain a transfer of the disputed domain name:

- The disputed domain name is identical or confusingly similar to a trademark or service mark in which the Complainant has rights;
- 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.

The Complainant has made the relevant assertions required under the Policy, and the dispute properly falls within its scope. The Panel has the authority to decide the dispute by examining the three cumulative elements set forth in paragraph 4(a) of the Policy, taking into account all relevant evidence, annexed materials, and submissions. The Panel may also conduct limited independent research pursuant to its general powers as set forth, inter alia, in paragraph 10 of the Rules.

Because the Respondent failed to submit a Response within the prescribed deadline, the Panel shall decide the dispute based upon the Complaint and draw such inferences as it considers appropriate, pursuant to paragraph 14(b) of the Rules.

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, namely the MIROVA Mark. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.2.1.

The disputed domain name incorporates the Complainant’s MIROVA Mark in its entirety. Under section 1.11.1 of the [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), the applicable generic Top-Level Domain (“gTLD”) - in this case, “.world” - is viewed as a standard technical requirement for domain name registration and is typically disregarded when assessing identity or confusing similarity under the first element. Accordingly, the Panel finds that the disputed domain name is identical to the Complainant’s MIROVA Mark for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.7.

Therefore, the Panel finds that the first element of paragraph 4(a) 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 that the Complainant has established a prima facie case that the Respondent lacks rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name. The Respondent failed to submit a Response to rebut 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 under paragraph 4(c) of the Policy or otherwise.

The Panel notes that the record demonstrates that:

(i) the Complainant has not licensed, authorized, or otherwise permitted the Respondent to use the MIROVA Mark;

(ii) the Respondent is not affiliated with or connected to the Complainant in any capacity;

(iii) searches across global trademark databases (such as TMview) reveal no trademark holdings for “MIROVA” or “MIROVA WORLD” by the Respondent; and

(iv) the disputed domain name does not resolve to an active website and is not being used in connection with any bona fide offering of goods or services or legitimate noncommercial or fair use.

The Panel further notes that the term “mirova” is not a dictionary word in major languages. Although this term may correspond to specific geographical locations in the Czech Republic or Estonia, nothing in the record suggests any genuine use or demonstrable preparation to use the disputed domain name in connection with those geographical meanings, or any connection of the Respondent with these locations.

Accordingly, the Panel finds that nothing in the record indicates that the Respondent holds any rights or legitimate interests in respect of the disputed domain name. The Respondent possesses no trademark rights corresponding to the disputed domain name, is not commonly known by it, and lacks authorization, license, or consent from the Complainant. Moreover, there is no evidence that the Respondent is making a legitimate noncommercial or fair use of the disputed domain name.

Therefore, the Panel finds that the second element of paragraph 4(a) 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 the strong distinctiveness and long-standing use of the MIROVA Mark for at least over fourteen years (with trademark registrations dating back to 2012), the Complainant's adoption of its corporate name for over thirty years (since 1994), its prominent online presence, and its international reputation within the financial sector, as recognized in various prior decisions under the Policy. See, e.g., *MIROVA v. Redacted for Privacy / Tod Francis, Francis Trucking Inc*, WIPO Case No. [D2020-2148](#); *MIROVA v. Withheld for Privacy Purposes, Privacy service provided by Withheld for Privacy ehf. / Gaulard Didier, MIROVA*, WIPO Case No. [D2021-1481](#); *Mirova v. Contact Privacy Inc. Customer 0162716733 / Tabora Dee, mlrova*, WIPO Case No. [D2021-3713](#); and *MIROVA v. HENRI MARCEL, HM FINANCE*, WIPO Case No. [D2024-2442](#).

Given the distinctiveness of the MIROVA Mark, its prominent online presence, its international reputation, and the identical nature of the disputed domain name, it is more likely than not that the Respondent selected and registered the disputed domain name without prior knowledge of and the intent to target the Complainant's rights.

Furthermore, the Panel notes that the choice of the generic Top-Level Domain ("gTLD") ".world" is particularly telling in the context of this case. While the gTLD is disregarded for the technical comparison under the first element of the Policy, its specific selection cannot be ignored when assessing the Respondent's intent. Given the Complainant's established international presence and global operations in sustainable finance and asset management, the pairing of the distinctive MIROVA Mark with the ".world" gTLD directly targets the Complainant's global footprint, further demonstrating that the Respondent likely acted with full knowledge of the Complainant and its prior rights.

Regarding the non-use of the disputed domain name, it is well established under section 3.3 of the [WIPO Overview 3.1](#) that the non-use of a domain name (including a passive or "coming soon" page) does not prevent a finding of bad faith under the doctrine of passive holding. Rather, panels must examine the totality of the circumstances in each case. Having reviewed the record - including the high degree of distinctiveness and reputation of the Complainant's trademark, the identity between the MIROVA Mark and the disputed domain name, the failure of the Respondent to submit a Response or to provide any evidence of actual or contemplated good-faith use, the Panel finds that the passive holding of the disputed domain name constitutes bad faith under the Policy.

Furthermore, the Panel observes that the initial concealment of the registrant's identity through a privacy shield service, together with the Respondent's subsequent failure to participate in these proceedings or provide any rationale for registering a domain name identical to a distinctive mark, reinforces the inference of bad faith.

In addition, the Panel takes into account the specific nature of the Complainant's business operations. Given that the Complainant operates within the highly regulated financial and asset management sector, where public trust, integrity, and security are paramount, the registration of a domain name identical to the well-known MIROVA Mark carries an inherent risk of deceptive or fraudulent activity. In the financial services industry, unauthorized domain names that are identical or confusingly similar to established brand names present a heightened risk of being deployed for illicit schemes, such as phishing, financial fraud, or impersonation. Under these circumstances, and absent any explanation or legitimate justification from the Respondent for adopting an identical mark, the potential for consumer harm reinforces the finding that the disputed domain name was registered and is being held in bad faith.

Accordingly, the Panel finds that the third element of paragraph 4(a) of the Policy is satisfied.

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 <mirova.world> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Reyes Campello Estebaranz/

Reyes Campello Estebaranz

Sole Panelist

Date: October 7, 2026