ARBITRATION
AND
MEDIATION CENTER

WIPO
WORLD
INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY
ORGANIZATION

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION
Airbus SAS v. Mary Anthianet
Case No. D2026-3915

1. The Parties

The Complainant is Airbus SAS, France, represented by CSC Digital Brand Services Group AB, Sweden.

The Respondent is Mary Anthianet, Cameroon.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <airbuslogistic.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 September 1, 2026. On September 2, 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 (The RDAP server redacted the value) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on September 3, 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 7, 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 14, 2026. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was October 4, 2026. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent's default on October 5, 2026.

The Center appointed Enrique Ochoa de G. Argüelles as the sole panelist in this matter on October 12, 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 globally renowned aerospace pioneer with a trading history spanning over 50 years, tracing its origins back to the formation of the Airbus Industrie GIE consortium in 1970.

The Complainant designs, manufactures, and delivers industry-leading commercial aircraft, helicopters, military transport vehicles, satellites, and launch vehicles. As of September 2021, its commercial footprint includes over 13,500 delivered aircraft to airlines worldwide and more than 12,000 helicopters servicing upwards of 3,000 global customers. It is also recognized as a top-tier global space and defense enterprise.

The Complainant commands a massive international presence, employing a workforce of over 157,000 personnel distributed across approximately 180 locations spanning Europe, the Americas, Africa, the Middle East, and Asia.

The Complainant is the exclusive owner of the AIRBUS trademark across numerous prominent jurisdictions worldwide (hereinafter "AIRBUS trademarks"). Its robust global portfolio includes, among others:

- European Union Trade Mark No. 019033485, AIRBUS and logo with registration date November 28, 2024;

- European Union Trade Mark No. 019033514, AIRBUS and logo with registration date November 28, 2024, in classes 12, 14, 16, 18, 21, 25, 28, 37, 41, and 42;

- International Trademark Registration No. 1112012, AIRBUS with registration date June 24, 2011; and

- International Trademark Registration No. 1247403, AIRBUS with registration date June 18, 2016.

The Complainant maintains an established and extensive internet presence, anchoring its primary corporate communications and commercial activities through its flagship domain name, <airbus.com>, which has been registered since May 23, 1995.

The disputed domain name was registered by the Respondent on July 2, 2026, and previously resolved to a website that extensively featured the AIRBUS logo and word mark. At the time of filing the Complaint, it resolves to an inactive website.

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's contentions may be summarized as follows:

In creating the disputed domain name, the Respondent has added the term "logistic" to the Complainant's AIRBUS trademarks, thereby making the disputed domain name confusingly similar to the Complainant's AIRBUS trademarks.

The fact that such term is closely linked and associated with the Complainant's AIRBUS trademarks only serves to underscore and increase the confusing similarity between the disputed domain name and the Complainant's AIRBUS trademarks.

More specifically, "logistic" – the Complainant offers a range of transportation and logistics services and is the parent organization of the subsidiary "Airbus Logistik GmbH".

Neither the Complainant nor its affiliates have licensed, authorized, or permitted the Respondent to register domain names incorporating the Complainant's AIRBUS trademark.

Thus, where no evidence suggests that the Respondent is commonly known by the disputed domain name, then the Respondent cannot be regarded as having acquired rights to or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name.

The Complainant and its AIRBUS trademark are known internationally, with trademark registrations across numerous countries, and the Respondent registered and used the disputed domain name with the intention of posing as the Complainant, which is clear evidence of bad faith registration and use.

B. Respondent

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

6. Discussion and Findings

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 Panel finds the mark is recognizable within the disputed domain name. Accordingly, the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to AIRBUS trademarks for the purposes of the Policy. WIPO Overview 3.1, section 1.7.

Although the addition of other terms here, "logistic" 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.

Furthermore, in *Uber Technologies, Inc. v Kadhim Alhisnawi, Middle East Load Board*, WIPO Case No. D2026-2209 concerning the domain name <uberlogistic.com> the panel in that case found that the addition of the term "logistic" to the complainant's trademark did not prevent a finding of confusing similarity.

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.

Panels have held that the use of a domain name for illegitimate or illegal activity here, claimed passing off, or other types of fraud, can never confer rights or legitimate interests on a respondent. WIPO Overview 3.1, section 2.13.1.

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.

It is worth mentioning that, in terms of the evidence of the case:

• The disputed domain name was registered after the registration of the Complainant's AIRBUS trademarks; and

• The composition of the disputed domain name and the content on the website indicate that Respondent was aware of the existence of the Complainant and its AIRBUS trademarks.

The Panel finds that the Respondent registered the disputed domain name in bad faith targeting the Complainant.

Panels have held that the use of a domain name for illegal activities such as claimed passing off or other types of fraud constitutes bad faith. WIPO Overview 3.1, section 3.4.

Having reviewed the record, the Panel finds the Respondent's registration and use of the disputed domain name constitutes 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 <airbuslogistic.com> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Enrique Ochoa de G. Argüelles/
Enrique Ochoa de G. Argüelles
Sole Panelist
Date: October 29, 2026