ARBITRATION
AND
MEDIATION CENTER

WIPO
WORLD
INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY
ORGANIZATION

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION
Alstom v. Anupam Kachhap, Renaissance Academy of Wisdom Private Limited
Case No. D2026-4004

1. The Parties

The Complainant is Alstom, France, represented by Lynde & Associes, France.

The Respondent is Anupam Kachhap, Renaissance Academy of Wisdom Private Limited, India, internally represented.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <career-alstom.com> is registered with CloudFlare, Inc. (the "Registrar").

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the "Center") on September 7, 2026. On September 7, 2026, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On September 8, 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 (Data redacted) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on September 10, 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 14, 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 18, 2026. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was October 8, 2026. The Respondent sent an email communication to the Center on September 19, 2026. However, the Respondent did not file any formal

Response. Accordingly, the Center notified the commencement of panel appointment process on October 13, 2026.

The Center appointed James Bridgeman as the sole panelist in this matter on October 19, 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.

Relevantly following the Notification of the Complaint and Commencement of Administrative Proceedings by the Center to the Respondent on September 18, 2026, there followed correspondence between the Parties which is addressed in detail below.

4. Factual Background

The Complainant is engaged in the business of power generation, power transmission and rail infrastructure and is the owner of a large international portfolio of trademark and service mark registrations for the ALSTOM mark including:

- Indian Trademark registration ALSTOM, registration number 819276 registered on September 15, 1998, for goods in class 7;
- United States of America Registered Trademark, ALSTOM, registration number 4570546, registered on the Principal Register on July 22, 2014 for goods and services in international classes 7, 9, 12, 35, 37, 39, and 42; and
- European Union registration number 948729, ALSTOM, registered on August 8, 2001 for goods and services in classes 6, 7, 9, 11, 12, 16, 19, 24, 35, 36, 37, 38, 39, 40, 41, and 42.

The Complainant has an established Internet presence and holds a large portfolio of Internet domain names including <alstom.com> which was registered on January 20,1998. All of the Complainant's domain names redirect to the Complainant's group website at "www.alstom.com".

The disputed domain name was registered on August 22, 2026, and resolves to an error page.

There is no information available about the Respondent except for that provided in the Complaint, the Registrar's WhoIs and the information provided by the Registrar in response to the request by the Center for details of the registration of the disputed domain name for the purposes of this proceeding.

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.

The Complainant claims rights in the ALSTOM trademark and service mark established by its ownership of the international portfolio of trademark registrations described below and extensive international use of the mark, including on the Internet, in its business in the field of power generation, power transmission and rail infrastructure.

The Complainant submits that it is was incorporated in 1928 and has grown to now have 36,000 employees engaged in more than 60 countries including India, the United States of America, the United Kingdom, Ireland, Sweden, France, Netherlands (Kingdom of the), Germany, Canada.

Furthermore, the Complainant submits that its reputation is enhanced by the use of the ALSTOM mark by a great number of subsidiary companies which it owns.

The Complainant firstly alleges that the disputed domain name is identical or confusingly similar to the ALSTOM mark in which it has rights.

It is argued that the disputed domain name is composed of a combination of the Complainant's ALSTOM mark in combination with the term "career" and the generic Top-Level Domain ("gTLD") extension ".com".

The Complainant submits that many decisions of panels established under the Policy have held there to be confusing similarity when a domain name wholly incorporates a complainant's mark and only adds a generic word, for example: *Société del Hotels Méridien v. Mr. Cuneyt Ozarici,* WIPO Case No. D2005-0201, a copy of the decision is exhibited in an annex to the Complaint.

The Complainant adds that in numerous decisions panels have held that the addition of the gTLD ".com" is not to be taken into consideration when examining the identity or similarity between the relevant mark and the domain name at issue.

Secondly the Complainant alleges that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name, arguing that:

- the Respondent is not affiliated in any way to the Complainant;
- the Complainant has not indeed authorized, licensed or permitted the Respondent to register or use a domain name incorporating their trademarks;
- the Respondent has not applied for or obtained any trademark registrations related to the sign ALSTOM. He is not either commonly known under the name ALSTOM;
- the Respondent did not provide any Response to the Complaint;
- the Respondent did not reply to the Complainant's claim in order to put forward his legitimacy or rights to the contested domain name, while he had the opportunity to do so;
- the Respondent attempts by any means to conceal his identity, namely by registering the domain name via an anonymization company; and
- the Respondent does not use the disputed domain name in relation to a bona fide offering of goods or services, and as shown in a screen capture exhibited in an annex to the Complaint, it leads to an error page.

Thirdly the Complainant alleges that the disputed domain name was registered and is being used in bad faith, arguing as follows:

The disputed domain name incontestably reproduces the Complainant's trademarks, and was acquired long after the Complainant's marks became well-known.

Further, in view of the well-known character of the name ALSTOM, it is virtually impossible that the Respondent was not aware of the Complainant's activities, at the time it registered the disputed domain name.

As held by the panel in *Veuve Clicquot Ponsardin v. The Polygenix Group co,* WIPO Case No. D2000-0163, a copy of which decision has been exhibited in an annex to the Complaint the registration of a well-known trademark of which the Respondent must reasonably be aware of constitutes bad faith.

The principle was also applied in *Alstom S.A. and General Electric Company v. Sichuan Electricity Transmission and Distribution Engineering,* WIPO Case No. DCO2016-0032, concerning the domain name <gecalsthom.co>, where the panel held "that the Domain Name has been registered and is being used in bad faith. The well-known trademarks of Complainant have been existing for a long time. Respondent knew or should have known that the Domain Name included Complainant's trademarks".

An Internet search carried out on July 18, 2026, produced a company profile of the Respondent, which is exhibited in an annex to the Complaint. The search report states that the Respondent is a private company incorporated in India on October 11, 2023, engaged in veterinary activities, including Clinico-Pathological and other diagnostic activities pertaining to animals and birds which is far from Complainant's fields of activity.

B. Respondent

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

C. Relevant *Inter Partes* Correspondence

Following the Notification of the Complaint and Commencement of Administrative Proceedings on September 18, 2026 the record shows that there was an exchange of email correspondence between the Complainant and the Respondent:

On September 19, 2026, the Respondent wrote to the Center and the Complainant stating: "Hi, Let's explore the settlement option."

On September 21, 2026, the Complainant responded inter alia: "To settle this dispute amicably, we demand that you transfer the domain name <career-alstom.com> to our client for free and that you send the auth code of the domain name."

On September 21, 2026, the Respondent responded inter alia "With regard to your questions, I would like to clarify that the domain name career-alstom.com was publicly available for registration through domain registrars at the time I registered it. I selected and registered the domain name because I considered it suitable for my business activities and intended to use it for legitimate business purposes. The registration was not made with the intention of damaging, infringing upon, or harming the reputation or trademark rights of ALSTOM. I had no intention to impersonate ALSTOM or mislead its customers, employees, or business partners… I appreciate your willingness to explore an amicable resolution. Since the domain is currently being used in connection with my business activities, an immediate transfer without compensation would cause a disruption to my ongoing business operations. Nevertheless, in the interest of resolving the matter amicably and avoiding further proceedings, I am willing to settle the dispute for USD 1,500".

On September 23, 2026 the Complainant replied to the Respondent as follows: "The unauthorized reproduction of one's prior trademark rights and its use in the course of trade constitutes an infringing act. What is more, your proposal to sell to us the domain at stake for USD 1,500 hints at your bad faith, as it is mentioned in the criteria upheld by the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center."

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 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 other terms, here the word "career" and a hyphen, may bear on assessment of the second and third elements, the Panel finds the addition of such terms 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.

The uncontested evidence is that the Respondent does not use the mark or name ALSTOM, and has been willing to transfer the domain name registration to the Complainant for USD 1,500. Furthermore, the disputed domain name is not being actively used by the Respondent, but instead resolves to an error page.

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. WIPO Overview 3.1, section 3.2.1.

In the present case, the Panel notes that while the Respondent did not file any formal Response to the Center, it did immediately respond with an offer to engage in negotiations about settling the dispute. The correspondence, which is described above, illustrates that the Respondent's first reaction was to offer to sell the disputed domain name to the Complainant.

The Panel takes the inference that the inter partes correspondence discloses that on the balance of probabilities circumstances indicating that the Respondent has registered or acquired the disputed domain name primarily for the purpose of selling it to the Complainant who is the owner of the ALSTOM trademark and service mark for valuable consideration in excess of the Respondent's documented out-of-pocket costs directly related to the domain name.

Paragraph 4(b)(i) of the Policy establishes that such circumstances, shall be evidence of the registration and use of the disputed domain name in bad faith.

Panels have found that the non-use of a domain name, including resolving to an error 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 the Respondent's offer to sell the disputed domain name to the Complainant, for valuable consideration in excess of the Respondent's documented out-of-pocket costs directly related to the 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 <career-alstom.com> be transferred to the Complainant.

/James Bridgeman SC/
James Bridgeman SC
Sole Panelist
Date: October 29, 2026