

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

Glass Auto Service v. Altrix UAE and ALTX UAE emirat's
Case No. D2026-4012

1. The Parties

Complainant is Glass Auto Service, France, represented by Jakubowicz & Associés, France.

Respondents are Altrix UAE, France ("Respondent No. 1"), and ALTX UAE emirat's, Qatar ("Respondent No. 2"), (together "Respondents").

2. The Domain Names and Registrar

The disputed domain names <glassauto24.com> ("disputed domain name No. 1") and <glassauto-plus.com> ("disputed domain name No. 2") (together "disputed domain names") are registered with Name.com, 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 names. On September 8, 2026, the Registrar transmitted by email to the Center its verification response disclosing registrant and contact information for the disputed domain names which differed from the named Respondent ("Redacted for Privacy, Domain Protection Services, Inc") and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to Complainant on September 9, 2026, with the registrant and contact information of nominally multiple underlying registrants revealed by the Registrar, requesting Complainant to either file separate complaint(s) for the disputed domain names associated with different underlying registrants or alternatively, demonstrate that the underlying registrants are in fact the same entity and/or that all domain names are under common control. Complainant filed an amended Complaint on September 11, 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 Respondents of the Complaint, and the proceedings commenced on September 17, 2026. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was October 7, 2026. Respondents did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified Respondents' default on October 8, 2026.

The Center appointed Stephanie G. Hartung as the sole panelist in this matter on October 14, 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

Complainant is a company organized under the laws of France whose business is the installation, repair, and replacement of all kinds of automotive windshields.

Complainant has provided evidence that it is the registered owner of the following trademarks relating to its company name and brand Glass Auto:

- word/design trademark GLASSAUTO, European Union Intellectual Property Office ("EUIPO"), registration number: 018949299, registration date: April 17, 2024, status: active;
- word/design trademark GLASSAUTO., Institut National de la Propriété Industrielle ("INPI") France, registration number: 4970693, registration date: June 19, 2023, status: active.

According to the Registrar verification, Respondent No. 1 is located in France, while Respondent No. 2 is located in Qatar. The disputed domain name No. 1 was registered on July 26, 2026; it resolves to a website at "www.glassauto24.com" set up in the French language which purports to offer windshield services by connecting customers with windshield repairers, thereby prominently displaying Complainant's GLASSAUTO trademark and inserting apparently false "Google reviews". The disputed domain name No. 2 was registered on May 19, 2026; it resolves to a typical "under construction" website at "www.glassauto-plus.com", again prominently displaying Complainant's GLASSAUTO trademark.

Complainant requests that the disputed domain names be transferred to Complainant.

5. Parties' Contentions

A. Complainant

Complainant contends that it has satisfied each of the elements required under the Policy for a transfer of the disputed domain names. Notably, Complainant contends that it uses its GLASS AUTO trademark for its network of franchisees specialized in the installation, repair, and replacement of all automotive windshields, which was created in 2003 and currently has 450 centers in French territory, why Complainant's business under the GLASS AUTO trademark enjoys a strong brand image among its customers.

Complainant submits that the disputed domain names are confusingly similar to Complainant's GLASSAUTO trademark, as they are composed of a term identical to such trademark, added by the nondistinctive generic terms "24" or "-plus". Moreover, Complainant asserts that Respondents have no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the disputed domain names since (1) Respondents, whose identities are hidden, cannot pretend to be commonly known by the disputed domain names, (2) Complainant, who exists under the GLASSAUTO brand since 2003, has never authorized Respondents to register or use the disputed domain names, and (3) the website under the disputed domain name No. 1 is used to connect customers with windshield replacement shops, all supported by attractive deals (e.g. EUR 500 free), under the name "GlassAuto" which is identical to Complainant's GLASSAUTO trademarks and company name, which enjoy the best reputation in the French market in the windshield repair business. Finally, Complainant argues that

Respondents have registered and are using the disputed domain names in bad faith since (1) Complainant's business has existed since 2003 and has a strong brand image among its customers in France for windshield repair and replacement services, (2) Respondent, therefore, must have known about the existence of Complainant and its GLASSAUTO trademark before registering the disputed domain names, and (3) the websites operating under the disputed domain names do not disclose the identity of their owner and publisher, and Respondents attempted to create confusion about their identity by referring to a variety of possible identities, and (4) the Google reviews on the website under the disputed domain name No. 1 are fake and the only customers verified reviews indicate that such website is a scam.

B. Respondents

Respondents did not reply to Complainant's contentions.

6. Discussion and Findings

Under paragraph 4(a) of the Policy, Complainant carries the burden of proving:

- (i) that the disputed domain names are identical or confusingly similar to a trademark or service mark in which Complainant has rights; and
- (ii) that Respondents have no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the disputed domain names; and
- (iii) that the disputed domain names have been registered and are being used in bad faith.

Respondents' default in the case at hand does not automatically result in a decision in favor of Complainant, however, paragraph 5(f) of the Rules provides that if Respondents do not submit a response, in the absence of exceptional circumstances, the Panel shall decide the dispute solely based upon the Complaint. Further, according to paragraph 14(b) of the Rules, the Panel may draw such inferences from Respondents' failure to submit a Response as it considers appropriate.

A. Consolidation due to multitude of Respondents and disputed domain names

As regards the multitude of Respondents and disputed domain names belonging to them, the Panel notes that (1) both disputed domain names have been set up in a similar naming pattern as they include Complainant's entire GLASSAUTO trademark, merely added by the number "24" in the disputed domain name No. 1, and by the term "plus" together with a hyphen in the disputed domain name No. 2, (2) both disputed domain names share other similarities amongst them, such as the same Registrar and a close period of time when they have been first registered, and (3) both Respondents share similarities as well, such as a similar name, and use of the same privacy service for the registration of the disputed domain names. Therefore, it is reasonable to argue that the disputed domain names are subject to common control which is why it is also fair and equitable to all Parties that this Complaint is consolidated against multiple Respondents at the same time. WIPO Overview of WIPO Panel Views on Select UDRP Questions, (["WIPO Overview 3.1"](#)), section 4.11.2.

B. Identical or Confusingly Similar

First, 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 Complainant's GLASSAUTO trademark and the disputed domain names. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.7.

Complainant has shown rights in respect of its GLASSAUTO trademark for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.2.1. Also, the entirety of such trademark is reproduced within both disputed domain names, merely added by the number "24" in the disputed domain name No. 1, and by the term "plus" together with a hyphen in the disputed domain name No. 2. Accordingly, the disputed domain names are confusingly similar to Complainant's GLASSAUTO trademark for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.7. Although the addition of such other components (here, the number "24" or the

term “plus”, and a hyphen) may bear on assessment of the second and third elements, UDRP panels take the view that the addition of such components does not prevent a finding of confusing similarity between the disputed domain names and Complainant’s GLASSAUTO trademark for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.8.

The Panel, therefore, finds the first element of the Policy has been established.

C. Rights or Legitimate Interests

Second, paragraph 4(c) of the Policy provides a list of circumstances in which Respondents may demonstrate rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain names.

Although 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 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 Complainant has established a prima facie case that Respondents lack rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain names. Respondents have not rebutted Complainant’s prima facie showing and have not come forward with any relevant evidence demonstrating rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain names such as those enumerated in the Policy or otherwise.

In particular, Respondents have not been authorized to use Complainant’s GLASSAUTO trademark, either as a domain name or in any other way. Also, there is no reason to believe that Respondents’ names somehow correspond with the disputed domain names, and Respondents do not appear to have any trademark rights associated with the term “glassauto” on their own. Quite to the contrary, the disputed domain name No. 1 resolves to a website at “www.glassauto24.com” set up in the French language which purports to offer windshield services by connecting customers with windshield repairers, thereby prominently displaying Complainant’s GLASSAUTO trademark in a similar manner as the one used by Complainant, that is, by making use of a capital “g” and “a” in the trademark, and inserting apparently false “Google reviews”; while the disputed domain name No. 2 resolves to a typical “under construction” website at “www.glassauto-plus.com”, which also prominently displays Complainant’s GLASSAUTO trademark. Such use of the disputed domain names, in the Panel’s view, does not qualify as bona fide nor as legitimate noncommercial or fair within the meaning of paragraph 4(c) of the Policy, as the disputed domain names carry a risk of consumer confusion. In this context, UDRP panels have long held that the use of a domain name for illegitimate activity (here: impersonation/passing off by Respondents for some unlawful purpose) can never confer rights or legitimate interests on a respondent. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 2.13.1.

D. Registered and Used in Bad Faith

Third, 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 circumstances to this case indicate to the Panel that Respondents were likely aware of Complainant’s rights in its GLASSAUTO trademark when registering the disputed domain names. Moreover, by using the disputed domain names (1) to resolve to a website at “www.glassauto24.com” set up in the French language which purports to offer windshield services by connecting customers with windshield repairers, thereby prominently displaying Complainant’s GLASSAUTO trademark and inserting apparently false “Google

reviews” (disputed domain name No. 1) or (2) to resolve to a typical “under construction” website at “www.glassauto-plus.com”, which is still prominently displaying Complainant’s GLASSAUTO trademark (disputed domain name No. 2), without any authorization to do so and without any disclaimer relating to the non-existing (business) relationship between the Parties, the Panel finds Respondents intentionally attempted to attract, for commercial gain, Internet users to their own websites by creating a likelihood of confusion with Complainant’s GLASSAUTO trademark as to the source, sponsorship, affiliation or endorsement of Respondents’ websites. Such circumstances are evidence of registration and use of the disputed domain names in bad faith within the meaning of paragraph 4(b)(iv) of the Policy. Also, UDRP panels have long held that the use of a domain name for illegitimate activity (here, impersonation/passing off by Respondents) constitutes bad faith. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 3.4.

The Panel further notes that, although the disputed domain name No. 2 resolves to an “under construction page”, thus, typically considered as a “non-use” of a domain name, such non-use would not prevent a finding of bad faith in the case under the doctrine of passive holding. Having reviewed the available record, the Panel notes the reputation of Complainant’s GLASSAUTO trademark, the composition of the disputed domain name, the use of Complainant’s trademark within such “under construction page”, and the failure of Respondents to come forward with any rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain names and finds that in the circumstances of this case the passive holding of the disputed domain name No. 2 does not prevent a finding of bad faith under the Policy.

The Panel, therefore, holds that Complainant has established the third element of the Policy, too.

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 names, <glassauto24.com> and <glassauto-plus.com>, be transferred to Complainant.

/Stephanie G. Hartung/

Stephanie G. Hartung

Sole Panelist

Date: October 23, 2026