

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

Alstom v. RANJAN SINGH, Alsthom Venture
Case No. D2026-4070

1. The Parties

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

The Respondent is RANJAN SINGH, Alsthom Venture, India.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <alsthomgroups.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 10, 2026. On September 10, 2026, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On September 11, 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 11, 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 15, 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 16, 2026. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was October 6, 2026. The Respondent did not submit a response by that date. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent’s default on October 7, 2026.

The Center appointed Evan D. Brown as the sole panelist in this matter on October 8, 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.

On October 9, 2026, the Respondent sent an email communication to the Center concerning the registration of the disputed domain name and disputing the Complainant's claims. The Center forwarded that communication to the Panel on the same date. In the exercise of its discretion under paragraphs 10 and 12 of the Rules, the Panel has considered the Respondent's communication in reaching its decision.

4. Factual Background

Founded in 1928, the Complainant is a French company operating internationally in the rail transportation and infrastructure sector, including in India. It formerly operated under the name Alstom and owns a number of trademark registrations for the ALSTOM and ALSTHOM marks. By way of example, the Complainant owns International Trademark Registration No. 1506804 for the ALSTHOM mark, registered on November 2, 2018, designating among others India, and Indian Trademark Registration No. 819276 for the ALSTOM mark, registered on September 15, 1998. The Complainant is also the registrant of numerous domain names that reflect its trademarks, such as <alstom.com>, <alsthom.com>, and <alstomgroup.com>.

The disputed domain name was registered on August 25, 2026. The disputed domain name previously resolved to the Registrar's parking page. Following the Complainant's complaint to the Registrar, the Registrar suspended services associated with the disputed domain name. The disputed domain name does not resolve to an active website.

The Registrar identified the registrant organization as "Alsthom Venture." The Complainant submitted screenshots of a website at the domain name <alsthomgroup.com> presenting a business called "Alsthom Group" and listing "ALSTHOM VENTURE" among its businesses. That website displays the same postal address and a telephone number disclosed by the Registrar for the Respondent. Its privacy policy states that Alsthom Group operates the disputed domain name, and also provides a contact email address using the disputed domain name.

5. Parties' Contentions

A. Complainant

The Complainant contends that the disputed domain name is identical or confusingly similar to the Complainant's trademark; that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the disputed domain name; and that the disputed domain name was registered and is being used in bad faith.

B. Respondent

The Respondent did not submit a formal Response but filed an informal communication stating, in principal part, that an adviser had registered the disputed domain name without any warning that it implicated another party's rights, that the Respondent was no longer interested in continuing to use the disputed domain name, and that it was not using the Complainant's name. The Respondent also disputed the Complainant's claims.

6. Discussion and Findings

To succeed, the Complainant must demonstrate that all of the elements listed in paragraph 4(a) of the Policy have been satisfied: (i) the disputed domain name is identical or confusingly similar to a trademark or service mark in which the Complainant has rights; (ii) the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in

respect of the disputed domain name; and (iii) the disputed domain name has been registered and is being used in bad faith. The Panel finds that all three of these elements have been met in this case.

A. Identical or Confusingly Similar

This first element functions primarily as a standing requirement. WIPO Overview of WIPO Panel Views on Select UDRP Questions (“[WIPO Overview 3.1](#)”), section 1.7. 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. *Id.* This element requires the Panel to consider two issues: first, whether the Complainant has rights in a relevant mark; and second, whether the disputed domain name is identical or confusingly similar to that mark.

A registered trademark provides a clear indication that the rights in the mark shown on the trademark certificate belong to its respective owner. See *Advance Magazine Publishers Inc., Les Publications Conde Nast S.A. v. Voguechen*, WIPO Case No. [D2014-0657](#). The Complainant has demonstrated its rights in the ALSTHOM mark by providing evidence of its trademark registrations. See [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.2.1.

The disputed domain name incorporates the ALSTHOM mark in its entirety with the addition of the term “groups”, which does not prevent a finding of confusing similarity between the disputed domain name and the Complainant’s ALSTHOM mark. See [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.8. The ALSTHOM mark remains recognizable within the disputed domain name.

It is standard practice when comparing a disputed domain name to a complainant’s trademark to disregard the applicable Top-Level Domain (“TLD”) extension. See [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.11.1. Accordingly, the “.com” extension is disregarded here.

The Panel finds that the Complainant has established this first element under the Policy.

B. Rights or Legitimate Interests

The Panel evaluates this element of the Policy by first looking to see whether the Complainant has made a prima facie showing that the Respondent lacks rights or legitimate interests in respect of the disputed domain name. If the Complainant makes that showing, the burden of production of demonstrating rights or legitimate interests shifts to the Respondent, with the burden of proof always remaining with the Complainant. See [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 2.1; *AXA SA v. Huade Wang*, WIPO Case No. [D2022-1289](#).

On this point, the Complainant asserts, among other things, that the Respondent is not affiliated with the Complainant; that the Complainant has not authorized, licensed, or permitted the Respondent to register or use a domain name incorporating its marks; and that the Respondent has no relevant trademark registrations in India. The Complainant also challenges the authenticity of the business presentation on the website at the domain name <alsthomgroup.com>. The Panel finds that the Complainant has made the required prima facie showing.

The Panel has considered the identification of the registrant organization as “Alsthom Venture” and the website at the domain name <alsthomgroup.com> presenting “Alsthom Group” as a business established in 2020. The website lists “ALSTHOM VENTURE” among its businesses, displays contact information matching the Respondent’s registration details, and expressly identifies the disputed domain name in its privacy policy. These circumstances connect the Respondent to that business presentation. They do not, however, independently verify the claimed business history or establish that the Respondent has been commonly known by the disputed domain name within the meaning of paragraph 4(c)(ii) of the Policy.

The Respondent’s informal communication does not supply that missing support. Its statements that an adviser registered the disputed domain name, that no warning of another party’s rights was given, and that it is not using the Complainant’s name do not explain the selection of the ALSTHOM mark or demonstrate a

bona fide basis for its use. The Respondent has provided no supporting evidence of an independently established business or of bona fide preparations to use the disputed domain name before notice of the dispute. In these circumstances, the business-name references and general denial do not overcome the Complainant's prima facie showing.

Accordingly, the Panel finds that the Complainant has established this second element under the Policy.

C. Registered and Used in Bad Faith

The Policy requires a complainant to establish that the disputed domain name was registered and is being used in bad faith. The circumstances described in paragraph 4(b) of the Policy are non-exhaustive. See [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 3.1.

The Panel finds that it is more likely than not that the Respondent registered the disputed domain name with knowledge of the Complainant and its trademark rights. The Complainant has had longstanding international operations under the ALSTHOM/ALSTOM mark, including substantial operations in India, where the Respondent is located. The record indicates that the Complainant formerly operated under the name Alsthom and continues to own registrations for the ALSTHOM mark that predate the registration of the disputed domain name. The Panel's limited independent research¹, consisting of a web search for "ALSTHOM," disclosed no apparent ordinary meaning or association independent of the Complainant and its historical activities. This observation corroborates the distinctive character of the ALSTHOM mark and the significance of the Respondent's selection of that mark.

The Respondent's informal communication does not persuasively explain that selection. The statement that an adviser registered the disputed domain name identifies who arranged the registration but does not explain why the ALSTHOM mark was chosen. Nor does the absence of a warning during registration establish that the selection was made in good faith. The Respondent's general denial that it is using the Complainant's name does not address the incorporation of the ALSTHOM mark in the disputed domain name or supply an independent explanation for its adoption. Considering these circumstances together, the Panel finds it more likely than not that the Respondent selected the disputed domain name to take unfair advantage of its association with the Complainant. See [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), sections 3.1.4 and 3.2.1.

The evidence also supports a finding of bad faith use. Although the disputed domain name does not resolve to an active website, the Complainant submitted evidence of a website appearing at the domain name <alsthomgroup.com>. Nevertheless, the matching postal address and telephone number, the listing of "ALSTHOM VENTURE," and the privacy policy expressly identifying the disputed domain name as one operated by the business connect that website to the Respondent and the disputed domain name. The website presents "Alsthom Group" as a diversified commercial enterprise. Its privacy policy also provides a contact email address using the disputed domain name. The disputed domain name is therefore expressly incorporated into that commercial presentation.

In light of the distinctive character and reputation of the ALSTHOM mark, its association with the Complainant, and the absence of a credible independent explanation for its selection, the Panel finds that the Respondent's use of the disputed domain name in that business presentation seeks to benefit from an impression of affiliation with the Complainant. Use of a domain name so closely associated with another party's distinctive name can support a finding of opportunistic bad faith. See *Parfums Christian Dior v. Javier Garcia Quintas and Christiandior.net*, WIPO Case No. [D2000-0226](#). The Respondent's statement that it no longer wishes to continue using the disputed domain name does not alter the character of the registration and use shown by the record.

¹ Noting in particular the general powers of a panel articulated inter alia in paragraphs 10 and 12 of the UDRP Rules, it has been accepted that a panel may undertake limited factual research into matters of public record if it would consider such information useful to assessing the case merits and reaching a decision. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 4.8.

Accordingly, the Panel finds that the Complainant has established this third element under 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 <alsthomgroups.com> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Evan D. Brown/

Evan D. Brown

Sole Panelist

Date: October 22, 2026