ARBITRATION
AND
MEDIATION CENTER

WIPO
WORLD
INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY
ORGANIZATION

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION
MIROVA v. HARTMANN STEFAN
Case No. D2026-4417

1. The Parties

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

The Respondent is HARTMANN STEFAN, Germany.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <mirova.top> is registered with Spaceship, Inc. (the "Registrar").

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the "Center") on September 30, 2026. On October 1, 2026, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On October 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 (Redacted for Privacy Purposes, Privacy service provided by WITHHELD FOR PRIVACY LLC) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on October 5, 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 October 6, 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 October 7, 2026. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was October 27, 2026. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent's default on October 28, 2026.

The Center appointed Gill Mansfield as the sole panelist in this matter on October 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 company registered in France operating as an asset manager in the financial services sector. It has achieved B Corp certification and, along with its affiliates, manages EUR 28.4 billion (as of September 2023).

The Complainant holds European Union and International registrations for the MIROVA trademark including, inter alia:

- European Union trademark registration number 10787307 for MIROVA (word mark) registered on September 10, 2012, in classes 16, 35, and 36.

- European Union trademark registration number 11123726 for MIROVA (figurative mark) registered on January 14, 2013, in classes 16, 35, and 36.

- International trademark registration number 1146522 for MIROVA (word mark) registered on August 14, 2012, in classes 35 and 36.

The Complainant also uses the following domain names, which are owned by its parent company NATIXIS: <mirova.com> registered on October 14, 2009, which redirects to the Complainant's website, and <mirova.fr> registered on March 7, 2012.

The disputed domain name was registered on September 17, 2026, and resolves to an error page. Mail Exchange ("MX") records associated with the disputed domain name have been configured.

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 or confusingly similar to the Complainant's MIROVA trademark as it incorporates the trademark entirely. It also contends that the Complainant's trademark is highly distinctive.

The Complainant contends that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the disputed domain name. It submits that the Respondent does not own any relevant trademark. It further submits that there is no business or legal relationship between the Complainant and the Respondent, and that the Complainant has not authorised or licensed the Respondent to use its trademark in any way. The Complainant states that the disputed domain name does not resolve to an active website, that the Respondent is not commonly known as MIROVA, and that the Respondent does not appear to engage in any legitimate noncommercial or fair use of the disputed domain name, nor any use of the disputed domain name in connection with any bona fide offering of goods or services.

Finally, the Complainant contends that the disputed domain name was registered and is being used in bad faith. It asserts that the MIROVA trademark is well known in France and other countries. It argues that its reputation in the financial services sector, and the distinctive nature of the MIROVA trademark, mean that the choice of the disputed domain name was not accidental, and that (in any event) a simple online search would

have made the Respondent aware of the Complainant's activities. It also asserts that MX records were activated for the disputed domain name on September 30, 2026, and argues that there is a high risk that the disputed domain name could be used for phishing or other scams.

B. Respondent

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

6. Discussion and Findings

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

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

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 identical to the mark for the purposes of the Policy. WIPO Overview 3.1, section 1.7.

The applicable Top-Level Domain (TLD) in a domain name is a standard registration requirement and as such the TLD ".top" in the disputed domain name is disregarded under the first element confusing similarity test. WIPO Overview 3.1, section 1.11.1.

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.

In particular, there is no business or legal relationship between the Complainant and the Respondent, and the Complainant has not authorised or licensed the Respondent to use the MIROVA trademark in any way. There is no evidence that the Respondent is commonly known by the disputed domain name. On the contrary, the name of the registrant of the disputed domain name as disclosed by the Registrar is "HARTMANN STEFAN". There is also no evidence of use, or demonstrable preparations to use, the disputed domain name for a bona fide offering of goods or services, or of any legitimate noncommercial or fair use of the disputed domain name without intent for commercial gain to misleadingly divert customers. As noted above, the disputed domain name does not resolve to an active website but to an error page.

The disputed domain name itself consists of the Complainant's MIROVA mark in its entirety with only the addition of the TLD ".top". In the circumstances, the Panel finds that the composition of the disputed domain name is such as to carry a high risk of implied affiliation with the Complainant's trademark which cannot constitute fair use as it effectively impersonates the Complainant, or suggests affiliation with or sponsorship or endorsement by the Complainant. WIPO Overview 3.1, section 2.5.1.

In addition, according to paragraph 14(b) of the Rules, the Panel may draw from the lack of response of the Respondent such inferences as it considers appropriate. The Panel is of the view that the lack of a substantive response to the Complainant's contentions from the Respondent further corroborates the absence of any rights or legitimate interests of the Respondent in the disputed domain name.

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.

In the present case, the Panel notes that the Respondent registered the disputed domain name on September 17, 2026, about 14 years after the Complainant's European Union and International trademark registrations. The available record shows that the Complainant (and its MIROVA mark) has a prominent online presence, and that the mark is distinctive and has gained an international reputation at least in the financial services sector.

The Panel finds that the Complainant's MIROVA mark is well known in the financial services sector. Further, given the composition of the disputed domain name, which is identical to the trademark with only the addition of the ".top" TLD, the Panel finds that it is highly unlikely that the Respondent was unaware of the Complainant's mark at the time that the disputed domain name was registered. The Panel also notes that MX records for the disputed domain name have been activated. This, at the very least, creates a potential risk of fraudulent activity. The risk is heightened by the fact that the Complainant operates in the financial services sector, and in the absence of any explanation or legitimate justification for use of the Complainant's mark, reinforces a finding that the disputed domain name was registered and is being used in bad faith.

As noted above, the disputed domain name does not resolve to an active website. It resolves to an error page.

Panels have found that the non-use of a domain name would not by itself prevent a finding of bad faith under the doctrine of passive holding. On 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 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 <mirova.top> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Gill Mansfield/
Gill Mansfield
Sole Panelist
Date: November 13, 2026