

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

Babbel GmbH v. Youssouf Boussioud

Case No. DAI2025-0026

1. The Parties

The Complainant is Babbel GmbH, Germany, represented by Lubberger Lehment Rechtsanwälte Partnerschaft mbB, Germany.

The Respondent is Youssouf Boussioud, Algeria.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <babbel.ai> is registered with NameCheap, Inc. (the “Registrar”).

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the “Center”) on June 17, 2025. On June 17, 2025, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On June 17, 2025, 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 (Unknown) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on June 20, 2025, 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 amendment to the Complaint on June 22, 2025.

The Center verified that the Complaint together with the amendment to the 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 June 24, 2025. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was July 14, 2025. The Respondent sent email communications to the Center on June 20, 2025.

The Center appointed Jeremy Speres as the sole panelist in this matter on July 18, 2025. 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, founded in 2007, offers online language learning services under its BABEL mark. The Complainant's revenue in 2024 exceeded EUR 280 million. The Complainant's website is hosted at its domain name <babbel.com>.

The Complainant's mark is registered in various jurisdictions, including European Union Trademark Registration No. 013641485 BABEL in classes 9, 16, and 41, having a registration date of April 28, 2015.

The disputed domain name was registered on June 4, 2025, and resolves to a webpage indicating that the disputed domain name is available for sale and providing a contact form. The disputed domain name is also listed for sale on a well-known domain name marketplace with a minimum offer of USD 2,000.

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 its BABEL mark is well known, and that the disputed domain name was registered and has been used in bad faith in order to sell the disputed domain name to the Complainant for a price in excess of the Respondent's out-of-pocket costs associated with registration of the disputed domain name. The Complainant indicates that it has requested a selling offer for the disputed domain name for test purposes and that it received an offer to acquire the disputed domain name for the price of USD 48,000.00.

B. Respondent

The Respondent did not formally reply to the Complainant's contentions. In its informal communications, the Respondent indicated that it registered the disputed domain name after its registration lapsed and after it was unsuccessfully listed for auction. The Respondent claims to be a domain name investor who buys and sells domain names for profit.

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 Selected UDRP Questions, Third Edition, ("[WIPO Overview 3.0](#)"), section 1.7.

The Complainant has shown rights in respect of a trademark or service mark for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), 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 3.0](#), section 1.7.

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 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 3.0](#), 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.

As discussed in relation to bad faith below, it is likely that the Respondent’s intentions were to sell the disputed domain name to the Complainant for valuable consideration in excess of its documented out-of-pocket costs (absent any evidence to the contrary). This cannot confer rights or legitimate interests. *Sistema de Ensino Poliedro Vestibulares Ltda., Editora Poliedro Ltda. v. Anonymize, Inc. / STANLEY PACE*, WIPO Case No. [D2022-1981](#).

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.

For the following reasons, the Panel finds that it is more likely than not that the Respondent registered and has used the disputed domain name with a view to selling it to the Complainant for valuable consideration in excess of its documented out-of-pocket costs, falling within paragraph 4(b)(i) of the Policy.

The Panel accepts that the Complainant’s evidence establishes that its BABBEL mark is well known. The Complainant’s mark is also inherently unique and invented, not having any discernible dictionary meaning. Internet searches for the Complainant’s mark, which is identical to the second-level portion of the disputed domain name, return results overwhelmingly related to the Complainant.

Particularly where the domain name at issue is identical to a highly distinctive or famous mark, as in this case, panels have tended to view with a degree of skepticism a respondent defense that the domain name was merely registered for legitimate speculation (based for example on any claimed dictionary meaning) as opposed to targeting a specific brand owner. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 3.1.1.

The Top-Level Domain (“TLD”) for the disputed domain name is associated with artificial intelligence. In accordance with its powers of independent research articulated inter alia in paragraphs 10 and 12 of the Rules, the Panel has established that the Complainant, before registration of the disputed domain name, publicly launched new services that are underpinned by artificial intelligence. The TLD of the disputed domain name is therefore associated with the Complainant’s business, which points to targeting of the Complainant. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 3.2.1.

The minimum offer amount set by the Respondent for the purchase of the disputed domain name is in excess of the Respondent’s out-of-pocket costs directly related to the disputed domain name (absent any evidence from the Respondent to the contrary).

The Respondent’s choice of domain name in these circumstances is unlikely to have been a coincidence, and the Panel draws an adverse inference from the Respondent’s failure to meaningfully rebut the Complainant’s contentions where an explanation is certainly called for. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 4.3.

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 <babbel.ai> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Jeremy Speres/

Jeremy Speres

Sole Panelist

Date: July 23, 2025