

## **ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION**

Thales Group v. Fei Miao  
Case No. DAI2025-0055

### **1. The Parties**

The Complainant is Thales Group, France, represented by CSC Digital Brand Services Group AB, Sweden.

The Respondent is Fei Miao, China.

### **2. The Domain Name and Registrar**

The disputed domain name <thalesgpt.ai> is registered with GoDaddy.com, LLC (the “Registrar”).

### **3. Procedural History**

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the “Center”) on October 24, 2025. On October 27, 2025, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On October 27, 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 (Registration Private, Domains By Proxy, LLC) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on October 30, 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 amended Complaint on November 3, 2025.

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 November 5, 2025. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was November 25, 2025. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent’s default on November 27, 2025.

The Center appointed Marina Perraki as the sole panelist in this matter on December 3, 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 is a French multinational aerospace and defense corporation specialized in electronics. Initially founded in 1893, the Complainant's group was rebranded as THALES in 2000 inspired by Thales of Miletus, the ancient Greek philosopher and mathematician. The Complainant engages in the manufacture, marketing and sale of electronic equipment and systems for aeronautics, naval, and defense sectors. The Complainant has more than 81,000 employees on five continents, and 18.4 billion EUR in revenue. The Complainant's group maintains more than 500 offices and facilities worldwide. The Complainant has received various industry awards and recognition for innovation and corporate responsibility including repeated listings in the Thomson Reuters Top 100 Global Innovators and recognition by the Dow Jones Sustainability Index (DJSI). The Complainant has also been recognized by Forbes in a number of Forbes Lists, such as: No. 607 World's Best Employers (2024), No. 524 Global 2000 (2024), and No. 202 Canada's Best Employers (2022). The Complainant maintains its main website at "www.thalesgroup.com" and is also active in the field of Artificial Intelligence ("AI") in sectors like defense, aerospace and digital technology. According to Similarweb.com, the Complainant's website "www.thalesgroup.com" received an average of more than 1 million visitors in December 2024 and was ranked as the 2nd most popular website in its industry, the 8,672nd in France and 54,896th globally. As of April 2023, the Complainant has reported over 75,000 "likes" on Facebook, 86,000 followers on X and over 3 million followers on LinkedIn.

The Complainant owns domain name registrations for <thalesgroup.com> and <thales.ai>.

The Complainant further owns numerous trademark registrations for THALES including:

- the United States of America trademark registration No. 3087138, THALES (word), filed on July 19, 2002, and registered on May 2, 2006, for goods and services in international classes 9, 28, 38, 13, 45, and 42; and
- the European Union trademark registration No. 002186088, THALES (word), filed on April 20, 2001, and registered on November 9, 2006, for goods and services in international classes 9, 13, 16, 35, 38, 41, and 42.

The disputed domain name was registered on March 30, 2023, and at the time of filing of the Complaint, it directed users to a website purportedly offering for sale digital clothes and/or to apply digital outfits to their avatars or digital items through trading NFTs and/or Crypto Tokens "throughout the Metaverse". According to the Complaint, the disputed domain name is also set up with mail exchange (MX) records.

The Complainant sent cease and desist letters to the Respondent to which the Respondent did not reply.

#### **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.

##### **B. Respondent**

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

## 6. Discussion and Findings

Paragraph 4(a) of the Policy lists the three elements which the Complainant must satisfy with respect to the disputed domain name:

- (i) the disputed domain name is identical or confusingly similar to a trademark or service mark in which the Complainant has rights; and
- (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.

### 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 Panel finds the mark is recognizable within the disputed domain name. Accordingly, the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to the mark for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 1.7.

Although the addition of other terms here the letters "gpt" at the end of the trademark, 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 3.0](#), section 1.8.

The Top-Level Domain ("TLD") ".ai" is disregarded, as TLDs typically do not form part of the comparison on the grounds that they are required for technical reasons. See *Rexel Developpements SAS v. Zhan Yequn*, WIPO Case No. [D2017-0275](#); *Hay & Robertson International Licensing AG v. C. J. Lovik*, WIPO Case No. [D2002-0122](#); see also [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), 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 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.

There is no evidence on record showing that the Respondent is commonly known by the disputed domain name. The Respondent has apparently used the disputed domain name to promote its own business of NFTs and/or Crypto Tokens trading under a different brand. Therefore, the disputed domain name has not been used for a bona fide offering of goods or services.

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 3.0](#), section 3.2.1.

Because the THALES mark had been used and registered by Complainant before the disputed domain name registration and enjoyed reputation, the Panel finds it more likely than not that the Respondent had the Complainant's mark in mind when registering the disputed domain name. This also in view of the fact that the disputed domain name incorporates the Complainant's mark in total with a TLD ".ai" referring to one of the fields that the Complainant is active.

As regards bad faith use, the Panel considers the following factors:

- (i) the use of the disputed domain name for a website apparently promoting the Respondent's own business of NFTs and/or Crypto Tokens trading under a different brand, for its commercial gain;
- (ii) the failure of the Respondent to submit any response; and
- (iii) the lack of a response to the Complainant's cease and desist letters.

Having reviewed the record, the Panel finds the Respondent's registration and use of the disputed domain name constitutes bad faith under the Policy, paragraph 4(b)(iv).

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 <thalesgpt.ai> be transferred to the Complainant.

*/Marina Perraki/*

**Marina Perraki**

Sole Panelist

Date: December 17, 2025