

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

Alstom v. Ngoc Giau Thai Thi, micheiln
Case No. DCC2025-0026

1. The Parties

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

The Respondent is Ngoc Giau Thai Thi, micheiln, United States of America (“United States”).

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

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

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the “Center”) on December 31, 2025. On January 2, 2026, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On January 3, 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 (“Privacy service provided by Withheld for Privacy ehf”) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on January 5, 2026, providing the registrant and contact information disclosed by the Registrar, and inviting the Complainant to submit an amendment to the Complaint. The Respondent sent email communications to the Center on January 5, 2026. The Complainant filed an amended Complaint on January 8, 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 January 12, 2026. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was February 1, 2026. No formal Response has been received. On January 15, 2026, the Complainant filed a Supplemental Filing. The Center informed the Parties on February 4, 2026 that it would proceed to panel appointment.

The Center appointed Jonathan Agmon as the sole panelist in this matter on February 18, 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 French company established in 1928 with operations in the fields of power generation, power transmission and rail infrastructure. It employs 36,000 professionals in more than 60 countries. The Complainant develops and markets a complete range of systems, equipment, and services in the railway industry, and has activities around the world, including in Iceland and Australia.

The Complainant is the owner of registrations comprising the word ALSTOM in numerous jurisdictions around the world, including the following trademark registrations:

- United States trademark registration No. 4570546 for the mark ALSTOM, registered on July 22, 2014;
- European Union trademark registration No. 000948729 for the mark ALSTOM, registered on August 8, 2001;
- Iceland trademark registration No. V0032731 for the mark ALSTOM (three dimensional), registered on January 20, 2000; and
- Australia trademark registration No. 814612 for the mark ALSTOM O (figurative), registered on November 19, 1999.

The Complainant is the registrant of numerous domain names comprising the ALSTOM mark including <alstomgroup.com>, registered on November 14, 2000, and <alstom.com>, registered on January 20, 1998, which serves as the gateway to the Complainant's presence online.

The disputed domain name was registered on December 18, 2025. At the time of filing of the Complaint, it resolved to a page showing a message that the content of the page cannot be displayed. The Complainant has submitted a Supplemental Filing showing that the disputed domain name has been used to send at least one fraudulent email soliciting payment from a Complainant's external customer.

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 Complainant submits that the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to its numerous ALSTOM trademarks under paragraph 4(a)(i) of the Policy because it wholly incorporates the ALSTOM mark and merely adds the term "group", which refers to a group of companies, together with the ".cc" country-code Top-Level Domain ("ccTLD"). The Complainant argues that Internet users will perceive the domain name as referring to the ALSTOM group of companies, particularly in a business environment where corporate groups are common and that multiple UDRP panels consider there to be confusing similarity when a domain name wholly incorporates a complainant's mark and only adds a generic term. The Complainant contends that Internet users will recognize its trademark and trade name in the disputed domain name and assume it was

registered by ALSTOM or a company within its group. It also emphasizes that the “.cc” ccTLD is irrelevant for the purpose of assessing confusing similarity, as panels routinely disregard TLDs, including ccTLDs. Finally, the Complainant highlights that it owns <alstomgroup.com>, registered in 2000 and used for employee email addresses in the format “name.surname@alstomgroup.com”.

- The Complainant contends that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name. The Respondent is not affiliated with the Complainant and has not been authorized, licensed, or otherwise permitted to register or use a domain name incorporating the ALSTOM trademark. The Respondent has not applied for or obtained any trademark rights in the name ALSTOM and is not commonly known by that name. In these circumstances, the Complainant submits that the Respondent lacks any rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name.

- The Complainant argues that the disputed domain name was registered and is being used in bad faith. The disputed domain name wholly reproduces the well-known ALSTOM trademark and was registered long after the mark had become widely known, making it highly unlikely that the Respondent was unaware of the Complainant and its rights at the time of registration. The Complainant notes that the Respondent replied to the Complainant’s claim only to propose selling the domain name, without asserting any rights or legitimate interests. The Respondent has also attempted to conceal his identity through an anonymization service. The disputed domain name has been used to send fraudulent emails, including messages from the disputed domain name to external customers, indicating phishing activity and creating risks for Internet users. The disputed domain name does not resolve to any bona fide offering of goods or services, instead displaying an error page. Taken together, the Complainant argues, the circumstances demonstrate that the disputed domain name was registered and is being used in bad faith.

On January 15, 2026, the Complainant submitted a Supplemental Filing providing evidence that the disputed domain name had been used to send at least one fraudulent email soliciting payment from a Complainant’s external customer. The Complainant argued that the evidence had not been previously available to it.

B. Respondent

The Respondent sent email communications to the Complainant copying the Center stating that he has decided to withdraw his involvement from the case. The Respondent further stated that he no longer wishes to pursue any action regarding the disputed domain name requesting that the proceeding be stopped.

6. Discussion and Findings

The Panel notes that the Complainant has provided in its Supplemental Filing evidence that was previously unavailable to it, and, exercising its discretion, decides that it is appropriate to admit the Complainant’s Supplemental Filing insofar as that evidence is relevant for the merits of the case.

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 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 3.1](#), section 1.7.

Although the addition of other term here, “group” may bear on assessment of the second and third elements, the Panel finds the addition of such term does not prevent a finding of confusing similarity between the disputed domain name and the mark for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.8.

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.

Panels have held that the use of a domain name for illegitimate activity here, phishing/identity theft, can never confer rights or legitimate interests on a respondent. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 2.13.1.

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.

In the present case, the Panel notes that the Respondent registered the disputed domain name, which wholly incorporates the Complainant’s well-known ALSTOM trademark together with the descriptive term “group”, long after the Complainant’s mark had become widely known. Given the distinctiveness and reputation of the ALSTOM mark, the close similarity with the Complainant’s own domain name <alstomgroup.com>, and the absence of any explanation for the choice of the disputed domain name, the Panel finds it implausible that the Respondent was unaware of the Complainant and its rights at the time of registration. The composition of the disputed domain name carries a risk of implied affiliation and indicates targeting, which is affirmed by the use of the disputed domain name in furtherance of a phishing scheme.

The record further shows that the Respondent replied to the Complainant’s claim by proposing to sell the disputed domain name, without asserting any rights or legitimate interests. Such conduct, in the totality of the circumstances of this case, is consistent with circumstances falling within paragraph 4(b)(i) of the Policy. Moreover, the evidence demonstrates that the disputed domain name has been used to send at least one fraudulent email impersonating the Complainant’s representatives to a third party. Panels have held that the use of a domain name for illegal activity, including phishing or other types of fraud, constitutes bad faith. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 3.4. Having reviewed the record, the Panel finds the Respondent’s registration and use of the disputed domain name for fraudulent email activity constitutes bad faith under the Policy.

Taking all the circumstances into account, including the notoriety of the Complainant's mark, the Respondent's targeting of that mark, the offer to sell the disputed domain name, and its use in connection with fraudulent email activity, the Panel concludes that the disputed domain name was registered and is being used in bad faith.

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 <alstomgroup.cc> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Jonathan Agmon/

Jonathan Agmon

Sole Panelist

Date: March 4, 2026