

PANEL DECISION

ALSTOM v. 101domain DAS Limited
Case No. DEU2025-0017

1. The Parties

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

The Respondent is 101domain DAS Limited, Ireland.

2. The Domain Name, Registry and Registrar

The Registry of the disputed domain name <inter-cfdt-alstom.eu> is the European Registry for Internet Domains ("EURid" or the "Registry"). The Registrar of the disputed domain name is 101domain GRS Ltd.

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the "Center") on July 15, 2025. On July 16, 2025, the Center transmitted by email to the Registry a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On July 24, 2025, the Registry transmitted by email to the Center its verification response confirming that the Respondent is listed as the registrant and providing the contact details.

The Center verified that the Complaint satisfied the formal requirements of the .eu Alternative Dispute Resolution Rules (the "ADR Rules") and the World Intellectual Property Organization Supplemental Rules for .eu Alternative Dispute Resolution Rules (the "Supplemental Rules").

In accordance with the ADR Rules, Paragraph B(2), the Center formally notified the Respondent of the Complaint, and the proceedings commenced on July 30, 2025. In accordance with the ADR Rules, Paragraph B(3), the due date for Response was August 19, 2025. The Respondent did not submit any response. An informal email communication was received from on August 13, 2025, from an address appearing to be associated with the Respondent, stating it is the Registrar and not the registrant of the disputed domain name.

The Center appointed Knud Wallberg as the sole panelist in this matter on August 26, 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 ADR Rules, Paragraph B(5).

4. Factual Background

The Complainant is a French company created in 1928. They are a global leader in the world of power generation, power transmission and rail infrastructure, employing 80,000 professionals in more than 63 countries, over 250 sites, including over 6,000 people, operating over 37 sites across the United Kingdom (“UK”) and Ireland, four of which are in Ireland.

Between 2022 and 2023, the Complainant’s order intake reached EUR 20.7 billion. The Complainant’s sales reached EUR 16.5 billion.

The Complainant holds trademark registrations comprising the word ALSTOM in numerous jurisdictions worldwide, including the following:

- European Union Trademark Registration ALSTOM (word) No. 000948729 registered on August 8, 2001, for goods and services in classes 6, 7, 9, 11, 12, 16, 19, 24, 35, 36, 37, 38, 39, 40, 41, and 42.
- European Union Trademark Registration ALSTOM (device) No. 000948802 registered on June 6, 2002, for goods and services in classes 6, 7, 9, 11, 12, 16, 19, 24, 35, 36, 37, 38, 39, 40, 41 and 42.
- International Registration ALSTOM (device) No. 706292 registered on August 28, 1998, for goods and services in classes 1, 2, 4, 6, 7, 9, 11, 12, 13, 16, 17, 19, 24, 35, 36, 37, 38, 39, 40, 41, and 42.

The ALSTOM group has registered numerous UK and Irish companies to manage their activities in this area, which all contain the name “Alstom”.

The Complainant is also the registrant of numerous domain names under various generic and country code Top-Level-Domains (“gTLDs” and “ccTLDs”) with the element “alstom”, such as:

- <alstom.ie> registered on February 6, 2001,
- <alstom.com> registered on January 20, 1998,
- <alstom.eu> registered on April 1, 2006.

The disputed domain name was registered on May 28, 2021, and redirects to an error page.

The Complainant sent a cease-and-desist letter to the Respondent on January 21, 2025, which remained without answer.

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.

The Complainant contends that the disputed domain name <inter-cfdt-alstom.eu> is confusingly similar to their trademark ALSTOM and to their prior domain names. The “Alstom” name is thus clearly distinguishable and identifiable within the disputed domain name, as it is separated from the other elements composing the disputed domain name by dashes or dots. Moreover, the “inter-” element simply refers to the common prefix “inter”, meaning between, among, or together. It could even be perceived as a reference to “international”. As to the “cfdt-” element, this is the name of a top syndicate in France.

The Complainant further contends that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect to the disputed domain name. The Respondent is not affiliated in any way with ALSTOM. The Complainant has not authorized, licensed or permitted the Respondent to register or use a domain name incorporating their trademarks. In addition, the Respondent has not applied for or obtained any trademark registrations related to the sign ALSTOM, nor is the Respondent commonly known under this name, just as the Respondent has not made any legitimate use of the domain name, in connection with the offering of goods or services.

The Complainant finally contends that the disputed domain name was registered or is being used in bad faith. In view of the well-known character of the name ALSTOM, it is thus virtually impossible that the Respondent was not aware of the Complainant's activities at the time it registered the disputed domain name, in addition to which the disputed domain name is not used in relation to a bona fide offering of goods or services.

B. Respondent

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

6. Discussion and Findings

Pursuant to Paragraph B(11)(d)(1) of the ADR Rules the Panel shall issue a decision granting the remedies requested by the Complainant in the event that the Complainant proves the following elements:

(i) the domain name is identical or confusingly similar to a name in respect of which a right is recognized or established by the national law of a Member State and/or European Union law and either;

(ii) the domain name has been registered by the Respondent without rights or legitimate interests in the name; or

(iii) the domain name has been registered or is being used in bad faith.

Due to similarities between the ADR Rules and the Uniform Domain Name Dispute Resolution Policy ("UDRP"), the Panel will also take into consideration the WIPO Overview of WIPO Panel Views on Selected UDRP Questions, Third Edition (["WIPO Overview 3.0"](#)).

A. Identical or Confusingly Similar to a name in respect of which a right or rights are recognized or established by national law of a Member State and/or European Union law

The Complainant has provided evidence that it is the owner of multiple trademarks ALSTOM, including an European Union registration.

It is evident that the disputed domain name consists of the Complainant's ALSTOM trademark, in combination with the terms "inter" and "cfdt" respectively as well as two hyphens. Although the addition of such terms may bear an assessment of the second and third elements, the Panel finds the addition of such a terms does not prevent a finding of confusing similarity between the disputed domain name and the mark for the purposes of ADR Rules. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 1.8.

The ".eu" Top-Level Domain is typically disregarded for the purposes of the comparison with the Complainant's trademarks on the basis that it is a standard technical requirement for registration.

Therefore, the requirements under the first element of Paragraph B(11)(d)(1)(i) of the ADR Rules were met.

B. Rights or Legitimate Interests

Under Paragraph B(11)(e) of the ADR Rules, rights or legitimate interests may be demonstrated where:

(i) prior to any notice of the dispute, the respondent has used the disputed domain name or a name corresponding to the domain name in connection with the offering of goods and services or has made demonstrable preparations to do so;

(ii) the respondent, being an undertaking, organization or natural person, has been commonly known by the domain name, even in absence of a right recognised or established by national and/or European Union law; and

(iii) the respondent is making a legitimate and noncommercial or fair use of the domain name, without intent to mislead consumers or harm the reputation of a name in respect of which a right is recognised or established by national and/or European Union law.

While the overall burden of proof in ADR Rules proceedings lies with the complainant, panels have acknowledged that proving a respondent lacks rights or legitimate interests in a domain name can often result in the challenging task of “proving a negative,” which requires information typically within the respondent’s knowledge or control. Consequently, when a complainant establishes a prima facie case that the respondent lacks rights or legitimate interests, the burden of production on this element shifts to the respondent to provide relevant evidence demonstrating their rights or legitimate interests in the domain name. If the respondent fails to present such evidence, the complainant is deemed to have satisfied the second element.

The Complainant has not granted the Respondent any permission, license, or authorization to use the Complainant’s trademark in any capacity, including as part of a domain name, just as it is clear that the Respondent is not commonly known by the disputed domain name.

The disputed domain name <inter-cfdt-alstom.eu>, is not used actively.

The Panel therefore finds that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name and that the Complainant has satisfied the condition set out at Paragraph B(11)(d)(1)(ii) of the ADR Rules.

C. Registered or Used in Bad Faith

As the two conditions stipulated in Paragraph B(11)(d)(1)(i) and (ii) of the ADR Rules have already been fulfilled, the Panel does not need to examine whether the Respondent has registered or is using the disputed domain name in bad faith, under Paragraph B(11)(d)(1)(iii) of the ADR Rules, since the conditions stipulated in Paragraphs B(11)(d)(ii) and (iii) of the ADR Rules are considered alternate bases for a successful complaint.

However, based on the facts and arguments of the case that the Complainant has put forward and which are described in the previous paragraphs, the Panel finds that it is obvious that the Respondent knew of and targeted the Complainant’s trademark when it registered and started using the disputed domain name. The Panel finds that the conditions of the bad faith stipulated in Paragraph (B)(11)(d)(1)(iii) of the ADR Rules have been met.

7. Decision

For the foregoing reasons, in accordance with Paragraph B(11) of the ADR Rules, the Panel orders that the disputed domain name, <inter-cfdt-alstom.eu> be transferred to the Complainant. ¹

/Knud Wallberg/

Knud Wallberg

Sole Panelist

Date: September 9, 2025

¹(i) The decision shall be implemented by the Registry within thirty (30) days after the notification of the decision to the Parties, unless the Respondent initiates court proceedings in a Mutual Jurisdiction, as defined in Paragraph A(1) of the ADR Rules.

(ii) As the Complainant is located in France, a Member State of the European Union, it satisfies the general eligibility criteria for registration of the disputed domain name set out in Article 3 of the Regulation (EU) 2019/517. Therefore, the Complainant is entitled to request the transfer of the disputed domain name.