ARBITRATION
AND
MEDIATION CENTER

WIPO
WORLD
INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY
ORGANIZATION

PANEL DECISION

Amadeus IT Group, S.A. and Navitaire LLC v. Anna Pazyna, All in Biz Club Spolka z Ograniczona Odpowiedzialnoscia
Case No. DEU2026-0004

1. The Parties

The Complainants are Amadeus IT Group, S.A., Spain and Navitaire LLC, United States of America ("United States"), represented by Ubilibet, S.L., Spain.

The Respondent is Anna Pazyna, All in Biz Club Spolka z Ograniczona Odpowiedzialnoscia, Poland.

2. The Domain Name, Registry and Registrar

The Registry of the disputed domain name <navitaire.eu> is the European Registry for Internet Domains ("EURid" or the "Registry"). The Registrar of the disputed domain name is Spaceship, Inc.

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the "Center") on February 10, 2026. On February 13, 2026, the Center transmitted by email to the Registry a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On February 16, 2026, 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 February 24, 2026. In accordance with the ADR Rules, Paragraph B(3), the due date for Response was March 16, 2026. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent's default on March 17, 2026.

The Center appointed Louis-Bernard Buchman as the sole panelist in this matter on April 17, 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 ADR Rules, Paragraph B(5).

4. Factual Background

Navitaire LLC, headquartered in Minneapolis, Minnesota, United States, is a subsidiary of Amadeus IT Group SA, a global leader in providing a cloud-based online reservation system and related technology services to the airline and rail industries, headquartered in Spain (together, “the Complainant”).

The Complainant asserts that as of 2014, Navitaire LLC served almost half of the top 30 low-cost carriers and hybrid airlines internationally, and that its last reported revenues amounted to USD 118.5 million. Since at least 2010, Navitaire LLC has won industry awards, notably for innovation, and various certifications from the competent authorities.

Navitaire LLC is the owner of several NAVITAIRE trademarks including inter alia the United States Trademark No. 2707647, registered on April 15, 2003, the Canada Trademark No. TMA623461, registered on October 25, 2004 and the European Union Trademark No. 003139961, registered on October 31, 2005 (together hereinafter referred to as: “the Mark”).

In addition, the Complainant owns and operates the <navitaire.com> domain name, registered in November 2000, which resolves to Navitaire LLC’s official website.

The disputed domain name <navitaire.eu> was registered on May 27, 2025, and does not resolve to an active website, but is for sale on a third party webpage. At the time of this Decision, the disputed domain name still resolves to such a page.

5. Parties’ Contentions

A. Complainant

The Complainant contends that it has satisfied each of the elements required under the ADR Rules for a transfer of the disputed domain name.

Notably, the Complainant contends that:

(i) the disputed domain name reproduces the Mark, in which the Complainant has rights recognized or established by national law of a Member State and/or European Union law, and is nearly identical to the Mark;

(ii) the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the disputed domain name, was never authorized by the Complainant to use the Mark in any manner and never had any affiliation with the Complainant;

(iii) the Respondent registered the disputed domain name in bad faith and, by selling it at an amount significantly exceeding the mere registration and maintenance cost, is also using it in bad faith.

The Complainant requests that the disputed domain name be transferred to the Complainant.

B. Respondent

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

6. Discussion and Findings

6.1. Procedural Aspects: Admissibility of a request to transfer and failure to comply

The Panel finds that the Complainant Amadeus IT Group SA is located in Spain and therefore satisfies the general eligibility criteria for registration set out in Article 3 of Regulation (EU) No 2019/517, and thus that, pursuant to sub-paragraph B(11)(b) of the ADR Rules, the transfer of the disputed domain name is a remedy available to the Complainant.

Pursuant to sub-paragraph B(11)(a) of the ADR Rules, the Panel is empowered to decide a Complaint on the basis of the statements and documents submitted.

Under paragraph B(11)(d) of the ADR Rules, it is the Complainant's burden to establish that all of the required criteria for granting the remedy sought have been met.

Under the ADR Rules, sub-paragraph B(10)(a), a failure by the Respondent to comply with any time period is a ground to accept the claims of the Complainant. As noted above, the Respondent has failed to respond within the time period provided.

Under sub-paragraph B(10)(b) of the ADR Rules, the Panel is empowered to draw from the Respondent's failure to comply such inferences as it considers appropriate, and under sub-paragraph B(7)(d) of the ADR Rules, the Panel is empowered to determine in its sole discretion the admissibility, relevance, materiality and weight of the evidence.

In this case, the Panel finds that the Respondent has failed to rebut any of the reasonable factual assertions that are made and supported by evidence submitted by the Complainant.

In particular, by failing to respond, the Respondent has failed to offer the Panel any of the types of evidence set forth in sub-paragraph B(11)(e) of the ADR Rules or otherwise, from which the Panel might conclude that the Respondent has any rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name, such as making legitimate noncommercial or fair use of the disputed domain name.

Moreover, as discussed below, the Respondent has failed to provide any exculpatory information or reasoning that might have led the Panel to question the Complainant's arguments that the Respondent has acted in bad faith.

6.2. Substantive Aspects

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

In comparing the Mark with the disputed domain name, it is evident that the latter consists of the Mark and the country-code Top-Level Domain ("ccTLD") ".eu".

It is well established that a ccTLD does not generally affect the assessment of a domain name for the purpose of determining identity or confusing similarity to the complainant's trademark.

The Panel finds that the disputed domain name <navitaire.eu> is identical to the Mark, which is incorporated in its entirety, as . See WIPO Overview of WIPO Panel Views on Select UDRP Questions ("WIPO Overview 3.1"), sections 1.7 and 1.11.1.[1]

[1] Noting the similarities between the Uniform Domain Name Dispute Resolution Policy (the "UDRP") and the ADR Rules, the Panel has referred to prior UDRP cases and the WIPO Overview 3.1, where appropriate.

Thus, the Complainant has satisfied the requirement of sub-paragraph B(11)(d)(1)(i) of the ADR Rules.

B. Rights or Legitimate Interests

Although a complainant bears the ultimate burden of establishing all required elements of sub-paragraph B(11)(d)(1) of the ADR Rules, with regard to sub-paragraph B(11)(d)(1)(ii) of the ADR Rules, this could result in the often impossible task of proving a negative proposition, requiring information that is primarily, if not exclusively, within the knowledge of a respondent.

Thus, the Panel's view is that sub-paragraph B(11)(d)(1)(ii) of the ADR Rules shifts the burden of production of evidence to the respondent to come forward with evidence of rights or legitimate interests in a domain name, once the complainant has made a prima facie showing, as the Panel finds the Complainant has made in this case, based on the facts and arguments set out above. See WIPO Overview 3.1, section 2.1.

As previously noted, the Respondent offered no reason for registering the disputed domain name. There is no evidence that the Respondent is known by the disputed domain name or uses (or has made bona fide preparations to use) the disputed domain name in a business or otherwise.

The nature of the disputed domain name is such that it carries a high risk of implied affiliation with the Complainant, since the disputed domain name is identical to the Mark.

No information is provided on what rights or legitimate interests the Respondent may have in the disputed domain name.

To counter any notion that the Respondent has such rights or legitimate interests, the Complainant has argued that the Respondent (i) has no affiliation with the Complainant and (ii) received no authorization from the Complainant to register or use the disputed domain name. In addition, the disputed domain name resolves to an inactive webpage and is for sale on a vendor's website for up to EUR 1,988. This further does not show that the Respondent carries any legitimate interests or rights in the disputed domain name.

In the circumstances, the Panel concludes that the Complainant has established the requirement of sub-paragraph B(11)(d)(1)(ii) of the ADR Rules with respect to the disputed domain name.

C. Registered or Used in Bad Faith

As noted above, the Respondent has failed to provide any exculpatory information or persuasive reasoning that might have led the Panel to question the Complainant's arguments that the Respondent acted in bad faith by creating confusion to the detriment of the Complainant in registering a domain name identical to the Mark.

UDRP Panels have found that the non-use of a domain name (including a blank or "coming soon" page) would not by itself prevent a finding of bad faith under the doctrine of passive holding. To 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 or reputation of the Mark, already recognized by at least one prior UDRP decision (*Navitaire LLC v. Kizzy Bradley*, WIPO Case No. D2023-4019), and the composition of the disputed domain name (identical to the Mark), 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 ADR Rules.

The Panel also finds it is not possible to imagine any plausible future active use of the disputed domain name that would not be illegitimate, considering the Complainant's reputation in the airline and rail industries.

Furthermore, the Panel notes that the Respondent has been involved as recently as last year in two trademark-abusive domain name registrations, involving the trademarks of third parties. See *Zambon S.P.A. v. All in Biz Club Spolka z Ograniczona Odpowiedzialnoscia, Anna Pazyna*, WIPO Case No. DEU2025-0029 and *GROUPE LA CENTRALE v. All in Biz Club Spolka z Ograniczona Odpowiedzialnoscia, Anna Pazyna*, WIPO Case No. DEU2025-0030.

Previous UDRP panels have held that establishing a pattern of bad faith conduct requires more than one, but as few as two instances of abusive domain name registration, see WIPO Overview 3.1, section 3.1.2.

In the view of the Panel, such behavior demonstrates a pattern of conduct by the Respondent of taking advantage of trademarks without any right to do so and is confirmative of the Respondent's bad faith.

In the light of its continuing pattern of bad faith conduct, the Panel considers that the Respondent is an obstinate cybersquatter.

The Panel concludes, notably in the light of the Respondent's electing not to provide any substantive defense of its position, that the Respondent's registration and use of the disputed domain name constitute bad faith, and that the requirement of sub-paragraph B(11)(d)(1)(iii) of the ADR Rules is also satisfied in this case.

7. Decision

For the foregoing reasons, in accordance with Paragraph B(11) of the ADR Rules, the Panel orders that the disputed domain name, <navitaire.eu>, be transferred to AMADEUS IT GROUP, S.A. 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.

/Louis-Bernard Buchman/
Louis-Bernard Buchman
Sole Panelist
Date: April 23, 2026