

PANEL DECISION

Chai Research Corp. v. FEU AZUR
Case No. DEU2026-0023

1. The Parties

The Complainant is Chai Research Corp. of United States of America, represented by Richard Law Group, United States of America.

The Respondent is FEU AZUR, Hungary.

2. The Domain Name, Registry and Registrar

The Registry of the disputed domain name <chai-ai.eu> is the European Registry for Internet Domains ("EURid" or the "Registry"). The Registrar of the disputed domain name is Namecheap Inc.

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the "Center") on June 5, 2026. On June 5, 2026, the Center transmitted by email to the Registry a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On June 8, 2026, the Registry 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 (not disclosed, Namecheap, Inc.) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on June 10, 2026, providing the registrant and contact information disclosed by the Registry, and inviting the Complainant to submit an amendment to the Complaint. The Complainant filed an amended Complaint on June 18, 2026.

The Center verified that the Complaint together with amended 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 June 22, 2026. In accordance with the ADR Rules, Paragraph B(3), the due date for Response was July 12, 2026. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent's default on July 13, 2026.

The Center appointed Eva Fiammenghi as the sole panelist in this matter on July 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

The Complainant, Chai Research Corp., is a corporation organized under the laws of Delaware, United States of America, active in the field of artificial intelligence (“AI”) and conversational AI technologies. The Complainant operates an AI platform under the trademark CHAI and offers its services through, inter alia, the domain names <chai-research.com> and <chai.ai>. The domain name <chai.ai> was created on December 15, 2017, and redirects to the Complainant’s principal website.

The Complainant is the owner of trademark rights in CHAI, including:

- International Trademark CHAI Reg. No. 1770831, registered on December 6, 2023, in Classes 9 and 42 designating the European Union ;

The disputed domain name <chai-ai.eu> was registered on January 5, 2026 and resolved to a website prominently displaying the designation “Chai AI” and offering AI chatbot services.

5. Parties’ Contentions

A. Complainant

The Complainant contends that it has satisfied each of the elements required under Paragraph B(11)(d)(1) of the ADR Rules for the revocation of the disputed domain name.

The Complainant submits that the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to its CHAI trademark because it incorporates the mark in its entirety, merely adding the term “ai” and the “.eu” country code Top-Level Domain (“ccTLD”).

The Complainant further contends that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the disputed domain name. The Respondent is not affiliated with the Complainant, has never been authorized to use the CHAI trademark, and is not commonly known by the disputed domain name. According to the Complainant, the disputed domain name has been used to impersonate the Complainant by reproducing its branding and content and by directing users to competing AI related services.

The Complainant also submits that the disputed domain name was registered and is being used in bad faith. The Complainant argues that its CHAI trademark had become distinctive and well known before the registration of the disputed domain name and that the Respondent deliberately selected the disputed domain name to create an association with the Complainant and its services. The Complainant further relies on the Respondent’s use of the disputed domain name to attract Internet users through confusion with the Complainant’s mark and redirect them to a third-party commercial website.

B. Respondent

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

6. Discussion and Findings

Under Paragraph B11(d) of the ADR Rules , to succeed a complainant must prove that:

- (i) The domain name is identical or confusingly similar to a name in respect of which a right is recognised 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 interest in the name; or
- (iii) The domain name has been registered or is being used in bad faith.

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

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 1.7.¹

The Complainant has shown rights in respect of a trademark or service mark for the purposes of the ADR Rules.

The disputed domain name incorporates the Complainant's CHAI trademark in its entirety. The addition of the term "ai" does not prevent a finding of confusing similarity. The hyphen is a technical element without distinguishing significance.

The ccTLD ".eu" is generally disregarded for the purpose of assessing confusing similarity.

The Panel finds that the Complainant's trademark CHAI is clearly recognizable within the disputed domain name and that the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to a name in respect of which the Complainant has rights.

Accordingly, the Panel finds that the first element of Paragraph B(11)(d)(1) of the ADR Rules has been established.

B. Rights or Legitimate Interests

Paragraph B(11)(d)(e) of the ADR Rules 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 the ADR Rules 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 3.1](#), section 2.1.

¹ Considering that panels in earlier .eu cases have established that there are substantive similarities between the ADR Rules and the Uniform Domain Name Dispute Resolution Policy (the "UDRP"), this Panel will refer to the WIPO Overview of WIPO Panel Views on Select UDRP Questions ("[WIPO Overview 3.1](#)"), where appropriate.

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.

The Complainant has not authorized the Respondent to use its CHAI trademark. There is no evidence that the Respondent is commonly known by the disputed domain name, nor is there evidence of any bona fide offering of goods or services, or legitimate noncommercial use.

Accordingly, the Panel finds that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the disputed domain name.

The second element of Paragraph B(11)(d)(1) of the ADR Rules has therefore been established.

C. Registered or Used in Bad Faith

The Panel notes that, Paragraph B(11)(d)(e) of the ADR Rules 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.

The Complainant's trademark rights substantially predate the registration of the disputed domain name. The disputed domain name incorporates the Complainant's trademark in its entirety together with the term "ai", which directly relates to the Complainant's business activities and strengthens the association with the Complainant. The Panel finds it implausible that the Respondent was unaware of the Complainant and its rights at the time of registration.

The record further shows that the Respondent used the disputed domain name in connection with a website promoting AI chatbot services while reproducing references to the Complainant and its CHAI trademark. The website also reproduced images originating from the Complainant's official App Store page and contained links associated with the Complainant's online presence.

The evidence additionally establishes that the disputed domain name redirected Internet users to a third-party commercial website. The Panel considers that such conduct demonstrates an intention to attract Internet users for commercial gain by creating a likelihood of confusion with the Complainant's trademark.

Accordingly, the third element of Paragraph B(11)(d)(1) of the ADR Rules has been established.

7. Decision

For the foregoing reasons, in accordance with Paragraph B(11) of the ADR Rules, the Panel orders that the disputed domain name <chai-ai.eu> be revoked.²

/Eva Fiammenghi/

Eva Fiammenghi

Sole Panelist

Date: July 31, 2026

² 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.