

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

MISTRAL AI v. Yvenel Benoit

Case No. DME2025-0010

1. The Parties

The Complainant is MISTRAL AI, France, represented by Blanche Avocats, France.

The Respondent is Yvenel Benoit, Costa Rica.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <mistralai.me> ("Disputed Domain Name") is registered with Spaceship, Inc. (the "Registrar").

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the "Center") on April 16, 2025. On April 17, 2025, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the Disputed Domain Name. On April 17, 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 (Withheld for Privacy ehf) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on April 22, 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 April 24, 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 April 25, 2025. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was May 15, 2025. The Respondent sent email communications to the Center on April 25, May 7, and May 10, 2025.

The Center appointed Nicholas Weston as the sole panelist in this matter on May 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 Rules, paragraph 7.

4. Factual Background

The Complainant is a company registered in France which operates a business providing generative artificial intelligence capabilities via large language models, assistants, agents and services. It has raised more than EUR 1 billion in three funding rounds since 2023. The Complainant holds registrations for the trademark MISTRAL AI, and variations of it, in several countries, including French trademark registration No. 4970012 for the mark MISTRAL AI registered on November 10, 2023; European Union trademark registration No. 018942618 for the mark MISTRAL AI registered on February 14, 2024; and International trademark registration No. 1794809 for the mark MISTRAL AI registered on December 15, 2023.

The Complainant is also the owner of the domain name <mistral.ai> which resolves to the company's main website.

The Disputed Domain Name <mistralai.me> was registered on February 3, 2024. The Complainant has supplied uncontested evidence that the Disputed Domain Name resolves to a website that displays the Complainant's trademark and purports to offer similar generative artificial intelligence capabilities to those of the Complainant.

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 cites a number of trademark registrations for the mark MISTRAL AI, in several countries, as prima facie evidence of ownership.

The Complainant submits that it has produced evidence for its rights in the mark MISTRAL AI which predate the Respondent's registration of the Disputed Domain Name. The Complainant submits that the Disputed Domain Name is identical to its trademark, for the reason that the Disputed Domain Name incorporates in its entirety the MISTRAL AI trademark, and that the confusing similarity is not removed by the generic Top-Level Domain ("gTLD") ".me".

The Complainant contends that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the Disputed Domain Name because, "[t]he Respondent [...] has no link whatsoever with the Complainant and is totally unknown by the Complainant [...] does not hold any right or legitimate interest in the name 'MISTRAL AI' [...] does not own any 'MISTRAL AI' or similar trademark[s] [...] [and] [...] the Complainant has never authorized the Respondent to register and use the [D]isputed [D]omain [N]ame" and infers that none of the circumstances set out in paragraph 4(c) of the Policy apply. The Complainant also contends that the Disputed Domain Name was used for a website which "reproduce the Complainant's trademarks everywhere, to create the illusion of an official website, and to impersonate MISTRAL AI's identity" and that such use should not be considered as a bona fide offering of goods or services.

Finally, the Complainant alleges that the registration and use of the Disputed Domain Name was, and currently is, in bad faith, contrary to the Policy and the Rules having regard to the prior use and "worldwide reputation since its creation in 2023" of the Complainants' trademarks, and, it submits, the use by the Respondent of the Disputed Domain Name to "[promote] generative artificial intelligence misleadingly called 'MISTRAL AI' and [create] a likelihood of confusion with the Complainant through the reproduction of the

Complainant's trademarks 'MISTRAL AI', concealing of its identity, and offering the Disputed Domain Name for sale to the Complainant for a price of USD 25,000, later reduced to USD 10,000, via solicitation emails, as evidence of bad faith.

B. Respondent

The Respondent filed a Response to the Complainant's contentions by sending emails on April 25, May 7, and May 10, 2025. The Respondent's email of May 7 ostensibly repeats the email of April 25. The email of May 10 confirms the Respondent's position that the May 7 email may be regarded as its formal Response.

On the issue of whether the Disputed Domain Name is identical or confusingly similar to a trademark or service mark in which the Complainant has rights, the Respondent submits that the Complainant did not have any registered trademark covering "Mistral AI" under the gTLD ".me", nor had they claimed rights to the "mistralai" string globally.

The Respondent contends that it has rights or legitimate interests in respect of the Disputed Domain Name because, "[t]he domain mistralai.me hosts a legitimate AI-based tool site built using a licensed PHP script called MagicAI, purchased from CodeCanyon. The site provides AI-powered services such as text-to-image generation, chatbot interfaces, and speech-to-text tools. It is an independent project with no relation to the Complainant's business operations" and "[t]he domain name 'mistralai.me' can reasonably be interpreted as 'Mistral AI for me' or as a personal project name". The Respondent contends that such use should be considered as a bona fide offering of goods or services.

Finally, the Respondent alleges that the registration and use of the Disputed Domain Name was not, and is not, in bad faith, contrary to the Policy and the Rules having regard to "a clear disclaimer on the website's homepage header" and stating that the offer for sale was "a standard business proposal based on the site's legitimate ranking for AI-related queries. The asking price reflected its development time and SEO performance".

6. Discussion and Findings

6.1 Preliminary Issue - Complainant's Supplementary Submission

As a preliminary matter, the Panel will consider whether the Complainant's late Supplementary Submission received by the Center on May 27, 2025 will be considered in this Decision.

Under paragraph 10 of the Rules, the panel has the authority to determine the admissibility, relevance, materiality and weight of the evidence, and to conduct the proceedings with due expedition. Paragraph 12 of the Rules expressly provides that it is for the panel to request, in its sole discretion, any further statements or documents from the parties it may deem necessary to decide the case. Unsolicited supplemental filings are generally discouraged, unless specifically requested by the panel. WIPO Overview of WIPO Panel Views on Selected UDRP Questions, Third Edition (["WIPO Overview 3.0"](#)), section 4.6.

In the present case, the Panel sees no "exceptional circumstances" nor any reason why the Complainant was unable to provide the information contained in the unsolicited supplemental filing in its Complaint. Accordingly, the Panel will not take into account the Complainant's unsolicited supplemental filing. In any event, the Panel notes the content of such submission would not alter the outcome in this case.

6.2 Substantive Issues

Under paragraph 4(a) of the Policy, the Complainant has the burden of proving the following:

(i) that the Disputed Domain Name is identical or confusingly similar to a trademark or service mark in which the Complainant has rights; and

- (ii) that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the Disputed Domain Name; and
- (iii) that 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 3.0](#), section 1.7.

Based on the available record, the Panel finds 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 Complainant has produced sufficient evidence to demonstrate that it has registered trademark rights in the mark MISTRAL AI in numerous countries.

Turning to whether the Disputed Domain Name is identical or confusingly similar to the MISTRAL AI trademark, the Panel observes that the Disputed Domain Name is comprised of: (a) an exact reproduction of the Complainant's trademark MISTRAL AI; (b) followed by the gTLD ".me".

It is well established that the gTLD used as part of a domain name is generally disregarded under the first element confusing similarity test. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 1.11.1. The relevant comparison to be made is with the second-level portion of each of the Disputed Domain Name, specifically: "mistralai".

The Panel finds the entirety of the mark is reproduced within the Disputed Domain Name. Accordingly, the Disputed Domain Name is identical to the mark for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 1.7.

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 disputed 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 disputed 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.

The Panel finds that the combined term "mistralai" has no ordinary meaning other than in connection with the Complainant. Furthermore, there is no indication that the Respondent was commonly known by the term "mistralai" prior to registration of the Disputed Domain Name and the Complainant also contends that it has not licensed, permitted, or authorized the Respondent to use the trademark MISTRAL AI. The Panel also notes that the composition of the Disputed Domain Name carries a risk of implied affiliation (see [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 2.5.1).

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 sufficiently 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 Panel notes the evidence that the Disputed Domain Name is being used to provide, in the Respondent's own words: "AI-powered services such as text-to-image generation, chatbot interfaces, and speech-to-text tools", which supports the Complainant's submission that this does not represent a bona fide offering of goods or services, or a legitimate noncommercial or fair use, given the substantial reputation and goodwill of the Complainant's mark or capacity to otherwise mislead Internet users. Use of the Disputed Domain Name in such a targeted way does not appear to be in connection with a legitimate noncommercial or fair use of the Disputed Domain Name as the Disputed Domain Name unfairly seeks to trade off the Complainant's reputation. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 2.5.3.

The Respondent submits that "[t]he domain name 'mistralai.me' can reasonably be interpreted as 'Mistral AI for me' or as a personal project name" but has supplied no evidence in support of that dubious contention. The Panel finds that the composition of the Disputed Domain Name carries a risk of implied affiliation as it effectively impersonates or suggests sponsorship or endorsement by the Complainant given the Disputed Domain Name clearly incorporates a well-known registered trademark in the AI field. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 2.5.1.

Panels have held that the use of a Disputed Domain Name for illegal activity, here, claimed impersonation of the Complainant or passing off, can never confer rights or legitimate interests on the Respondent. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), 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.

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.

In the present case, the Panel finds that the evidence in the case shows the Respondent registered and has used the Disputed Domain Name in bad faith.

On the issue of registration, given the composition of the Disputed Domain Name, and the distinctive nature of the Complainant's trademark, the Panel is satisfied that the Respondent targeted the Complainant's trademark when it registered the Disputed Domain Name.

Further, given the use of the Disputed Domain Name to display the Complainant's name next to a copyright claim on the Respondent's webpage content, the Panel is prepared to infer that the Respondent knew, or should have known, that its registration would be identical or confusingly similar to the Complainant's trademark (see [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 3.2.2). On this evidence also, the Complainant's mark was plainly targeted by the Respondent. The Respondent contends that a disclaimer indicating that the website was "not affiliated with Mistral AI or the French company Mistral AI" shows an attempt to avoid confusion in good faith. However, where the overall circumstances of a case point to a respondent's bad faith, the mere existence of a disclaimer cannot cure such bad faith. In such cases, panels may consider the respondent's use of a disclaimer as an admission by the respondent that users may be confused. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 3.7. In this case, noting the identity of the Disputed Domain Name to the Complainant's prior-registered mark and the offering of directly competing services, the disclaimer cannot cure the Respondent's bad faith, and does tend to suggest that users may be confused.

The Disputed Domain Name containing the Complainant's distinctive and well-known MISTRAL AI trademark has been directly offered for sale by the Respondent to the Complainant for USD 25,000 (by email on March 13, 2025), later reduced to USD 10,000 (by email on April 25, 2025) in a further solicitation by the

Respondent to the Complainant. These are both sums in excess of out-of-pocket registration costs relating to the Disputed Domain Name. The offering for sale of a disputed domain name containing a well-known mark for sums in excess of out-of-pocket costs of registration is commonly held by Panels to be registration and use in bad faith under the paragraph 4(b)(i) of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 3.1.1.

Also, on the issue of use, Panels have also held that the use of a domain name for illegal activity, here, claimed impersonation or passing off, constitutes bad faith. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 3.4. Having reviewed the record, the Panel finds the Respondent's registration and use of the Disputed Domain Name constitutes bad faith under the Policy.

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 <mistralai.me> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Nicholas Weston/

Nicholas Weston

Sole Panelist

Date: June 4, 2025.