

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

Amadeus IT Group, S.A. v. bryan oliveros
Case No. DME2025-0022

1. The Parties

The Complainant is Amadeus IT Group, S.A., Spain, represented by Ubilibet, Spain.

The Respondent is bryan oliveros, Mexico.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

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

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the “Center”) on August 7, 2025. On August 8, 2025, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On August 8, 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 (REDACTED FOR PRIVACY) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on August 11, 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 August 13, 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 August 14, 2025. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was September 3, 2025. The Respondent sent email communications to the Center on August 15, 27, and 28, 2025. On August 27, 2025, the Center informed the Parties that if they would like to explore settlement options, the Complainant should submit a request to suspend the proceeding. On August 29, 2025, the Complainant requested the Center to continue with the proceeding. On September 9, 2025, the Center informed the Parties that it would proceed with panel appointment.

The Center appointed Deanna Wong Wai Man as the sole panelist in this matter on September 15, 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 Amadeus IT Group, S.A., a company headquartered in Madrid, Spain, active globally in the travel technology and services sector. The Complainant was incorporated in 1987 and essentially states that it is a technology company that designs and delivers software, data solutions, and IT systems that power the travel ecosystem: airlines, airports and ground handlers, car rental agencies, corporations, cruise and ferry operators, hotels and event venues, insurance providers, travel sellers, tourism boards, travelers themselves and more. The Complainant operates in over 190 countries and is a publicly traded company, listed on the IBEX 35, Spain's top-35 stock index, and it is also featured in various stock indices worldwide.

The Complainant owns a large international trademark portfolio for the trademark AMADEUS in various jurisdictions, including, but not limited to the following:

- European Union trademark AMADEUS, Reg. No. 002069375, registered on August 29, 2005, in classes 9, 12, 16, 35, 36, 38, 39, and 42.
- United States of America trademark AMADEUS, Reg. No. 73682376, registered on March 14, 1989, in classes 35, 39, and 42.
- International trademark AMADEUS, Reg. No. 1321806, registered on June 22, 2016, in classes 9, 35, 36, 38, 39, 41, 42, 43, and 45, designating among others Mexico.
- Mexican trademark AMADEUS, Reg. No. 0119850045242, registered on August 12, 1992, in classes 39 and 41.

The Complainant also provides references to several prior UDRP decisions which have held that the Complainant's AMADEUS trademarks are well known, including *AMADEUS IT GROUP, S.A. v. Karla Guajardo*, WIPO Case No. [D2015-0167](#) and *Amadeus IT Group, S.A. v. Connect Systems / Hostonik.com Web Hosting*, WIPO Case No. [D2018-0252](#).

The Complainant also operates domain names incorporating the AMADEUS trademark, including <amadeus.com>, which hosts the official website of the Complainant.

The disputed domain name was registered on May 19, 2025, and directs to an active website containing a personal introduction or portfolio of an individual nicknamed "Amadevss", who identifies as a full stack software developer and technology enthusiast based in Mexico City. The site features a description of the Respondent's skills, professional background, contact information including email and social media links, and objectives related to technology development and collaboration, all presented in Spanish.

The Complainant sent a cease-and-desist letter to the Registrar on May 23, 2025, demanding that the Registrar immediately lock and suspend all services related to the disputed domain name due to infringement of the Complainant's trademark rights, and disclose the complete registrant information.

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 disputed domain name is identical or confusingly similar to its well-known AMADEUS trademark, as the disputed domain name reproduces the Complainant's trademark with only a single letter substitution ("u" replaced by "v"), which is a common and accepted form of typosquatting, that does not affect the confusing similarity under established UDRP jurisprudence.

The Complainant contends that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name. The Complainant emphasizes that the Respondent is not authorized to use the AMADEUS trademark or any confusingly similar signs, and that the content hosted on the disputed domain name is a personal and professional profile under the name "Amadevss", not "Amadevs", and further that the disputed domain name directs to a personal portfolio website. The Complainant states that the website at the disputed domain name shows the use of styling and colors closely imitating the Complainant's trademark, with no legitimate connection to the Complainant's services. The Complainant argues that the Respondent has also failed to demonstrate any bona fide use or legitimate noncommercial use of the disputed domain name, as required under the Policy. The Complainant states that the public email address shown on the website is unrelated to the disputed domain name (even though the disputed domain name has an active MX (Mail Exchange) record, and that the Respondent did not respond to cease-and-desist communications from the Complainant. The Complainant argues that these facts strongly indicate the absence of any legitimate interest in the disputed domain name.

Regarding bad faith, the Complainant argues that the disputed domain name was registered and is being used in bad faith under paragraph 4(a)(iii) of the Policy. The Complainant argues that its trademark is well known globally, and it is highly unlikely that the Respondent was unaware of it at the time of registration. The Complainant argues that the disputed domain name's close visual and textual similarity to the Complainant's trademark, combined with the Respondent's use of similar branding elements, suggests an intent to confuse or capitalize on the Complainant's reputation. The Complainant highlights the Respondent's failure to provide any legitimate explanation or use for the disputed domain name, which, coupled with an unrelated public email address and an active MX (Mail Exchange) record, raises concerns about potential deceptive practices. This conduct aligns with the opportunistic domain registration behaviors the Policy seeks to prevent. Therefore, the Complainant submits that the Respondent registered and is using the disputed domain name in bad faith.

B. Respondent

The Respondent did not reply formally to the Complainant's contentions. The Respondent's arguments, as presented in email communications between August 15 and August 28, 2025, reflect a position focused on negotiating the sale or transfer of the disputed domain name. On August 15, 2025, the Respondent offered to sell the disputed domain name for USD 1,000. In subsequent emails, the Respondent described himself as a hardworking individual who registered the disputed domain name to secure work opportunities, expressing a willingness to negotiate the price and stating an intention not to cause harm to the Complainant. The Respondent refused to relinquish the disputed domain name, asserting that it is used to promote his personal services to support his family.

Further, the Respondent denied the allegations, characterizing them as defamatory, and indicated an inability to retain legal counsel. Further communications reiterated the refusal to surrender the disputed domain name and emphasized the disputed domain name's role in promoting the Respondent's services, coupled with proposals for private negotiations. The Respondent sought procedural suspension to explore settlement possibilities which did not succeed.

6. Discussion and Findings

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 Selected UDRP Questions, Third Edition (["WIPO Overview 3.0"](#)), section 1.7.

The Complainant has shown rights in respect of a trademark or service mark for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 1.2.1.

The Panel finds that the mark is clearly recognizable within the disputed domain name, as the disputed domain name reproduces the Complainant's trademark with only the substitution of a single letter ("u" replaced by "v"). Accordingly, the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to the mark for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), sections 1.7 and 1.9.

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 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 3.0](#), 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.

In addition, the Panel notes that the disputed domain name resolves to a personal portfolio website for an individual using the apparent nickname "Amadevss", which seems to be a unique moniker distinct from the main part of the disputed domain name "Amadevs". Furthermore, the Panel notes the use of the stylized blue font on the website to display the name "Amadevss", which aligns with the Complainant's typical branding style and color scheme for the AMADEUS brand, underscores the apparent intention of the Respondent to evoke association with the Complainant and its well-known trademark. The Panel also notes that the Complainant owns prior trademark registrations for the AMADEUS marks in the Respondent's jurisdiction of Mexico, covering the same type of information technology (IT) services as purportedly offered by the Respondent. Further, the Respondent's name as confirmed by the Registrar is "bryan oliveros", which does not show any resemblance with the main part of the disputed domain name "Amadevs" or the nickname "Amadevss" displayed on the website at the disputed domain name. In the absence of the Respondent's explanation of his choice for "Amadevs" in the disputed domain name and "Amadevss" on the website at the disputed domain name, the Panel finds on balance that the intention of the Respondent's choice of the disputed domain name that is a misspelled version of the Complainant's AMADEUS mark and the display of "Amadevss" using a style and color scheme similar to the Complainant's AMADEUS mark on the website at

the disputed domain name is likely to take advantage of the Complainant's mark to possibly promote his own services and is inconsistent with any right or legitimate interest the Respondent might claim. Moreover, the Respondent fails to provide any credible evidence or minimal supporting documentation which could rebut the Complainant's prima facie case showing that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name.

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 in May 2025, which is many years after the registration date of the Complainant's trademarks. Further, the Panel accepts that the Complainant's AMADEUS marks are used intensively and are internationally well known, as has also been recognized earlier by panels applying the Policy, see for instance the decisions cited above. The Panel also notes that the Complainant has a business presence and valid trademarks in the Respondent's jurisdiction Mexico. Therefore, based on the available record, the Panel finds on balance that the Respondent has registered the disputed domain name in bad faith. The Panel further notes that the mere registration of the disputed domain name, which is a misspelled version of the Complainant's well-known and intensively used trademarks, by the Respondent, who is unaffiliated with the Complainant, but according to his own statements on the website at the disputed domain name active in the same sector of information technology services, creates by itself a presumption of bad faith of the Respondent (see in this regard *Alain Afflelou Franchiseur v. Lihongbo, Lihongbo*, WIPO Case No. [D2020-2075](#), and [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 3.1.4).

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.

Having reviewed the record in detail, the Panel finds that the Respondent is using the disputed domain name in bad faith. The Respondent's website at the disputed domain name particularly employs a stylized blue font resembling that typically used by the Complainant, which is likely intended to capitalize on the Complainant's well-known trademark reputation to promote his own services. This finding is further reinforced by the overlap of the Parties' activities in the IT services sector in Mexico. Finally, the Respondent's communicated willingness to sell the disputed domain name for what is likely a significant profit, as evidenced for instance in his email dated August 15, 2025, and the lack of explanation from the Respondent's regarding his choice of the disputed domain name, further raises the question regarding the Respondent's primary intent to register the disputed domain name. Considering the Complainant's well-known trademark rights in Mexico, supported by longstanding domestic and international registrations and an active commercial presence, the Panel finds on the balance of probabilities that the Respondent's registration and use of the disputed domain name is apparently also aimed at gaining an undue financial advantage rather than use it in good faith, which constitutes bad faith use 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 <amadevs.me> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Deanna Wong Wai Man/

Deanna Wong Wai Man

Sole Panelist

Date: September 29, 2025