Decision for dispute CAC-UDRP-107676

Case number	CAC-UDRP-107676
Time of filing	2025-06-20 12:54:08
Domain names	amunditc.com

Case administrator

Name	Olga Slanařová (Case admin)

Complainant

Organization	AMUNDI ASSET MANAGEMENT

Complainant representative

Organization	NAMESHIELD S.A.S.

Respondent

Name	jiangli

OTHER LEGAL PROCEEDINGS

The Panel is not aware of any other legal proceedings which are pending or decided and which relate to the disputed domain name.

IDENTIFICATION OF RIGHTS

The Complainant owns the International trademark AMUNDI, registration number 1024160, which was registered 24 September 2009.

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

The Complainant is a leading French asset management company. Globally it ranks in the top 10 asset management companies. It has offices in Europe, Asia-Pacific, the Middle East and the Americas.

The Complainant has owned the International trademark registration for AMUNDI since 2009. It also owns domain names that include the trademark AMUNDI, such as <amundi.com>, registered 26 August 2004 and <amundi-tc.com> registered 23 December 2009.

The Respondent registered the disputed domain name on 17 June 2025 using a privacy service. It resolves to a parking page with commercial links. MX servers are configured.

PARTIES CONTENTIONS

The Complainant contends that the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to its the trademark AMUNDI. It says the addition of the letters “tc” are not sufficient to avoid the likelihood of confusion and do not change the overall impression that it is connected to the Complainant’s trademark, AMUNDI.

The Complainant contends that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name. It states the Respondent is not known as the disputed domain name; is not related to the Complainant’s business and is not affiliated to the Complainant; and is not authorised to use the trademark AMUNDI or apply for registration of the disputed domain name. It states the disputed domain name points to a parking page with commercial links, which is not a bona fide offering of goods or services, nor legitimate non-commercial or fair use.

The Complainant asserts that the disputed domain name was registered and is being used in bad faith. It contends the requirements of the Policy have been met and that the disputed domain name should be transferred to it.

No administratively compliant Response has been filed.

RIGHTS

The Complainant has, to the satisfaction of the Panel, shown the disputed domain name is identical or confusingly similar to a trademark or service mark in which the Complainant has rights (within the meaning of paragraph 4(a)(i) of the Policy).

NO RIGHTS OR LEGITIMATE INTERESTS

The Complainant has, to the satisfaction of the Panel, shown the Respondent to have no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the disputed domain name (within the meaning of paragraph 4(a)(ii) of the Policy).

BAD FAITH

The Complainant has, to the satisfaction of the Panel, shown the disputed domain name has been registered and is being used in bad faith (within the meaning of paragraph 4(a)(iii) of the Policy).

PROCEDURAL FACTORS

The Panel is satisfied that all procedural requirements under UDRP were met and there is no other reason why it would be inappropriate to provide a decision.

PRINCIPAL REASONS FOR THE DECISION

Paragraph 4(a) of the Policy requires the Complainant to prove each of the following three elements:

i. the disputed domain is identical or confusingly similar to a trademark or service mark in which the Complainant has rights;
ii. the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name; and
iii. the disputed domain name has been registered and used in bad faith.

A. IDENTICAL OR CONFUSINGLY SIMILAR

The disputed domain name is made up of the Complainant’s distinctive trademark AMUNDI, plus the letters “tc” and the top-level domain “.com”. The top-level domain “.com” is a standard registration requirement and can be disregarded when assessing whether the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to the Complainant’s trademark.

The most distinctive part of the disputed domain name is the mark AMUNDI. In a side-by-side comparison, adding the letters “tc” to the Complainant’s trademark AMUNDI does not avoid a finding that the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to that mark.

The Panel finds that the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to the Complainant’s trademark and that the requirements of paragraph 4(a)(i) of the Policy have been met.

B. NO RIGHTS OR LEGITIMATE INTERESTS

The Complainant has provided evidence of its rights in the mark AMUNDI that predate the registration of the disputed domain name, and has established a prima facie case that the Respondent lacks rights or legitimate interest in the disputed domain name. The burden of proof now shifts now shifts to the Respondent to show that he has relevant rights.

The Respondent has not filed a Response, nor challenged any of the Complainant's assertions, nor provided any evidence of his rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name. The Respondent is not authorised to use the Complainant's trademark and there is no evidence to show that he is known by the disputed domain name. The disputed domain name points to a parking page with commercial links. This is not a bona fide offering of goods or services or legitimate non-commercial or fair use. There is no evidence to indicate that the Respondent has any relevant rights or legitimate interests.

The Panel finds that the Respondent has no right or legitimate interest in the disputed domain name and that the requirements of paragraph 4(a)(ii) of the Policy have been met.

C. REGISTERED AND BEING USED IN BAD FAITH

Complainant's trademark AMUNDI predates the registration of the disputed domain name by over 15 years. Given the distinctiveness of the Complainant's trademark and reputation, it is reasonable to infer that the Respondent registered the disputed domain name with full knowledge of the Complainant's trademark.

The disputed domain name points to a parking page with commercial links. There appears no reason for doing so other than to attempt to attract Internet users to the Respondent's own website for commercial gain by creating a likelihood of confusion with the Complainant's trademark.

The disputed domain name has been set up with MX records, which suggests that it may be actively used for e-mail. There appears no plausible use of the disputed domain name by the Respondent for e-mails purposes that would not infringe the Complainant's rights.

Considering all these factors and the evidence submitted with the Complaint, the Panel finds that the Respondent registered and has used the disputed domain name in bad faith and that the requirements of paragraph 4(a)(iii) of the Policy have been met.

FOR ALL THE REASONS STATED ABOVE, THE COMPLAINT IS

Accepted

AND THE DISPUTED DOMAIN NAME(S) IS (ARE) TO BE

1. **amunditc.com**: Transferred

PANELLISTS

Name	**Veronica Bailey**

DATE OF PANEL DECISION 2025-07-23

Publish the Decision