Decision for dispute CAC-UDRP-108347

Case number	CAC-UDRP-108347
Time of filing	2026-01-21 09:16:35
Domain names	amundiconsulting.top

Case administrator

Organization	Iveta Špiclová (Czech Arbitration Court) (Case admin)

Complainant

Organization	AMUNDI ASSET MANAGEMENT

Complainant representative

Organization	NAMESHIELD S.A.S.

Respondent

Organization	Beacon Services

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 is the registered owner of International trademark registration no. 1024160 AMUNDI, registered 24 September 2009 for services in class 36, designating amongst others the European Union.

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

It results from the Complainant’s undisputed allegations is Europe's number one asset manager by assets under management and has offices in Europe, Asia-Pacific, the Middle-East and the Americas. With over 100 million retail, institutional and corporate clients, the Complainant ranks in the top 10 globally.

Furthermore, the Complainant owns and uses the domain name <amundi.com>, registered on 26 August 2004, for its official website.

The disputed domain name was registered on 15 January 2026. Furthermore, the undisputed evidence provided by the Complainant proves that it resolves to a website in Chinese language allegedly offering management framework services.

PARTIES CONTENTIONS

The Complainant contends that 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

1. Pursuant to paragraph 4(a)(i) of the Policy, the complainant must establish rights in a trademark or service mark, and that the disputed domain name is identical or confusingly similar to a trademark in which the complainant has rights.

It results from the evidence provided, that the Complainant is the registered owner of AMUNDI trademark.

Prior UDRP panels have found that a disputed domain name is confusingly similar to a complainant's trademark where the disputed domain name incorporates the complainant's trademark in its entirety (see WIPO Overview of WIPO Panel Views on Selected UDRP Questions, Third Edition ("WIPO Overview 3.0") at section 1.7. This Panel shares this view and notes that the Complainant's registered trademark AMUNDI is fully included in the disputed domain name.

Although the addition of other terms (here "consulting") may bear on assessment of the second and third elements, the Panel finds the addition of such term does not prevent a finding of confusing similarity between the disputed domain name and the mark for the purposes of the Policy. WIPO Overview 3.0, section 1.8.

Finally, the generic Top-Level Domain ("gTLD") ".top" of the disputed domain name is typically disregarded under the first element confusing similarity test (see WIPO Overview 3.0 at section 1.11.1).

In the light of the above, the Panel finds that the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to a trademark in which the Complainant has rights.

2. Pursuant to paragraph 4(a)(ii) of the Policy, the Complainant must secondly establish that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the disputed domain name.

Paragraph 4(c) of the Policy contains a non-exhaustive list of circumstances which, if found by the Panel to be proved, shall demonstrate the Respondent's rights or legitimate interests to the disputed domain name.

In the Panel's view, based on the undisputed allegations stated above, the Complainant has made a prima facie case that none of these circumstances are found in the case at hand and, therefore, that the Respondent lacks rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name.

According to the Complaint, which has remained unchallenged, the Complainant has no relationship in any way with the Respondent

and did, in particular, not authorize the Respondent's use of the Complainant's trademark AMUNDI, e.g. by registering the disputed domain name, comprising said trademark entirely.

Moreover, the Panel notes that the disputed domain name contains the Complainant's registered trademark AMUNDI followed by a term which clearly refers to the Complainant's field of commerce and that more likely than not, this trademark is not a trademark that one would legitimately adopt in a domain name unless to suggest an affiliation with the Complainant.

Furthermore, the Panel notes that there is no evidence showing that the Respondents might be commonly known by the disputed domain name in the sense of paragraph 4(c)(ii) of the Policy.

It is acknowledged that once the Panel finds a prima facie case is made by a complainant, the burden of production under the second element shifts to the respondent to come forward with relevant evidence demonstrating rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name (see WIPO Overview 3.0 at section 2.1). Since the Respondent in the case at hand failed to come forward with any allegations or evidence, this Panel finds, in the circumstances of this case, that the Respondents have no rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain names.

The Panel finds that the Complainant has therefore satisfied paragraph 4(a)(ii) of the Policy.

3. According to paragraph 4(a)(iii) of the Policy, the Complainant must thirdly establish that the disputed domain name has been registered and is being used in bad faith. The Policy indicates that certain circumstances specified in paragraph 4(b) of the Policy may, "in particular but without limitation", be evidence of the disputed domain name's registration and use in bad faith.

It is the view of this Panel that these circumstances are met in the case at hand.

The Panel shares the view of other UDRP panels and finds that the Complainant's trademark AMUNDI is well-known (e.g. AMUNDI S.A. v. John Crawford, CAC-UDRP-101803; Amundi Asset Management v. li shi min, li shi min, WIPO Case D2025-3543; Amundi Asset Management v. Laurent Moreac, WIPO case D2024-3182). Therefore, this Panel has no doubt that the Respondent positively knew or should have known that the disputed domain name consisted of the Complainant's trademark when registered the disputed domain name. Registration of the disputed domain name in awareness of the reputed AMUNDI mark and in the absence of rights or legitimate interests in this case amounts to registration in bad faith, see WIPO Overview 3.0, section 3.1.4.

Finally, the further circumstances surrounding the disputed domain name's registration and use confirm the findings that the Respondent has registered and is using the disputed domain name in bad faith (see WIPO Overview 3.0 at section 3.2.1):

(i) the nature of the disputed domain name (i.e., entirely containing the Complainant's registered trademark AMUNDI followed by a term which clearly refers to the Complainant's field of commerce);

(iv) a clear absence of rights or legitimate interests coupled with no credible explanation for the Respondent's choice of the disputed domain name;

(v) the respondent's concealing its identity through a privacy service.

The Panel finds that the Complainant has therefore satisfied paragraph 4(a)(iii) of the Policy.

FOR ALL THE REASONS STATED ABOVE, THE COMPLAINT IS

Accepted

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

1. **amundiconsulting.top**: Transferred

PANELLISTS

Name	**Dr. Federica Togo**

DATE OF PANEL DECISION 2026-02-25

Publish the Decision