Decision for dispute CAC-UDRP-108378

Case number	CAC-UDRP-108378
Time of filing	2026-02-03 08:35:45
Domain names	amundfinanc.com

Case administrator

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

Complainant

Organization	AMUNDI ASSET MANAGEMENT

Complainant representative

Organization	NAMESHIELD S.A.S.

Respondent

Organization	amundifinances

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

According to the submitted evidence, the Complainant owns the following Trademark:

-International trademark for AMUNDI (word mark), Reg. No. 1024160, registered on September 24, 2009, in IC 36, and in force until September 24, 2029, with designations to numerous jurisdictions worldwide, including the European Union, Australia, Japan, the United States of America, and China.

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

The Complainant is a well-recognized European asset manager with offices in Europe, Asia-Pacific, the Middle East, and the Americas. The Complainant has over 100 million retail, institutional, and corporate clients and ranks in the top 10 globally.

Apart from the AMUNDI International trademark, the Complainant also owns the domain name <amundi.com>, registered and used since August 26, 2004.

The disputed domain name <**amundfinanc.com**> was registered on **January 27, 2026**. At the time of filing, the disputed domain name resolved to a parking page. By the time of this Decision, resolves to an inactive website with no content on it. In addition, Mail Exchange (“MX”) servers are configured for the disputed domain name.

The Panel notes that AMUNDI is a well-known trademark, a status that has also been confirmed by previous UDRP panelists, see Amundi Asset Management v. Andreas Jens, WIPO Case No. D2025-3758; Asset Management v. Thierry Barboure, CAC-UDRP Case No. 101803.

PARTIES CONTENTIONS

Response

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

Complainant Contentions:

In summary, the Complainant contends that:

- The disputed domain name is confusingly similar to the trademark AMUNDI; the disputed domain name contains the Complainant's trademark AMUNDI in its entirety, plus the addition of the term "financ" (a misspelled version of the term "FINANCE"), which is not sufficient to avoid the likelihood of confusion between the disputed domain name and the Complainant.

- The Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the disputed domain name given that the Respondent is not known as the disputed domain name; that the Respondent is not related in any way to the Complainant's business, nor affiliated or authorized in any way to use the Complainant's trademark AMUNDI; that the disputed domain name resolves to a parking page, which confirms that Respondent has no demonstrable plan to use the disputed domain name.

- The disputed domain name has been registered and is being used in bad faith, given that AMUNDI is a well-known trademark, inferring with it, that the Respondent has registered it in full knowledge of the Complainant; that the disputed domain name resolved to a parking page, demonstrating with it, no activity in respect of the disputed domain name, making impossible to conceive of any plausible actual or contemplated active use of the domain name by the Respondent that would not be illegitimate. Finally, the Complainant also contends that the disputed domain name has been set up with MX records, which suggests that it may be actively used for e-mail purposes.

RIGHTS

The Complainant has, to the satisfaction of the Panel, shown the disputed domain name is 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. Identical or Confusingly Similar

The Complainant has shown Trademark rights over the term AMUNDI since 2009, which significantly precedes the registration of

the disputed domain name.

The disputed domain name is composed of the Complainant's Trademark AMUNDI and the term "financ", addition that does not prevent a finding of confusing similarity between the disputed domain name and the Complainant's Trademark under the First Element of the Policy (see WIPO Overview of WIPO Panel Views on Select UDRP Questions ("WIPO Overview 3.1"), section 1.7 and section 1.8).

As for the applicable generic Top-Level Domain ("gTLD") ".com", it is well established that such element is viewed as a standard registration requirement and as such is disregarded under the first element confusing similarity test (see WIPO Overview 3.1, section 1.11.1).

The Panel finds the first element of the Policy has been established.

2. Rights or Legitimate Interests

Concerning the Second Element of the Policy, to this Panel it is clear that:

- The Respondent registered the disputed domain name on January 27, 2026, meaning very well after (at least 17 years) the Complainant acquired its trademark Rights over the term AMUNDI on September 24, 2009.
- The Complainant has never granted the Respondent any authorization, right, or license to use or to register the AMUNDI trademark, including as a domain name, nor is the Respondent affiliated with the Complainant in any form or has endorsed or sponsored the Respondent or the Respondent's website.
- There is no evidence that the Respondent corresponds to or has become commonly known by the disputed domain name, including by the WhoIs information.
- The Respondent is not making a bona fide offering of goods or services, nor for a legitimate non-commercial or fair use of the disputed domain name, which is based on the Complainant's trademark AMUNDI, resolved to a parking page (at least until January 29, 2026), and currently to an inactive website.

Therefore, this Panel finds that the Complainant has successfully made a prima facie case, which was not rebutted in any manner by the Respondent, and concludes that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the disputed domain name.

The Panel finds the second element of the Policy has been established.

3. Bad Faith

Bad Faith Registration:

The Complainant is a recognized European asset management company, with consistent presence, including online, in Europe, Asia-Pacific, the Middle-East, and the Americas. According to the evidence submitted in this case, the Complainant acquired its trademark rights on September 24, 2009, meaning 17 years before the Respondent registered the disputed domain name on January 27, 2026.

Given the worldwide recognition and distinctiveness of the Complainant's well-known trademark AMUNDI, the nature and composition of the disputed domain name, to this Panel, it is clear that the Respondent was fully aware of the Complainant's business and trademark value at the time of the registration of the disputed domain name and sought to confuse (see WIPO Overview 3.1, section 3.1.4, 3.2.1 and section 3.2.2).

Bad Faith Use

The disputed domain name, resolved at least until January 29, 2026, to a registrar parking page. By the time of this Decision, the disputed domain name resolves to an inactive website, change that to this Panel can only emphasize the Respondent's knowledge concerning the existence and consequences of this dispute. Additionally, the Respondent has configured the Mail Exchange ("MX") servers for the disputed domain name.

Such facts and evidence to this Panel can only emphasize the Respondent's knowledge regarding the Complainant, and of course, its bad faith use. In line with it, panels have held that the use of a domain name for illegal activity – here, found as the respondent's use of the domain name to send deceptive emails or other types of fraud- constitutes bad faith.

Section 3.4 of the WIPO Overview 3.1 states that:

> "Panels have held that the use of a domain name for purposes other than to host a website may constitute bad faith. **Such active ("behind the scenes") uses are considered distinct from the passive holding doctrine discussed above, and can include a range of bad faith activity or scams such as sending email**, phishing, identity theft, or malware distribution. (In some such cases, the respondent may even host a copycat version of the complainant's website.) **Many such cases involve the respondent's use of the domain name to send deceptive emails, e.g., to obtain sensitive or confidential personal information from prospective job applicants, or to solicit payment of fraudulent invoices by the complainant's actual or prospective customers**." (emphasis added).

The Panel finds that the Complainant has established the third element of the Policy.

FOR ALL THE REASONS STATED ABOVE, THE COMPLAINT IS

Accepted

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

1. **amundfinanc.com**: Transferred

PANELLISTS

Name	**María Alejandra López García**

DATE OF PANEL DECISION 2026-03-04

Publish the Decision