Decision for dispute CAC-UDRP-108408

Case number	CAC-UDRP-108408
Time of filing	2026-02-16 09:25:25
Domain names	amundi-finances.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	Containers SL

OTHER LEGAL PROCEEDINGS

The Panel is not aware of any other legal proceedings that are pending or decided and that relate to the Disputed Domain Name.

IDENTIFICATION OF RIGHTS

Complainant states, and provides documentation in support thereof, that it is the owner of Int'l Reg. No. 1024160 for AMUNDI (registered September 24, 2009) for use in connection with, inter alia, "financial affairs, banking operations, monetary affairs." This registration is referred to herein as the "AMUNDI Trademark."

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

Complainant states that it is "Europe's number one asset manager by assets under management and has offices in Europe, Asia-Pacific, the Middle-East and the Americas"; and that "[w]ith over 100 million retail, institutional and corporate clients, the Complainant ranks in the top 10 globally."

The Disputed Domain Name was created on October 30, 2025, and, according to the Complaint, "redirects to a website offering competing financial services." In support thereof, Complainant has provided a screenshot from a website associated with the Disputed Domain Name, which appears to offer financial services.

PARTIES CONTENTIONS

Complainant contends, in relevant part, as follows:

- Paragraph 4(a)(i): Complainant states that the Disputed Domain Name is confusingly similar to the AMUNDI Trademark because the Disputed Domain Name "contains the Complainant's trademark AMUNDI in its entirety" and the addition of the word "finances" "does not change the overall impression of the designation as being connected to the Complainant's trademark AMUNDI."
- Paragraph 4(a)(ii): Complainant states that Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the Disputed Domain Name because, inter alia, "Respondent is not known as the disputed domain name"; Respondent "is not related in any way to the Complainant's business"; "the disputed domain name redirects to a website offering financial services, which compete with the Complainant's services" and "uses the Complainant's address"; and "[u]sing a confusingly similar domain name that resolves to a competing webpage is not a bona fide offering of goods or services."
- Paragraph 4(a)(iii): Complainant states that the Disputed Domain Name was registered and is being used in bad faith because, inter alia, "the disputed domain name redirects to a website offering competing financial services"; "given the distinctiveness of the Complainant's trademark and reputation, it is reasonable to infer that the Respondent has registered the domain name with full knowledge of the Complainant's trademarks"; the website associated with the Disputed Domain Name "uses the Complainant's address"; by "us[ing the domain name to divert Internet users searching for the Complainant's website to the Respondent's competing website," Respondent has "create[d] a likelihood of confusion with the Complainant's mark for the Respondent's commercial gain by offering competing services."

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 UDRP).

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 UDRP).

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 UDRP).

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

Identical or Confusingly Similar: Paragraph 4(a)(i)

The trademark citation and documentation provided by Complainant are sufficient to establish that Complainant has rights in the AMUNDI Trademark.

As to whether the Disputed Domain Name is identical or confusingly similar to these trademarks, the relevant comparison to be made is with the second-level portion of the Disputed Domain Name only (i.e., "amundi-finances") because "[t]he applicable Top Level Domain ('TLD') in a domain name (e.g., '.com', '.club', '.nyc') is viewed as a standard registration requirement and as such is disregarded under the first element confusing similarity test." WIPO Overview of WIPO Panel Views on Select UDRP Questions ("WIPO Overview 3.1"), section 1.11.1.

Here, the Disputed Domain Name contains the AMUNDI Trademark in its entirety. As set forth in section 1.7 of WIPO Overview 3.1: "[I]n cases where a domain name incorporates the entirety of a trademark…, the domain name will normally be considered confusingly similar to that mark."

As to the addition of the hyphen and the word “finances”, section 1.8 of WIPO Overview 3.1 says: “Where the relevant trademark is recognizable within the disputed domain name, the addition of other terms (whether descriptive, geographical, pejorative, meaningless, or otherwise) would not prevent a finding of confusing similarity under the first element.”

Accordingly, the Panel finds that Complainant has proven the first element of the Policy.

Rights or Legitimate Interests: Paragraph 4(a)(ii)

Complainant states that Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the Disputed Domain Name because, inter alia, “Respondent is not known as the disputed domain name”; Respondent “is not related in any way to the Complainant’s business”; “the disputed domain name redirects to a website offering financial services, which compete with the Complainant’s services” and “uses the Complainant’s address”; and “[u]sing a confusingly similar domain name that resolves to a competing webpage is not a bona fide offering of goods or services.”

WIPO Overview 3.1, section 2.1, states: “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 often impossible 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. If the respondent fails to come forward with such relevant evidence, the complainant is deemed to have satisfied the second element.”

The Panel finds that Complainant has established its prima facie case and, without any evidence from Respondent to the contrary, the Panel is satisfied that Complainant has satisfied the second element of the Policy.

Registered and Used in Bad Faith: Paragraph 4(a)(iii)

Whether a domain name is registered and used in bad faith for purposes of the UDRP may be determined by evaluating four (non-exhaustive) factors set forth in paragraph 4(b) of the UDRP: (i) circumstances indicating that the registrant has registered or the registrant has acquired the domain name primarily for the purpose of selling, renting, or otherwise transferring the domain name registration to the complainant who is the owner of the trademark or service mark or to a competitor of that complainant, for valuable consideration in excess of the registrant’s documented out-of-pocket costs directly related to the domain name; or (ii) the registrant has registered the domain name in order to prevent the owner of the trademark or service mark from reflecting the mark in a corresponding domain name, provided that the registrant has engaged in a pattern of such conduct; or (iii) the registrant has registered the domain name primarily for the purpose of disrupting the business of a competitor; or (iv) by using the domain name, the registrant has intentionally attempted to attract, for commercial gain, Internet users to the registrant’s website or other online location, by creating a likelihood of confusion with the complainant’s mark as to the source, sponsorship, affiliation, or endorsement of the registrant’s website or location or of a product or service on the registrant’s website or location.

Creating a website using a domain name containing Complainant’s trademark to offer the same or similar services identified by the AMUNDI Trademark may create a likelihood of confusion and, therefore, constitutes bad faith. See, e.g., Arla Foods amba v. Jucco Holdings, WIPO Case No. D2006-0409 (“the practice of registering a domain name and using it to redirect a user to a website which is used for the sale of competing services constitutes evidence of registering and using a trademark in bad faith”); Six Continents Hotels, Inc. v. NA InterMos, WIPO Case No. D2006-1313 (Respondent “intentionally uses the domain name… aiming to profit from Complainant’s renowned trademark by attracting Internet users. The confusion created by the domain name makes potential customers to choose other services than the Complainant’s, disrupting Complainant’s business.”); and Six Continents Hotels, Inc., v. Bunjong Chaiviriyawong, WIPO Case No. D2013-1942 (by using disputed domain name in connection with a website that “offers… services in competition with the Complainant… the Respondent, by such use, intentionally attempted to attract Internet users, expecting to reach the website corresponding to the Complainant’s services and to obtain information about the Complainant’s activity, to services related to another [company], by creating a likelihood of confusion with the Complainant’s trademark and business, and damaging the Complainant’s business”).

Accordingly, the Panel finds that Complainant has proven 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. **amundi-finances.com**: Transferred

PANELLISTS

Name	**Douglas Isenberg**
DATE OF PANEL DECISION	2026-03-27

DATE OF PANEL DECISION 2020 05 27

Publish the Decision