Decision for dispute CAC-UDRP-108687

Case number	CAC-UDRP-108687
Time of filing	2026-06-03 09:57:15
Domain names	Clearstream-global.com

Case administrator

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

Complainant

Organization	Clearstream Services, société anonyme

Complainant representative

Organization	Grünecker Patent und Rechtsanwälte PartG mbB

Respondent

Name	Orwell Sullivan

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 has established rights in the trademark **CLEARSTREAM** through numerous trademark registrations worldwide, including European Union Trademark No. 001403476, with the priority date from 29 November 1999, the UK Trademark No. UK00901403476, with the priority date from 29 November 1999, and the United States Trademark Registration No. 2477515, also with the priority date from 29 November 1999, all registered for goods and services in Classes 9, 36 and 42. The Complainant also owns several additional national registrations for the trademark CLEARSTREAM in various jurisdictions, including Canada, Brazil, Switzerland, Australia, and China.

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

The Complainant, Clearstream Services S.A., is a leading European provider of post-trading services and a wholly owned subsidiary of Deutsche Börse AG. It provides settlement, custody and asset servicing services to customers in more than 110 countries and settles over 250,000 securities transactions on a daily basis. The Complainant conducts its business through; the website located at www.clearstream.com.

The disputed domain name <clearstream-global.com> was registered on 10 April 2026.

Although the disputed domain name does not resolve to an active website, the evidence submitted by the Complainant

demonstrates that it has been used in connection with the e-mail address compliance@clearstream-global.com to impersonate the Complainant and solicit sensitive identification documents from Internet users under the false pretext of regulatory compliance and anti-money laundering verification.

No information is known about the Respondent beyond the registration details available in the Whois records.

PARTIES CONTENTIONS

COMPLAINANT'S CONTENTIONS

Identical or confusingly similar

The Complainant contends that the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to its registered CLEARSTREAM trademarks because it incorporates the trademark in its entirety. The additional descriptive term "global" considers merely refers to worldwide activities and does not dispel the confusing similarity. The ".com" generic Top-Level Domain is irrelevant for the assessment under the Policy.

No rights or legitimate interests

The Complainant submits that the Respondent has never been authorised or licensed to use the CLEARSTREAM trademark, is not affiliated with the Complainant, and is not commonly known by the disputed domain name.

The Complainant further argues that the disputed domain name has been used to send fraudulent emails impersonating the Complainant's compliance department and requesting recipients to provide passports, identity cards or driver's licences. According to the Complainant, such use cannot constitute a bona fide offering of goods or services or any legitimate non-commercial or fair use.

Registered and used in bad faith

The Complainant submits that the Respondent registered the disputed domain name with full knowledge of the Complainant's well-known CLEARSTREAM trademark.

According to the Complainant, the disputed domain name has been used exclusively as part of a phishing scheme in which the Respondent impersonated the Complainant and falsely requested sensitive identification documents from recipients under the guise of compliance with anti-money laundering regulations. The Complainant therefore contends that the Respondent intentionally attempted to create a likelihood of confusion for fraudulent purposes, which constitutes clear evidence of bad faith registration and use.

RESPONDENT'S CONTENTIONS

No administratively compliant Response has been filed.

RIGHTS

The Complainant has, to the satisfaction of the Panel, shown the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to a trademark 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 15 of the Rules provides that the Panel shall decide the Complaint on the basis of the statements and documents submitted, in accordance with the Policy, the Rules and any rules and principles of law that it deems applicable.

Pursuant to paragraph 14 of the Rules, where a Party defaults, the Panel may draw such inferences from that default as it considers appropriate.

In the present case, the Respondent has not submitted a Response and has therefore not contested any of the Complainant's factual assertions or evidence. The Panel accordingly bases its findings on the Complaint and the supporting evidence.

First, the Panel finds that the disputed domain name <clearstream-global.com> is confusingly similar to the Complainant's registered trademark **CLEARSTREAM**, as it incorporates the trademark in its entirety.

The additional descriptive term "global" does not prevent a finding of confusing similarity. Rather, given the international nature of the Complainant's business, it reinforces the impression that the disputed domain name refers to the Complainant's global operations. Likewise, the generic Top-Level Domain ".com" is a technical requirement of registration and does not affect the comparison between the disputed domain name and the Complainant's trademark.

Accordingly, the Panel concludes that the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to the Complainant's trademark and that paragraph 4(a)(i) of the Policy is satisfied.

Furthermore, according to the Complainant's uncontested submissions and supporting evidence, the Respondent is not affiliated with the Complainant, has never been authorized or licensed to use the CLEARSTREAM trademark, and is not commonly known by the disputed domain name.

Although the disputed domain name does not resolve to an active website, the evidence demonstrates that it has been actively used as part of an e-mail scheme through the address compliance@clearstream-global.com. The Respondent impersonated the Complainant and its employees and requested recipients to provide highly sensitive personal identification documents, including passports, identity cards and driver's licences, under the false pretext of anti-money laundering and compliance procedures.

Such use is neither a bona fide offering of goods or services nor a legitimate non-commercial or fair use of the disputed domain name. Rather, it is calculated to mislead Internet users into believing that the e-mails originate from the Complainant.

Accordingly, and in the absence of any Response, the Panel finds that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name within the meaning of paragraph 4(a)(ii) of the Policy.

Finally, the Panel finds that the Respondent registered and used the disputed domain name in bad faith.

The Complainant's CLEARSTREAM trademark had been registered for many years before the registration of the disputed domain name and has been used extensively in connection with the Complainant's international financial services. In these circumstances, and given that the disputed domain name wholly incorporates the distinctive CLEARSTREAM trademark together with the descriptive term "global", the Panel considers it inconceivable that the Respondent registered the disputed domain name without knowledge of the Complainant and its trademark rights.

The evidence further shows that the disputed domain name was not merely passively held but was actively used as part of a phishing and impersonation scheme. The Respondent sent emails falsely purporting to originate from the Complainant's compliance department, requested recipients to submit identity documents for purported regulatory verification, and falsely represented that significant financial assets would be released following completion of the requested "KYC" procedures. The e-mails also falsely referred to the UK Money Laundering Regulations and the UK Data Protection Act in order to lend credibility to the scheme.

In the Panel's view, such conduct clearly demonstrates an intentional attempt to create a likelihood of confusion with the Complainant's trademark for fraudulent purposes. The use of a confusingly similar domain name solely for deceptive e-mail communications constitutes compelling evidence of bad faith registration and use under paragraph 4(b)(iv) of the Policy.

The Respondent has provided no explanation or evidence capable of rebutting the Complainant's prima facie case.

Accordingly, the Panel finds that the disputed domain name has been registered and is being used in bad faith and that the Complainant has 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. **Clearstream-global.com**: Transferred

PANELLISTS

Name	**Hana Císlerová**

DATE OF PANEL DECISION 2026-07-10

Publish the Decision