Decision for dispute CAC-UDRP-108743

Case number	CAC-UDRP-108743
Time of filing	2026-06-18 09:57:13
Domain names	amundi.dev

Case administrator

Name	Olga Slanařová (Case admin)

Complainant

Organization	AMUNDI ASSET MANAGEMENT

Complainant representative

Organization	NAMESHIELD S.A.S.

Respondent

Organization	KAOS AI SEC URITY S.L (B24966996)

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, inter alia, a registered owner of the following **trademark** containing the word element "AMUNDI":

(i) AMUNDI (word), International (WIPO) trademark, application date 4 June 2009, registration date 26 September 2009, trademark registration no. 1024160, registered for services in the international class 36,

(referred to as "Complainant's trademark").

The Complainant is also the owner of domain names including the Complainant's trademark, such as the domain name <amundi.com>, registered and used since 26 August 2004.

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

The **Complainant** in this administrative proceeding is AMUNDI ASSET MANAGEMENT, Europe's number one asset manager 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, which has been proved by relevant evidence.

The **disputed domain name** <amundi.dev> was registered on 14 June 2026 and is held by the Respondent.

The **disputed domain name website** (i.e. website available under internet address containing the disputed domain name) appears to be a Spanish-language online educational and certification platform dedicated to specialized training in cybersecurity and applied artificial intelligence.

The website offers structured professional development tracks, such as the Cybersecurity Practitioner and AI Practitioner programs, combining theoretical manuals, practical laboratory exercises (e.g., using VirtualBox and Kali Linux), self-assessments, and instructor-evaluated assignments. The platform covers industry-standard frameworks and tools, including NIST, OWASP, MITRE ATT&CK, Burp Suite, Python, and various LLM technologies.

The website is commercial and interactive in nature, featuring user login and registration portals (Acceder, Inscríbete meaning Log in, Sign up), course pricing, and methodology breakdowns under the brand name AMUNDI DEV.

The **Complainant seeks the transfer** of the disputed domain name to the Complainant.

PARTIES CONTENTIONS

COMPLAINANT:

A) IDENTITY OR CONFUSING SIMILARITY

The Complainant states that:

- The disputed domain name <amundi.dev> is identical to the Complainant's trademark, as the mark is contained within the domain name without any additions or deletions.
- TLDs (including ".dev") are disregarded when assessing identity or confusing similarity, as they are standard registration elements.

B) NO RIGHTS OR LEGITIMATE INTERESTS

The Complainant states that:

- The Respondent is not affiliated with, licensed by, or authorized to use the Complainant's trademark, and no business relationship exists between the parties.
- The Respondent is not commonly known by the AMUNDI name.
- Resolving the domain to a website offering unrelated AI and cybersecurity training under the AMUNDI name does not constitute a bona fide offering of goods or services or fair use in general.

C) BAD FAITH REGISTRATION AND USE

The Complainant states that:

- The Complainant's AMUNDI trademark is widely recognized and well-known, establishing that the Respondent knew or should have known of the Complainant's trademark when registering the disputed domain name.
- Given the high distinctiveness and international reputation of the Complainant's trademark, bad faith registration can be inferred.
- By resolving the domain to a website offering paid AI and cybersecurity courses, the Respondent intentionally attempts to attract Internet users for commercial gain by creating a likelihood of confusion with the Complainant's trademark as to source, sponsorship, or affiliation.
- Exploiting a confusingly identical disputed domain name to promote unrelated commercial services constitutes bad faith targeting the Complainant's trademark goodwill.
- The domain is configured with active Mail Exchange (MX) records, indicating it can be used for email communications. However, any email sent from an address incorporating the AMUNDI Complainant's trademark could not serve a legitimate or good-faith purpose, reinforcing a finding of bad faith.

Accordingly, the Complainant concludes that the domain name was registered and is being used in bad faith.

RESPONDENT:

The Respondent has not provided any response to the Complaint.

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

A) RIGHTS

The first UDRP element functions primarily as a standing requirement. The standing (or threshold) test for identity or confusing similarity involves a reasoned but relatively straightforward comparison between the Complainant’s trademark and the disputed domain name(s).

This test typically involves a side-by-side comparison of the disputed domain name and the textual components of the relevant trademark to assess whether the trademark is recognizable within the disputed domain name.

The disputed domain name consists solely of the Complainant’s AMUNDI trademark followed by the “.dev” generic Top-Level Domain (gTLD). The applicable gTLD is ordinarily disregarded under the first element as a standard technical requirement of registration.

The Panel therefore finds the disputed domain name identical to a trademark in which the Complainant has rights (within the meaning of paragraph 4(a)(i) of the Policy).

B) NO RIGHTS OR LEGITIMATE INTERESTS

Paragraph 4(a)(ii) of the Policy requires the Complainant to establish that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the disputed domain name. It is well established that, while the overall burden of proof rests with the Complainant, once the Complainant makes out a prima facie case that the Respondent lacks such rights or legitimate interests, the burden of production 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, section 2.1).

The Panel is satisfied that the Complainant has made out a prima facie case. In particular, (i) the Complainant has not authorised, licensed or otherwise permitted the Respondent to use the AMUNDI trademark or to register any domain name incorporating that mark; (ii) the WHOIS record does not identify the Respondent by the name "AMUNDI", nor is there any evidence on the record that the Respondent is commonly known by the disputed domain name within the meaning of paragraph 4(c)(ii) of the Policy; and (iii) the Respondent has no trademark or other intellectual property rights in the term "AMUNDI".

The Respondent has not filed a Response and has therefore not rebutted the Complainant's prima facie case or otherwise come forward with any explanation or evidence of rights or legitimate interests. Under paragraph 14(b) of the Rules, the Panel may draw such inferences from the Respondent's default as it considers appropriate.

The Panel has nonetheless considered whether the Respondent's apparent use of the disputed domain name in connection with a commercial platform offering cybersecurity and artificial-intelligence training services could, on any view, amount to a bona fide offering of goods or services within the meaning of paragraph 4(c)(i) of the Policy. The Panel concludes that it cannot, for the following reasons.

First, the disputed domain name is identical to the Complainant's distinctive and widely known AMUNDI trademark, save for the ".dev" gTLD. Where a domain name consists of a trademark plus a gTLD that carries a specific connotation - here, ".dev", commonly associated with software developers and technology projects; Internet users are likely to assume some form of affiliation with, or endorsement by, the trademark owner. Such use carries a high risk of implied affiliation and cannot, according to the consensus view of UDRP panels, constitute fair or bona fide use (see WIPO Overview 3.0, section 2.5.1).

Second, even assuming the Respondent operates a genuine business, the mere fact that a website is operational and offers services for payment does not, of itself, confer a right or legitimate interest in a domain name that reproduces a third party's trademark in its entirety (see Oki Data Americas, Inc. v. ASD, Inc., WIPO Case No. D2001-0903). The Respondent's services (cybersecurity and AI training) bear no apparent relationship to the Complainant or to the Complainant's business as an asset manager, and there is nothing on the face of the record to suggest that the Respondent had any legitimate reason to select the term "AMUNDI" other than to take advantage of its trademark significance.

Third, the Respondent's use is manifestly commercial in nature, involving paid access to training content and user-registration functionalities ("Acceder", "Inscríbete"). Such use, combined with the reproduction of a well-known third-party mark, is not consistent with any legitimate non-commercial or fair use of the disputed domain name within the meaning of paragraph 4(c)(iii) of the Policy.

In light of the foregoing, the Panel finds that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the disputed domain name. The Complainant has therefore satisfied the requirement under paragraph 4(a)(ii) of the Policy.

C) BAD FAITH

Paragraph 4(a)(iii) of the Policy requires the Complainant to establish that the disputed domain name has been registered and is being used in bad faith. Paragraph 4(b) of the Policy sets out a non-exhaustive list of circumstances which, if found by the Panel, shall be evidence of registration and use in bad faith.

Registration in bad faith. The Complainant's AMUNDI trademark is highly distinctive, has no dictionary meaning in any language known to the Panel, and enjoys a substantial reputation internationally as the name of one of Europe's largest asset managers.

The Complainant's rights in the mark predate the registration of the disputed domain name by many years. In these circumstances, and having regard to the identity between the disputed domain name and the Complainant's mark, the Panel is satisfied that the Respondent could not plausibly have registered the disputed domain name without knowledge of the Complainant and its rights. The choice of the ".dev" gTLD, which is commonly associated with technology and developer-oriented projects, reinforces the inference that the Respondent specifically targeted the Complainant, whose activities include significant investment in financial technology.

Registration of a domain name identical to a well-known third-party trademark, in the awareness of that trademark and without any credible justification, is by itself indicative of registration in bad faith (see WIPO Overview 3.0, section 3.1.4).

Use in bad faith. The disputed domain name resolves to an active, commercial website offering cybersecurity and artificial-intelligence training services. By using a domain name identical to the Complainant's distinctive mark to attract Internet users to that website, the Respondent has created a likelihood of confusion with the Complainant's mark as to the source, sponsorship, affiliation, or endorsement of the Respondent's website and of the services offered thereon. This falls squarely within paragraph 4(b)(iv) of the Policy, which identifies as evidence of bad faith the use of a domain name intentionally to attempt to attract, for commercial gain, Internet users to a website by creating such a likelihood of confusion.

The Panel further notes that the disputed domain name is configured with active MX (mail-exchange) records. The presence of active MX records on a domain name that is identical to a well-known third-party trademark creates an inherent risk that the disputed domain name may be used, or has been used, to send email correspondence purporting to originate from the Complainant, in particular for phishing or other fraudulent purposes.

The Respondent's failure to respond to the Complaint, and the absence of any plausible good-faith explanation for the registration and use of a domain name identical to the Complainant's distinctive and well-known mark, further support a finding of bad faith. The Panel has also considered whether any conceivable good-faith use of the disputed domain name by the Respondent is realistic, and concludes that, given the distinctiveness and reputation of the AMUNDI mark and the identity between the mark and the disputed domain name, no such use is plausible (see WIPO Overview 3.0, section 3.1.4).

Accordingly, the Panel finds that the disputed domain name was registered and is being used in bad faith, and that the Complainant has satisfied the requirement under 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. **amundi.dev**: Transferred

PANELLISTS

Name	**Jiří Čermák**

DATE OF PANEL DECISION 2026-07-26

Publish the Decision