Decision for dispute CAC-UDRP-108718

Case number	CAC-UDRP-108718
Time of filing	2026-06-15 09:12:29
Domain names	amanhotel.site

Case administrator

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

Complainant

Organization	Aman Group S.à r.l.

Complainant representative

Organization	HSS IPM GmbH

Respondent

Name	michal smith

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 submitted evidence, which the Panel accepts, showing that it is the registered owner of the trademarks bearing “AMAN”, inter alia, the following:

- Australian trademark “AMAN” n°834808, registered on May 11, 2000;
- International trademark “AMAN” n°953150, registered on August 24, 2007;
- European Union trademark “AMAN” n°005892757, registered on March 4, 2008;

- International device trademark “AMAN” n°1443849, registered on August 31, 2018;
- United States trademark “AMAN” n°5870593, registered on October 1, 2019.

Moreover, the Complainant is also the owner of the < aman.com> domain name bearing the sign “AMAN” (registered on July 22, 1997).

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

The Complainant, Aman Group S.à r.l., is a luxury hospitality group, founded in 1988 with the opening of Amanpuri in Phuket, Thailand. The Complainant operates approximately 36 hotels, resorts and branded residences across 20 countries, providing luxury

hospitality, wellness, travel, and related services worldwide. It was ranked by Travel Luxury Intelligence in 2018 as the world's leading luxury hotel brand.

The Complainant holds several trademark registrations for “AMAN” going back to 2000 and the Complainant also holds the domain name bearing “AMAN” as <www.aman.com> registered on July 22, 1997.

On February 13, 2026; the Respondent registered the disputed domain name <amanhotel.site>. The disputed domain name resolves to a web page where it is shown as belonging to AMAN GROUP and includes the content regarding luxury experiences with AMAN brand.

PARTIES CONTENTIONS

COMPLAINANT:

1. THE DISPUTED DOMAIN NAME IS CONFUSINGLY SIMILAR

The disputed domain name is confusingly similar to the Complainant’s formerly registered distinctive and well-known trademarks, as it entirely incorporates the Complainant’s “AMAN” trademark with the addition of the descriptive term “hotel”, which would not prevent a finding of confusing similarity. Moreover, it is claimed that it directly refers to the Complainant’s luxury hospitality business and the consumers will think that it is an official website of the Complainant. The Complainant’s “AMAN” trademark is claimed to remain clearly recognizable within the disputed domain name. The Complainant refers to previous panel decision in support of its arguments.

The Complainant refers to earlier decisions and claims that the gTLD “.site” is disregarded, so the domain name remains confusingly similar despite its inclusion.

2. NO RIGHTS OR LEGITIMATE INTERESTS IN RESPECT OF THE DISPUTED DOMAIN NAME

The Complainant states that the Respondent has no rights on the disputed domain name as the Respondent is not known as the disputed domain name. The Complainant also states that the Respondent is neither affiliated nor authorized by the Complainant in any way and neither license nor authorization has been granted to the Respondent to use the Complainant’s trademark “AMAN”.

Additionally, it is stated that the disputed domain name resolves to a website that presents itself as being officially associated with Complainant and this website is clearly designed to impersonate Complainant and reproduce its branding without authorization. It reproduces the visual identity, footer structure, destination listings and overall look and feel of Complainant's official website. The Complainant also claims that the Respondent apparently uses the disputed domain name to perpetrate a phishing scheme that cannot constitute legitimate rights and interests pursuant to Policy 4(a)(ii), since the Respondent is using the disputed domain name in a fraudulent scheme to deceive Internet users into providing their personal information. It is argued that through the website, the Respondent seeks to mislead Internet users into believing that the site is affiliated with the Complainant and to induce them to provide personal information.

3. THE DISPUTED DOMAIN NAME WAS REGISTERED AND IS USED IN BAD FAITH

The Complainant claims that the Respondent registered the disputed domain name many years after the first registrations of the Complainant’s “AMAN” trademarks. The Complainant states that “AMAN” is a well-known trademark, and it is claimed that by conducting a simple online search regarding the terms “AMAN HOTEL”, the results are predominantly the Complainant’s business and the Respondent either knew or would have inevitably learned about the Complainant, its trademark and business at the time of the registration. Furthermore, the addition of the word "hotel", which directly describes the Complainant's core business, seems to confirm that the Respondent selected the disputed domain name with the Complainant specifically in mind.

Additionally, it was claimed that given the longstanding use and worldwide recognition of the Complainant’s “AMAN” trademark in the luxury hospitality industry, the Respondent could not reasonably have selected the disputed domain name without knowledge of the Complainant's rights. The choice of the disputed domain name <amanhotel.site> itself is asserted to show clear targeting of the Complainant's trademark and business. This is further confirmed by the content and structure of the website, which reproduces the footer, destination listings, similar visual layout, and overall look and feel of the Complainant's official website in a way that can only be the result of deliberate and intentional copying, according to the Complainant, and this presentation is clearly designed to mislead Internet users into believing that the website is affiliated with, sponsored by, or endorsed by the Complainant, which has been found to be in bad faith by various previous panels.

The Complainant further explained that the website also includes a "SIGN UP" section inviting users to register their interest in order to receive updates about exclusive experiences and new destinations. Clicking that button leads to a login page and, subsequently, to a full registration form requesting personal information such as full name, e-mail address, phone number, and password. These forms collect sensitive user data under the false impression that the site is an official platform of the Complainant. This conduct is claimed to be going beyond mere confusion; it constitutes an attempt to deceive Internet users and obtain their personal

information by impersonating a well-known luxury brand.

Furthermore, the Complainant noted that the disputed domain name has active MX records, which means that the Respondent has the technical capability to send and receive e-mails using addresses under the <amanhotel.site> domain. This was considered particularly concerning given that the website already impersonates the Complainant's official platform. Previous panels have recognized that the configuration of a disputed domain name with MX records represents an ongoing risk of phishing or fraud.

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

RESPONDENT:

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

Paragraph 15 of the Rules provides that the Panel is to decide the Complaint on the basis of the statements and documents submitted and in accordance with the Policy, the Rules and any rules and principles of law that it deems applicable.

In this context, the Panel also notes that the burden of proof is on the Complainant to make out its case and past UDRP panels have consistently said that a Complainant must show that all three elements of the Policy have been made out before any order can be made to transfer a domain name.

For the Complainant to succeed it must prove, within the meaning of paragraph 4(a) of the Policy, that:

1. the disputed domain name is identical or confusingly similar to a trademark or service mark in which the Complainant has rights;
2. the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the disputed domain name; and
3. the disputed domain name has been registered and is being used in bad faith.

The Panel will therefore deal with each of these requirements in turn.

1. IDENTICAL OR CONFUSINGLY SIMILAR

The Policy simply requires the Complainant to demonstrate that the disputed domain name is identical or confusingly similar to a trademark in which the Complainant has rights. The Panel is satisfied that the Complainant is the owner of registration of “AMAN” trademark.

The Panel finds that the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to the Complainant’s “AMAN” trademark and the addition of the term “hotel”, which describes and points out to the Complainant’s business operations, is not sufficient to vanish the similarity.

Moreover, the addition of the gTLD “.site” is not enough to abolish the similarity.

The Panel is of the opinion that the Internet users will easily fall into false impression that the disputed domain name is one of the official domain names of the Complainant. The Panel recognizes the Complainant's rights and concludes that the disputed domain name is confusingly similar with the Complainant's trademarks. Therefore, the Panel concludes that the requirements of paragraph 4(a)(i) of the Policy is provided.

2. NO RIGHTS OR LEGITIMATE INTERESTS

Under paragraph 4(a)(ii) of the Policy, the complainant has the burden of establishing that the respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the domain name.

It is open to a respondent to establish its rights or legitimate interests in a domain name, among other circumstances, by showing any of the following elements:

(i) before any notice to the respondent of the dispute, the use or making demonstrable preparations to use the domain name or a name corresponding to the domain name in connection with a bona fide offering of goods or services; or

(ii) the respondent of the dispute (as an individual, business, or other organization) has been commonly known by the domain name, even if it has acquired no trademark or service mark rights; or

(iii) the respondent of the dispute is making a legitimate non-commercial or fair use of the domain name, without an intent for commercial gain to misleadingly divert consumers or to tarnish the trademark or service mark at issue.

Thus, if the respondent proves any of these elements or indeed anything else that shows that it has a right or legitimate interest in the disputed domain name, the complainant will have failed to discharge its burden of proof and the complaint will fail. The burden is on the complainant to demonstrate a prima facie case that the respondent does not have rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name. Once the complainant has made out a prima facie case, then the respondent may, inter alia, by showing one of the above circumstances, demonstrate rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name.

The Complainant contends that the Respondent has nothing to do with the Complainant and any use of the trademark “AMAN” must be authorized by the Complainant but there is no such authorization. Moreover, the disputed domain name has no relation with the Respondent, and the Respondent is not commonly known as the disputed domain name.

In the absence of a response, the Panel accepts the Complainant’s allegations as true that the Respondent has no authorization to use the Complainant’s trademarks in the disputed domain name.

Additionally, considering that there is no authorization to use the trademark and no affiliation with the Complainant, the disputed domain name being resolved to a web page that clearly impersonate the Complainant cannot be considered legitimate.

Hence, as the Complainant has made out its prima facie case, and as the Respondent has not demonstrated any rights or legitimate interests as illustrated under paragraph 4(c) of the Policy, nor has the Panel found any other basis for finding any rights or legitimate interests of the Respondent in the disputed domain name, the Panel concludes that the Complainant has satisfied the requirements of paragraph 4(a)(ii) of the Policy.

3. BAD FAITH

The Panel concludes that the Complainant's “AMAN” trademark is of distinctive character. Therefore, the Panel is of the opinion that due to the earlier rights of the Complainant in the “AMAN” trademarks, the Respondent should have been aware of the Complainant and its trademarks at the time of registration of the disputed domain names (see e.g., Ebay Inc. v. Wangming, WIPO Case No. D2006-1107). Referring to Parfums Christian Dior v. Javier Garcia Quintas and Christiandior.net, WIPO Case No. D2000-0226, the Panel believes that the awareness of the Complainant’s trademark at the time of the registration of the disputed domain names is to be considered an inference of bad faith registration.

Moreover, the disputed domain name resolves to a web page that shows the use of AMAN trademark on luxury experiences. The content and structure of the website is similar in terms of the footer, destination listings, visual layout, and overall look of the Complainant's official website and the Panel considers that it seems to be the result of intentional copying, clearly designed to mislead Internet users into believing that the website is affiliated with the Complainant. The Panel considers that this may be evaluated under (iv) of paragraph 4(b), which is as follows: by using the domain name, the respondent has intentionally attempted to attract, for commercial gain, Internet users to its website or other on-line location, by creating a likelihood of confusion with the complainant’s mark as to the source, sponsorship, affiliation, or endorsement of the respondent’s website or location or of a product

or service on the respondent’s website or location.

The fact that the sign-up forms on the website collecting sensitive user data under the false impression that the site is an official platform of the Complainant may be used to attempt to deceive Internet users, also considering that the Respondent registered MX records, is also taken into account. It was decided before by past panels that the configuration of a disputed domain name with MX records represents a risk of phishing or fraud.

Therefore, in light of the above-mentioned circumstances in the present case, the Panel finds that the disputed domain name has been registered and is being used in bad faith and that the Complainant has established the third element 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. **amanhotel.site**: Transferred

PANELLISTS

Name	**Mrs Selma Ünlü**

DATE OF PANEL DECISION 2026-07-29

Publish the Decision