

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

AXA SA v. Host Master, 1337 Services LLC

Case No. D2023-4747

1. The Parties

The Complainant is AXA SA, France, represented by Selarl Candé - Blanchard - Ducamp, France.

The Respondent is Host Master, 1337 Services LLC, Saint Kitts and Nevis.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <axa-esp-fr.com> is registered with Tucows Inc. (the “Registrar”).

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the “Center”) on November 15, 2023. On November 15, 2023, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On November 15, 2023, the Registrar transmitted by email to the Center its verification response disclosing registrant and contact information for the disputed domain name which differed from the named Respondent (Redacted for Privacy) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on November 16, 2023 providing the registrant and contact information disclosed by the Registrar, and inviting the Complainant to submit an amendment to the Complaint. The Complainant filed an amendment to the Complaint on November 16, 2023.

The Center verified that the Complaint together with the amendment to the Complaint satisfied the formal requirements of the Uniform Domain Name Dispute Resolution Policy (the “Policy” or “UDRP”), the Rules for Uniform Domain Name Dispute Resolution Policy (the “Rules”), and the WIPO Supplemental Rules for Uniform Domain Name Dispute Resolution Policy (the “Supplemental Rules”).

In accordance with the Rules, paragraphs 2 and 4, the Center formally notified the Respondent of the Complaint, and the proceedings commenced on November 20, 2023. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was December 10, 2023. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent’s default on December 11, 2023.

The Center appointed Zoltán Takács as the sole panelist in this matter on December 13, 2023. The Panel finds that it was properly constituted. The Panel has submitted the Statement of Acceptance and Declaration of Impartiality and Independence, as required by the Center to ensure compliance with the Rules, paragraph 7.

4. Factual Background

The Complainant is the holding company of the AXA Group (hereinafter “AXA”), which is one of the world leaders in insurance, savings and asset management.

AXA employs 110,302 people and serves 93 million customers around the world.

After a succession of mergers, acquisitions, and name changes involving some of the biggest insurance companies in the world the trade name AXA was introduced in 1985. Since 1988, AXA is listed on the Paris Stock Exchange and since 1996 on New York Stock Exchange.

The Complainant owns numerous trademarks in multiple jurisdictions, including the International Trademark Registration No. 490030 for the word mark AXA registered since December 5, 1984, and the European Union Trademark Registration No. 008772766 for the word mark AXA registered since September 7, 2012, both for predominantly services related to advertising, business, insurance, and finance.

The Complainant maintains its principal corporate website at “www.axa.com”. The corresponding domain name <axa.com> was registered on October 24, 1995.

The disputed domain name was registered on February 6, 2023, and appears not to have resolved to an active website.

5. Parties’ Contentions

A. Complainant

The Complainant contends that it has satisfied each of the elements required under the Policy for a transfer of the disputed domain name.

Notably, the Complainant contends that:

- the disputed domain name, which fully incorporates its AXA trademark, is confusingly similar to it because addition of the terms “esp” and “fr”, which could refer to Spain and France, is not sufficient to distinguish the disputed domain name from the trademark;
- the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the disputed domain name; and
- the Respondent has knowingly and without any authorization incorporated its well-known AXA trademark in the disputed domain name with intent to take unfair advantage of the trademark’s notoriety.

The Complainant requests that the disputed domain name be transferred from the Respondent to the Complainant.

B. Respondent

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

6. Discussion and Findings

Paragraph 15(a) of the Rules requires that the Panel's decision be made "on the basis of the statements and documents submitted and in accordance with the Policy, these Rules and any rules and principles of law that it deems applicable".

A complainant must evidence each of the three elements required by paragraph 4(a) of the Policy in order to succeed on the complaint, namely that:

- (i) the domain name is identical or confusingly similar to a trademark or service mark in which the complainant has rights;
- (ii) the respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the domain name; and
- (iii) the domain name has been registered and is being used in bad faith.

A. Identical or Confusingly Similar

It is well accepted that the first element functions primarily as a standing requirement. The standing (or threshold) test for confusing similarity involves a reasoned but relatively straightforward comparison between the Complainant's trademark and the disputed domain name. WIPO Overview of WIPO Panel Views on Selected UDRP Questions, Third Edition, ("[WIPO Overview 3.0](#)"), section 1.7.

Based on the available record, the Panel finds the Complainant has shown rights in respect of a trademark or service mark for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 1.2.1.

The Panel finds that the entirety of the mark is reproduced within the disputed domain name. Accordingly, the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to the mark for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 1.7. Although the addition of other terms, here "esp" and "fr", which can reasonably be interpreted as the common abbreviation for Spain and France, may bear on assessment of the second and third elements, the Panel finds the addition of such terms separated by hyphens does not prevent a finding of confusing similarity between the disputed domain name and the mark for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 1.8.

Based on the available record, the Panel finds the first element of the Policy has been established.

B. Rights or Legitimate Interests

Paragraph 4(c) of the Policy provides a list of circumstances in which the Respondent may demonstrate rights or legitimate interests in a disputed domain name.

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 difficult 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 (although the burden of proof always remains on the complainant). If the respondent fails to come forward with such relevant evidence, the complainant is deemed to have satisfied the second element. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 2.1.

Having reviewed the available record, the Panel finds the Complainant has established a *prima facie* case that the Respondent lacks rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name. The Respondent has not rebutted the Complainant's *prima facie* showing and has not come forward with any relevant evidence demonstrating rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name such as those enumerated in the Policy or otherwise.

Furthermore, the Panel finds that the composition of the disputed domain name carries a risk of implied affiliation with the Complainant. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 2.5.1.

Based on the available record, the Panel finds the second element of the Policy has been established.

C. Registered and Used in Bad Faith

The Panel notes that, for the purposes of paragraph 4(a)(iii) of the Policy, paragraph 4(b) of the Policy establishes circumstances, in particular, but without limitation, that, if found by the Panel to be present, shall be evidence of the registration and use of a domain name in bad faith.

It has been well-established in prior decisions under the UDRP, with which the Panel agrees, that the Complainant's AXA trademark is well known (see *e.g.*, *AXA v. Frank Van*, WIPO Case No. [D2014-0863](#), and *AXA SA v. Perfect Privacy, LLC / Julien Dubois*, WIPO Case No. [D2017-1702](#)). UDRP panels have consistently found that the mere registration of a domain name that is identical or confusingly similar to a famous or widely-known trademark by an unaffiliated entity can by itself create a presumption of bad faith. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 3.1.4.

In the present case, the Panel also notes that the Respondent replicated the Complainant's well-known and distinctive AXA trademark in the disputed domain name. Hence, in the Panel's view the Respondent clearly had the Complainant's AXA trademark in mind at the time of registration and had registered the disputed domain name to target the Complainant and its well-known trademark.

As mentioned above, there is no evidence that the disputed domain name has resolved to an active website.

Panels have found that the non-use of a domain name (including a blank or "coming soon" page) would not prevent a finding of bad faith under the doctrine of passive holding. Although panelists will look at the totality of the circumstances in each case, factors that have been considered relevant in applying the passive holding doctrine include: (i) the degree of distinctiveness or reputation of the complainant's mark, (ii) the failure of the respondent to submit a response or to provide any evidence of actual or contemplated good-faith use, and (iii) the respondent's concealing its identity or use of false contact details (noted to be in breach of its registration agreement). [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 3.3.

Having reviewed the available record, the Panel notes the distinctiveness and reputation of the Complainant's trademark, the composition of the disputed domain name as mentioned above, as well as the Respondent's failure to provide any good faith explanation as to its registration of the disputed domain name. Furthermore, any good faith use to which the inherently misleading disputed domain name may be put appears to be implausible. Accordingly, the Panel finds that in the circumstances of this case, the passive holding of the disputed domain name does not prevent a finding of bad faith under the Policy.

Based on the available record, the Panel finds that the Complainant has established the third element of the Policy.

7. Decision

For the foregoing reasons, in accordance with paragraphs 4(i) of the Policy and 15 of the Rules, the Panel orders that the disputed domain name <axa-esp-fr.com> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Zoltán Takács/

Zoltán Takács

Sole Panelist

Date: December 27, 2023