

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

Mistral AI v. Arnold Gribabasko
Case No. D2026-1349

1. The Parties

Complainant is Mistral AI, France, represented by Blanche Avocats, France.

Respondent is Arnold Gribabasko, Ukraine.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <mistraltradeai.pro> is registered with NameCheap, Inc. (the “Registrar”).

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the “Center”) on March 30, 2026. On March 30, 2026, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On March 31, 2026, 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 (Withheld for Privacy ehf) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to Complainant on March 31, 2026, providing the registrant and contact information disclosed by the Registrar, and inviting Complainant to submit an amendment to the Complaint. Complainant filed an amended Complaint on April 1, 2026.

The Center verified that the Complaint together with the amended 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 Respondent of the Complaint, and the proceedings commenced on April 8, 2026. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was April 28, 2026. Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified Respondent’s default on May 4, 2026.

The Center appointed Frederick M. Abbott as the sole panelist in this matter on May 6, 2026. 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

Complainant is MISTRAL AI, a simplified joint stock company, registered on April 28, 2023, with the Paris Trade and Companies Register under No 952 418 325, with headquarters in Paris, France. Complainant operates in the field of generative artificial intelligence, specializing in developing and offering large language models (LLMs) based on its proprietary models. Complainant is valued at over EUR 10 billion. Complainant operates a commercial website at the domain name <mistral.ai>, (“https://mistral.ai/”) and is registrant of additional mistral-formative domain names. Complainant at its commercial website promotes various products and services related to the development and deployment of AI-related activities.

Complainant is the owner of registration for the word trademark MISTRAL AI on the trademark register of the French Intellectual Property Office (INPI), registration number 4970012, registration dated November 10, 2023, in international classes (ICs) 9, 35 and 42, covering downloadable software for artificial intelligence, learning, language generation, data mining and predictive analysis, as further specified. Complainant is owner of registration for the word trademark MISTRAL AI on the register of the European Union Intellectual Property Office (EUIPO), registration number 018942618, registration dated February 14, 2024, in IC 42, covering software development, maintenance and design of computer systems, as further specified. Complainant is the owner of registration for MISTRAL AI as an International Trademark under the Madrid System, registration number 1794809, registration dated December 15, 2023, in ICs 9, 35 and 42, covering downloadable computer software for artificial intelligence, commercial analysis, and software as a service using artificial intelligence, as further specified. Complainant also is owner of registration of the design  as an International Trademark under the Madrid System, registration number 1863642, registration dated January 23, 2025, in ICs 9, 35 and 42, covering downloadable computer software for artificial intelligence, commercial analysis, and software as a service using artificial intelligence, as further specified, designating inter alia, China, the European Union, the Russian Federation and the United States of America (with varying acceptance/rejection status).

According to the Registrar’s verification, Respondent is registrant of the disputed domain name. According to the Whois report, the disputed domain name was registered on August 1, 2025.

Respondent has used the disputed domain name to direct Internet users to a website with an appearance substantially similar to that of Complainant’s commercial website. Respondent’s website uses the same (or a very similar) distinctive orange color for the large header of the homepage, with a substantially similar (though not identical) representation of mountains in design format. Respondent’s website incorporates a design mark identical or very similar to that registered by Complainant. Respondent’s website offers artificial intelligence models similar to those offered by Complainant and asserts affiliations with a number of well-known companies operating in the computer and digital commercial spaces. Respondent’s website is flagged by Google Chrome as a potentially dangerous website. The record is not clear as to whether Respondent is delivering AI software to Internet users who interact with its website, although Complainant indicates that the buttons and links on Respondent’s website lead only to a request for subscription and personal details. Complainant requested Cloudflare, the host of Respondent’s website, to take down Respondent’s website based on trademark infringement, but that request was not successful.

Complainant has provided evidence that Respondent (as part of a consolidated group) was determined by the Czech Arbitration Court to have abusively registered and used the trademarks of TotalEnergies SE in connection with 11 disputed domain names, *TotalEnergies SE v. MarkPoint, et al.*, Case No. CAC-UDRP-106945, decided February 12, 2024.

There is no evidence on the record of this proceeding of any association or affiliation, commercial or otherwise, between Complainant and Respondent.

5. Parties' Contentions

A. Complainant

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

Notably, Complainant contends that it holds rights in the trademark MISTRAL AI and that the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to that trademark. Complainant further refers to its company name and domain names as the basis for establishing confusing similarity with the disputed domain name.

Complainant alleges that Respondent lacks rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name because: (1) Respondent has no link with Complainant; (2) Respondent does not own any rights in trademarks similar to that of Complainant's; (3) Complainant has not authorized Respondent to use the disputed domain name or its trademarks; (4) Respondent had no justification for selecting Complainant's trademarks to use in the disputed domain name; (5) there is no legitimate noncommercial or fair use of the disputed domain name; (6) Respondent registered and used the disputed domain name to confuse Internet users as to an affiliation with Complainant; (7) Respondent is using the disputed domain name confusingly similar to Complainant's trademarks benefit financially from Complainant's reputation and investments.

Complainant argues that Respondent registered and is using the disputed domain name in bad faith because: (1) Respondent was aware of Complainant's reputation when it registered the disputed domain name; (2) Respondent used terms associated with professional financial services to enhance its credibility; (3) none of the links or buttons on Respondent's website works other than to lead to a request for subscription and personal details; (4) Respondent falsely claims affiliation with prominent companies; (5) Respondent's website is flagged as potentially dangerous or unsafe by Google; (6) Respondent engaged a privacy service when it registered the disputed domain name, and it did not provide legal information with respect to its identity on its website, and; (7) Respondent was previously found to have registered and used disputed domain names in bad faith.

B. Respondent

Respondent did not reply to Complainant's contentions.

6. Discussion and Findings

According to the Registrar's information, Respondent appears to be in Ukraine, which is subject to an international conflict at the date of this Decision. It is therefore appropriate for the Panel to consider under paragraph 10 of the Rules whether the proceedings should continue. The Panel notes that the Center has sent notice of the proceedings to Respondent as per the Rules. The Panel also notes that Respondent registered the disputed domain name after the commencement of the international conflict, so Respondent should have received at least electronic notice of this proceeding. The Panel has no serious doubt that Respondent registered and has used the disputed domain name in bad faith as discussed later in this Decision.

The Panel concludes that the Parties have been given a fair opportunity to present their case, and the Panel proceeds to a Decision so that the administration of proceedings takes place with due expedition.

Paragraph 4(a) of the Policy sets forth three elements that must be established by a complainant to merit a finding that a respondent has engaged in abusive domain name registration and use and to obtain relief.

These elements are that:

- (i) the disputed domain name is identical or confusingly similar to a trademark or service mark in which complainant has rights;
- (ii) respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the disputed domain name; and
- (iii) the disputed 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 Select UDRP Questions ("[WIPO Overview 3.1](#)"), section 1.7.

Complainant has shown rights in respect of the MISTRAL AI trademark for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.2.1.

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 3.1](#), section 1.7.

Although the addition of another term, here "trade", and use of the top level domain (TLD) ".pro", may bear on assessment of the second and third elements, the Panel finds the addition or use of such terms does not prevent a finding of confusing similarity between the disputed domain name and the mark for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.8.

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 this UDRP proceeding is on Complainant, panels have recognized that proving that 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 Respondent. As such, where Complainant, as here, makes out a prima facie case that Respondent lacks rights or legitimate interests, the burden of production on this element shifts to Respondent to come forward with relevant evidence demonstrating rights or legitimate interests in the domain name (although the burden of proof always remains on Complainant). If Respondent, as here, fails to come forward with such relevant evidence, Complainant is deemed to have satisfied the second element. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 2.1.

Having reviewed the available record, the Panel finds Complainant has established a prima facie case that Respondent lacks rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name. Respondent has not rebutted 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.

Panels have held that the use of a domain name for illegitimate or illegal activity, here claimed as creating a copycat site, and/or passing off, can never confer rights or legitimate interests on Respondent. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 2.13.1.

Respondent's conspicuous use of Complainant's design mark on its website, along with a substantially similar color palette and layout, and explanatory terms, evidences a deliberate effort to confuse Internet

users as to the source of the promoted AI models and related products or services. Respondent has provided no potential justification for its use of Complainant's distinctive trademark in the disputed domain name or on its website. The Panel declines to speculate regarding potential justifications. The Panel determines that Complainant has established that Respondent lacks rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name.

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.

In the present case, the Panel notes that the Respondent was manifestly aware of Complainant and its distinctive trademark when it registered the disputed domain name. Respondent set about creating a website having a substantially similar appearance, including descriptive terms, as Complainant's commercial website. The substantial similarities are obvious, not "subtle". By registering the disputed domain name substantially similar to Complainant's trademark and deploying it to confuse Internet users, Respondent undertook registration in bad faith.

Paragraph 4(b) of the Policy sets out a list of non-exhaustive circumstances that may indicate that a domain name was registered and used in bad faith, but other circumstances may be relevant in assessing whether a respondent's registration and use of a domain name is in bad faith. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 3.2.1.

Respondent used the disputed domain name to direct Internet users to a website substantially similar to Complainant's commercial website where Respondent purported to offer services and products in the same general field as Complainant. There is no disclaimer of affiliation with Complainant and/or its trademark on Respondent's website. Complainant has indicated that the links and buttons on Respondent's website function only to direct Internet users to a request for subscription and personal information. The evidence is not clear as to whether Respondent delivered any type of product or service. That, however, is not necessary to support the finding by this Panel that Respondent diverted Internet users traffic to its own website for purposes of commercial gain, at the same time depriving Complainant of Internet user traffic.

Panels have held that the use of a domain name for illegitimate or illegal activity, here claimed as creating a copycat site, and/or passing off, constitutes bad faith. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 3.4. Having reviewed the record, the Panel finds Respondent's registration and use of the disputed domain name constitutes bad faith under the Policy.

The Panel finds that 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 <mistraltradeai.pro> be transferred to Complainant.

/Frederick M. Abbott/
Frederick M. Abbott
Sole Panelist
Date: May 20, 2026