Decision for dispute CAC-UDRP-101740

Case number	CAC-UDRP-101740
Time of filing	2017-10-20 11:23:37
Domain names	ca-ibps-credit-agricole-adhesion.com

Case administrator

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

Complainant

Organization	CREDIT AGRICOLE SA

Complainant representative

Organization	Nameshield (Laurent Becker)

Respondent

Name	fanis ismael

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 the owner of several trademark registrations including the wording "CREDIT AGRICOLE", inter alia International registration no. 1064647 "CREDIT AGRICOLE", registered on January 4, 2011 for various goods and services in classes 9, 16, 35, 36, 38, and 42 (hereinafter referred to as the "Trademark").

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

The Complainant is one of the largest banks in Europe. The Complainant provides information on its goods and services online at <credit-agricole.com>.

The disputed domain name was registered on October 16, 2017 and is not used in connection with an active website.

PARTIES CONTENTIONS

PARTIES' CONTENTIONS:

COMPLAINANT:

The Complainant contends that the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to the Trademark as the addition of the generic words “CA” (which refers to “Crédit Agricole”), “IBPS” and “adhesion” are not sufficient elements to escape the finding that the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to the Trademark.

Furthermore, the Complainant contends that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name. In this regard, the Complainant states that the Respondent is not affiliated with nor authorized by the Complainant in any way, that the Complainant does not carry out any activity for, nor has any business with the Respondent, and that neither licence nor authorization has been granted to the Respondent to make any use of the Trademark or to apply for registration of the disputed domain name by the Complainant.

Finally, the Complainant contends that the disputed domain name was registered and is being used in bad faith. In this regard, the Complainant argues that the trademark is widely known and highly distinctive and that it is reasonable to infer that the Respondent has registered the domain names with full knowledge of the Trademark. With regard to bad faith use, the Complainant argues that it is well established that passive holding, i.e. the incorporation of a famous trademark into a domain name, coupled with an inactive website, may be evidence of bad faith registration and use.

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

Under paragraph 4(a) of the Policy, the Complainant must prove that each of the following three elements is present:

(i) the disputed domain name is identical or confusingly similar to the Complainant's trademark; and

(ii) the 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.

1. The Panel accepts that the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to the Trademark as it fully incorporates the well-established Trademark. It is well-established that a domain name that wholly incorporates a trademark may be confusingly similar to such trademark for purposes of the Policy despite the addition of generic terms, such as "ca" (Canada's country code and the Complainant's acronym), "ibps" (Institute of Banking Personnel Selection), or "adhension".

2. The Complainant has substantiated that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name. The Panel finds that the Complainant has fulfilled its obligations under paragraph 4(a)(ii) of the Policy. The Respondent did not deny these assertions in any way and therefore failed to prove any rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name.

3.1 The Panel is also convinced that the Respondent registered the disputed domain name with full knowledge of the Complainant and its rights in the Trademark as the Trademark is highly distinctive and well-established.

3.2 Finally, the Panel accepts the Complainant's contentions that the disputed domain name has been used in bad faith under the principles of passive holding. It is consensus view that the lack of an active use of a domain name does not as such prevent a finding of bad faith under the Policy. In such cases the Panel must examine all the circumstances of the case to determine whether a Respondent is acting in bad faith. Examples of circumstances that can indicate bad faith include a complainant having a well-known trademark, no response to the complaint, Respondent’s concealment of identity and the impossibility of conceiving a good faith use of the domain name (cf Telstra Corporation Limited v. Nuclear Marshmallows, WIPO Case No. D2000-0003; Jupiters Limited v. Aaron Hall, WIPO Case No. D2000-0574; Ladbroke Group Plc v. Sonoma International LDC, WIPO Case No. D2002-0131).

The Panel is convinced that the Trademark is highly distinctive and well-established. Furthermore, the Respondent failed to file a Response and therefore did not provide evidence of any actual or contemplated good faith use of the disputed domain name. In the view of the Panel, the facts of this case do not allow for any plausible actual or contemplated active use of the disputed domain name by the Respondent in good faith. The Panel is therefore convinced that, even though the disputed domain name has not yet been actively used, the Respondent’s non-use of the disputed domain name equals to use in bad faith.

FOR ALL THE REASONS STATED ABOVE, THE COMPLAINT IS

Accepted

AND THE DISPUTED DOMAIN NAME(S) IS (ARE) TO BE

1. **CA-IBPS-CREDIT-AGRICOLE-ADHESION.COM**: Transferred

PANELLISTS

Name	**Peter Müller**

DATE OF PANEL DECISION 2017-12-04

Publish the Decision