# Decision for dispute CAC-UDRP-102210

| | |
|---|---|
| Case number | CAC-UDRP-102210 |
| Time of filing | 2018-10-29 13:21:28 |
| Domain names | jcdecauxgroup.com |

## Case administrator

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

## Complainant

| | |
|---|---|
| Organization | JCDECAUX SA |

## Complainant representative

| | |
|---|---|
| Organization | Nameshield (Enora Millocheau) |

## Respondent

| | |
|---|---|
| Name | Shane Alborough |

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 trademark registrations across various jurisdictions, inter alia International trademark registration no. 803987 JCDecaux, registered on November 27, 2001 for various goods and services in classes 6, 9, 11, 19, 20, 35, 37, 38, 39, 41, and 42 (hereinafter referred to as the "Trademarks").

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

The Complainant is a multinational corporation based in France, known for its bus-stop advertising systems, billboards, public bicycle rental systems, and street furniture. It is the largest outdoor advertising corporation in the world.

The Complainant provides information on its goods and services online under numerous domain names, such as <jcdecaux.com> (registered since 1997).

The disputed domain name was registered on October 22, 2018 and is being used in connection with a standard placeholder website of the Respondent's registrar.

PARTIES CONTENTIONS

PARTIES' CONTENTIONS:

COMPLAINANT:

The Complainant contends that the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to the Trademarks.

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 commonly known by the disputed domain name, 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 license nor authorization has been granted to the Respondent to make any use of the Trademark or 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. It contends that the Respondent must have been aware of the Complainant and its well-known Trademarks at the time of registration of the disputed domain name and that the Respondent's non-use of the disputed domain name is an evidence of bad faith.

RESPONDENT:

The Respondent filed a Response on November 1, 2018.

The Respondent only states that the disputed domain name was selected in the memory of a deceased friend, James Connor Decaux and that it is intended for non-commercial use.

Furthermore, the Respondent contends that he was unaware that the Complainant was any trademarked company. However, he also states that he would prefer to be compensated for the costs of such domain registration in the event of losing the disputed domain name.

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 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 domain name; and

(iii) the 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 Trademarks as it fully includes the Trademarks. 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 "group".

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 only claims rights but failed to provide any evidence in this regard. Therefore, the Panel finds that the Respondent failed to prove any rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name.

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

3.2 Furthermore, 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 Trademarks are highly distinctive and well-established. Furthermore, the Respondent, although having filed a response, 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.

Finally, according to Para. 4(b)(i) of the Policy, circumstances indicating that the Respondent registered or acquired the domain name primarily for the purpose of selling, renting, or otherwise transferring the domain name registration to the Complainant who is the owner of the trademark or service mark or to a competitor of the Complainant, for valuable consideration in excess of the Respondent's documented out-of-pocket costs directly related to the domain name, constitute evidence of both bad faith registration and use of the domain name. The fact that the Respondent has expressed the wish of compensation is enough evidence for the Panel to conclude that the disputed domain name was registered to sell it to the Complainant.

FOR ALL THE REASONS STATED ABOVE, THE COMPLAINT IS

Accepted

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

1. **JCDECAUXGROUP.COM**: Transferred

## PANELLISTS

| Name | **Peter Müller** |
|---|---|

DATE OF PANEL DECISION 2018-11-28

Publish the Decision