

Decision for dispute CAC-UDRP-102339

Case number CAC-UDRP-102339

Time of filing 2019-02-05 13:10:45

Domain names igpdecaux-it.com

Case administrator

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

Complainant

Organization JCDECAUX SA

Complainant representative

Organization Nameshield (Enora Millocheau)

Respondent

Name Sean Sterling

OTHER LEGAL PROCEEDINGS

The Panel is not aware of any other legal proceedings pending or decided which relate to the disputed domain name.

IDENTIFICATION OF RIGHTS

Since 1964, JCDECAUX SA is the worldwide number one in outdoor advertising. Throughout the world, the company's success is driven by meeting the needs of local authorities and advertisers by a constant focus on innovation. For more than 50 years JCDECAUX SA has been offering solutions that combine urban development and the provision of public services in approximately 80 countries. The Complainant is currently the only group present in the three principal segments of outdoor advertising market: street furniture, transport advertising and billboard.

All over the world, the digital transformation is gathering pace: JCDECAUX® now have more than 1,074,113 advertising panels in Airports, Rail and Metro Stations, Shopping Malls, on Billboards and Street Furniture.

The Group is listed on the Premier Marché of the Euronext Paris stock exchange and is part of Euronext 100 index. Employing a total of 13,040 people, the Group is present in more than 80 different countries and 4,033 cities and has generated revenues of €3,472m in 2017.

JCDECAUX SA is present worldwide, notably present in Italy, through its subsidiary IGP DECAUX.

JCDECAUX SA owns several trademarks containing the term “DECAUX” such as the international trademarks JCDECAUX® n° 803987 registered since November 27, 2001 and DECAUX® n° 991341 registered since April 4, 2008.

JCDECAUX SA is also the owner of a large domain names portfolio, including the same distinctive wording DECAUX®, such as <decaux.com> registered since June 23, 1997. It also owns, through its subsidiary IGP DECAUX, the domain name <igpdecaux.it>, registered since December 5, 2001 and used for its official website.

The disputed domain name <igpdecaux-it.com> was registered on September 2, 2018. It points to a registrar parking page with commercial links.

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

FACTS ASSERTED BY THE COMPLAINANT AND NOT CONTESTED BY THE RESPONDENT:

THE DISPUTED DOMAIN NAME IS IDENTICAL OR CONFUSINGLY SIMILAR TO A TRADEMARK OR SERVICE MARK IN WHICH THE COMPLAINANT HAS RIGHTS.

The Complainant states that the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to its prior trademarks.

Indeed, the addition of the term IGP (which is the abbreviation for “Impresa Generale Pubblicita”) and the geographic term “IT” (for Italy) in the trademark is not sufficient to escape the finding that the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to the trademark DECAUX ®.

It is well-established that “a domain name that wholly incorporates a Complainant’s registered trademark may be sufficient to establish confusing similarity for purposes of the UDRP”. Please see for instance WIPO Case No. D2003-0888, Dr. Ing. h.c. F. Porsche AG v. Vasily Terkin.

On the contrary, those additions worsens the likelihood of confusion, as the abbreviations “IGP” and “IT” refer directly to IGP DECAUX, the Complainant’s Italian subsidiary.

Furthermore, Complainant contends that the addition of the gTLD “.COM” does not change the overall impression of the designation as being connected to Complainant’s trademark. It does not prevent the likelihood of confusion between the disputed domain name and Complainant, its trademark and its domain names associated.

Thus, the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to the Complainant's prior trademarks.

PARTIES CONTENTIONS

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).

This is thus a clear case of “typosquatting”, i.e. the disputed domain name contains an obvious misspelling of the Complainant’s trademark. It is also well established that the specific top level of a domain name such as “.com”, “.org” or “.net” does not affect the domain name for the purpose of determining whether it is identical or confusingly similar.

Previous panels have found that the slight spelling variations does not prevent a domain name from being confusing similar to the complainant’s trademark.

Simple exchange or adding of letters is not a sufficient element to escape the finding that the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to the complainant’s trademarks and domain names.

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).

The Complainant contends that the Respondent is not affiliated with him nor authorized by him in any way to use his trademarks in a domain name or on a website. The Complainant does not carry out any activity for, nor has any business with the Respondent.

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).

Given the distinctiveness of the trademark and the content of the website, it is clear that the Respondent has registered the disputed domain name with knowledge of the Complainant and its trademark.

In addition, the disputed domain name is not used for any bone fide offerings. More particularly, there are present circumstances indicating that the Respondent has registered or acquired the disputed domain name primarily for the purpose of selling, renting, or otherwise transferring the disputed domain name registration to the Complainant who is the owner of the trademark or service mark or to a competitor of Complainant, for valuable consideration in excess of the Respondent's documented out-of-pocket costs directly related to the disputed domain name (par. 4(b)(i) of the Policy).

All these elements lead to the conclusion that the Respondent has intentionally attempted to attract Internet users to the Respondent's website for commercial gain by creating a likelihood of confusion with the Complainant's trademark as to the source, sponsorship, affiliation, or endorsement of such websites.

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

1. The three essential issues under the paragraph 4(a) of the Policy are whether:

i. the disputed domain name is identical or confusingly similar to a trademark or service mark in which the Complainant has rights; and

ii. the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests with respect to the disputed domain name; and

iii. the disputed domain name has been registered and is being used in bad faith.

2. The Panel reviewed carefully all documents provided by the Complainant. The Respondent did not provide the Panel with any documents or statements. The Panel also visited all available websites and public information concerning the disputed domain name, namely the WHOIS databases.

3. The UDRP Rules clearly say in its Article 3 that any person or entity may initiate an administrative proceeding by submitting a complaint in accordance with the Policy and these Rules.

4. The Panel therefore came to the following conclusions:

a) The Complainant has clearly proven that it is a long standing and successful company in the outdoor advertising. It is clear that its trademark and domain name containing the term "DECAUX" are well-known.

The Complainant states and proves that the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to its trademarks and its domain names. Indeed, the trademark is partially incorporated in the disputed domain name.

The disputed domain name is therefore deemed identical or confusingly similar.

b) It has to be stressed that it was proven that there are no fair rights of the Respondent to the disputed domain name. The Respondent is not generally known by the disputed domain name and have not acquired any trademark or service mark rights in the name or mark.

The Panel therefore finds that the Respondent does not have rights or legitimate interest with respect to the disputed domain name.

c) The disputed domain name was registered with an intention to attract customers of another well-known domain name/registered trademark holder. Therefore there cannot be found any legitimate interest of the Respondent.

It is clear that the Complainant's trademarks and website(s) were used by the Complainant long time before the disputed domain name was registered and used. It is therefore concluded that the disputed domain name was registered with an intention to attract customers of another well-known domain name/registered trademark holder.

The Panel therefore finds that the disputed domain name has been registered and is being used in bad faith.

For the reasons stated above, it is the decision of this Panel that the Complainant has satisfied all three elements of paragraph 4(a) of the Policy.

FOR ALL THE REASONS STATED ABOVE, THE COMPLAINT IS

Accepted

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

1. IGPDECAUX-IT.COM:

PANELLISTS

Name	Dr. Vít Horáček
------	-----------------

DATE OF PANEL DECISION 2019-03-09

Publish the Decision
