

## Decision for dispute CAC-UDRP-103317

Case number CAC-UDRP-103317

---

Time of filing 2020-09-30 10:57:31

---

Domain names boursorama-fr.com

---

### Case administrator

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

---

### Complainant

Organization BOURSORAMA SA

---

### Complainant representative

Organization Nameshield (Enora Millocheau)

---

### Respondent

Name LaMark Indian Robinson

---

#### OTHER LEGAL PROCEEDINGS

There are no other legal proceedings.

---

#### IDENTIFICATION OF RIGHTS

The Complainant is the owner of EUTM registration No. 001758614 BOURSORAMA, filed on 13 July 2000 and granted on 19 October 2001, for products/services in classes 9, 16, 35, 36, 38, 41 and 42.

---

#### FACTUAL BACKGROUND

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

Founded in 1995, BOURSORAMA S.A. (the Complainant) grows in Europe with the emergence of e-commerce and the continuous expansion of the range of financial products online.

Pioneer and leader in its three core businesses, online brokerage, financial information on the Internet and online banking, BOURSORAMA S.A. based its growth on innovation, commitment and transparency.

In France, BOURSORAMA is the online banking reference with over 2 million customers. The portal [www.boursorama.com](http://www.boursorama.com) is the first national financial and economic information site and first French online banking platform.

The Complainant is the owner of several trademarks BOURSORAMA®, such as the European trademark n° 1758614 registered since 19 October 2001.

The Complainant also owns a number of domain names, including the same distinctive wording BOURSORAMA®, such as the domain name <boursorama.com>, registered since 1 March 1998 and <boursorama-banque.com> registered since 26 May 2005.

The disputed domain name was registered on 23 September 2020 and to a page without any substantial content, except for the message “Future home of something quite cool”.

The disputed domain name is confusingly similar to the Complainant’s mark:

The Complainant states that the disputed domain name <boursorama-fr.com> is confusingly similar to its trademark BOURSORAMA®.

The addition of the abbreviation “FR” (for France) is not sufficient to escape the finding that the domain name is confusingly similar to the trademark BOURSORAMA®. It does not change the overall impression of the designation as being connected to the Complainant’s trademark BOURSORAMA®. It does not prevent the likelihood of confusion between the disputed domain name and the Complainant and its trademark.

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 WIPO Case No. D2003-0888, Dr. Ing. h.c. F. Porsche AG v. Vasilij Terkin.

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

Please see WIPO Case No. D2006-0451, F. Hoffmann-La Roche AG v. Macalve e-dominios S.A. (“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.”).

Thus, the disputed domain name <boursorama-fr.com> is confusingly similar to the Complainant's trademark BOURSORAMA®.

The Respondent does not have any rights or legitimate interest in the disputed domain name:

According to the WIPO Case No. D2003-0455, Croatia Airlines d.d. v. Modern Empire Internet Ltd., the Complainant is required to make out a prima facie case that the Respondent lacks rights or legitimate interests. Once such prima facie case is made, the Respondent carries the burden of demonstrating rights or legitimate interests in the domain name. If the Respondent fails to do so, the Complainant is deemed to have satisfied paragraph 4(a) (ii) of the Policy.

The Complainant asserts that the Respondent is not identified in the Whois database as the disputed domain name. Past panels have held that a Respondent was not commonly known by a disputed domain name if the Whois information was not similar to the disputed domain name. Thus, the Respondent is not known as the disputed domain name.

Please see for instance NAF Case No. FA 1781783, Skechers U.S.A., Inc. and Skechers U.S.A., Inc. II v. Chad Moston / Elite Media Group <bobsfromsketchers.com> (“Here, the WHOIS information of record identifies Respondent as “Chad Moston / Elite Media Group.” The Panel therefore finds under Policy 4(c)(ii) that Respondent is not commonly known by the disputed domain name under Policy 4(c)(ii).”).

The Respondent is not known by the Complainant. The Complainant contends that Respondent is not affiliated with nor

authorized by the Complainant in any way. The Complainant contends that Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the disputed domain name. The Complainant does not carry out any activity for, nor has any business with the Respondent.

Neither license nor authorization has been granted to the Respondent to make any use of the Complainant's trademark BOURSORAMA®, or apply for registration of the disputed domain name <boursorama-fr.com>.

Furthermore, the disputed domain name resolves to a page without any substantial content, except for the message "Future home of something quite cool". Therefore, the Complainant contends that Respondent did not make any use of disputed domain name since its registration, and it confirms that Respondent has no demonstrable plan to use the disputed domain name. It demonstrates a lack of legitimate interests in respect of the disputed domain name.

Accordingly, Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests on the disputed domain name <boursorama-fr.com>.

The disputed domain name has been registered and is being used in bad faith:

The disputed domain name <boursorama-fr.com> is confusingly similar to the Complainant's well-known trademark BOURSORAMA®.

Therefore, it is reasonable to infer that the Respondent has registered the domain name with full knowledge of the Complainant's trademark.

For example:

- CAC Case No. 101131, BOURSORAMA v. PD Host Inc – Ken Thomas ("In the case at hand, the Respondent acted in bad faith especially because the Respondent, who has no connection with the well-known "BOURSORAMA" trademark, registered a domain name, which incorporates the well-known "BOURSORAMA" trademark and it is totally unrealistic to believe that the Respondent did not know the Complainant's trademark when registered the domain name <wwwboursorama.com>.");

- WIPO Case No. D2017-1463, Boursorama SA v. Estrade Nicolas ("Given the circumstances of the case including the evidence on record of the longstanding of use of the Complainant's trademark, and the distinctive nature of the mark BOURSORAMA, it is inconceivable to the Panel in the current circumstances that the Respondent registered the disputed domain name without prior knowledge of the Complainant and the Complainant's mark.").

Finally, all the Google results for a search of the terms "BOURSORAMA FR" are related to the Complainant.

Thus, the Complainant contends that the Respondent has registered and used the disputed domain name <boursorama-fr.com> with full knowledge of the Complainant's trademark.

Furthermore, the disputed domain name resolves to a page without any substantial content, except for the message "Future home of something quite cool". The Complainant contends that the Respondent has not demonstrated any activity in respect of the disputed domain name, and it is not possible to conceive of any plausible actual or contemplated active use of the domain name by the Respondent that would not be illegitimate, such as by being a passing off, an infringement of consumer protection legislation, an infringement of the Complainant's rights under trademark law, or an attempt to attract, for commercial gain, Internet users to his own website, by creating a likelihood of confusion with Complainant's trademark as to the source, sponsorship, affiliation or endorsement of Respondent's website.

As prior WIPO UDRP panels have held, the incorporation of a famous mark into a domain name, coupled with an inactive website, may be evidence of bad faith registration and use.

For instance:

- WIPO Case No. D2000-0003, Telstra Corporation Limited v. Nuclear Marshmallows;

- WIPO Case No. D2000-0400, CBS Broadcasting, Inc. v. Dennis Toeppen.

On these bases, the Complainant concludes that the Respondent has registered and is using the disputed domain name <boursorama-fr.com> in bad faith.

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 WIPO Case No. D2003-0888, Dr. Ing. h.c. F. Porsche AG v. Vasily Terkin.

Please see for instance Forum Case No. FA 1781783, Skechers U.S.A., Inc. and Skechers U.S.A., Inc. II v. Chad Moston / Elite Media Group <bobsfromsketchers.com> ("Here, the WHOIS information of record identifies Respondent as "Chad Moston / Elite Media Group." The Panel therefore finds under Policy 4(c)(ii) that Respondent is not commonly known by the disputed domain name under Policy 4(c)(ii).").

Please see:

- CAC Case No. 101131, BOURSORAMA v. PD Host Inc – Ken Thomas ("In the case at hand, the Respondent acted in bad faith especially because the Respondent, who has no connection with the well-known "BOURSORAMA" trademark, registered a domain name, which incorporates the well-known "BOURSORAMA" trademark and it is totally unrealistic to believe that the Respondent did not know the Complainant's trademark when registered the domain name <wwwboursorama.com>.");

- WIPO Case No. D2017-1463, Boursorama SA v. Estrade Nicolas ("Given the circumstances of the case including the evidence on record of the longstanding of use of the Complainant's trademark, and the distinctive nature of the mark BOURSORAMA, it is inconceivable to the Panel in the current circumstances that the Respondent registered the disputed domain name without prior knowledge of the Complainant and the Complainant's mark.").

Please see for instance:

- WIPO Case No. D2000-0003, Telstra Corporation Limited v. Nuclear Marshmallows;

- WIPO Case No. D2000-0400, CBS Broadcasting, Inc. v. Dennis Toeppen.

---

#### 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).

---

#### 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

### I. RIGHTS

The disputed domain name is confusingly similar to the Complainant's registered trademarks since it reproduces the Complainant's mark 'BOURSORAMA', merely adding the letters "FR" at the end (country code for France), with a hyphen between the two words.

### II. NO RIGHTS OR LEGITIMATE INTERESTS

The Respondent has not submitted any response. Therefore, it has submitted no information on possible rights or legitimate interests it might hold. On its part, the Complainant has submitted information and arguments which allow it to be reasonably assumed that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interest in the domain name in dispute.

As the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center pointed out in UDRP case No. D20020856:

"As mentioned [in the decision], the Respondent has not filed a Response and is therefore in default. In those circumstances when the Respondent has no obvious connection with the disputed domain name, the prima facie showing by the Complainant that the Respondent has no right or legitimate interest is sufficient to shift the burden of proof to the Respondent to demonstrate that such a right or legitimate interest exists." WIPO Case No. D20020273 <sachsenanhalt>; WIPO Case No. D20020521 <volvovehicles.com>.

Furthermore, currently the domain name in dispute is redirected to a parking website containing links to banking and investment websites, the main activity of the Complainant, therefore clearly trying to impersonate the Complainant. Obviously, this use cannot be considered as legitimate.

Accordingly, the Panel finds that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name.

### III. BAD FAITH

The Respondent has, as a result of his default, not invoked any circumstances which could invalidate the Complainant's allegations and evidence with regard to the Respondent's registration and use of the disputed domain name in bad faith.

The Complainant has filed evidence of the well-known character of its BOURSORAMA trademark for banking and financial services. The disputed domain name resolves to a parking with links to banking and investment websites. Since this is the main activity of the Complainant, it seems clear that the Respondent is trying to impersonate the Complainant.

It is therefore clear that the Respondent registered the domain name for this fraudulent purpose.

Paragraph 4(b) (iii) of the Policy provides that the following circumstances are deemed to be evidence that the Respondent has registered and is using the disputed domain name in bad faith:

(iv) by using the domain name, the respondent has intentionally attempted to attract, for commercial gain, Internet users to its website or other online location, by creating a likelihood of confusion with the complainant's mark as to the source, sponsorship, affiliation or endorsement of its website or location or of a product or service on its website or location.

As mentioned in Andrey Ternovskiy dba Chatroulette v. Alexander Ochki, WIPO Case No. D2017-0334:

"It is clear in the Panel's view that in the mind of an Internet user, the disputed domain names could be directly associated with the Complainant's trademark, which is likely to be confusing to the public as suggesting either an operation of the Complainant or one associated with or endorsed by it (see AT&T Corp. v. Amjad Kausar, WIPO Case No. D2003-0327)."

It has, therefore, been satisfactorily demonstrated to the Panel that the disputed domain name has been registered and used in bad faith.

---

FOR ALL THE REASONS STATED ABOVE, THE COMPLAINT IS

Accepted

---

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

1. **BOURSORAMA-FR.COM**: Transferred

---

## PANELLISTS

Name	<b>José Ignacio San Martín</b>
------	--------------------------------

---

DATE OF PANEL DECISION **2020-10-27**

Publish the Decision

---