

## Decision for dispute CAC-UDRP-103471

Case number CAC-UDRP-103471

---

Time of filing 2020-12-22 10:48:11

---

Domain names boursorama.link

---

### Case administrator

Organization Denisa Bilík (CAC) (Case admin)

---

### Complainant

Organization BOURSORAMA SA

---

### Complainant representative

Organization Nameshield (Enora Millocheau)

---

### Respondent

Organization arandi

---

#### 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 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, the Complainant based its growth on innovation, commitment and transparency.

In France, the Complainant is the online banking reference with over 2.37 million customers. The portal <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 BOURSORAMA n° 1758614 registered since October 19th, 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 March 1st, 1998.

---

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

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

The disputed domain name was registered on December 15th, 2020 and redirects to the Registrar parking page.

I. Domain name is identical

The Complainant states that the disputed domain name <boursorama.link> is identical to its trademark BOURSORAMA.

Besides, it is well established that TLDs may typically be disregarded in the assessment under paragraph 4(a)(i) of the Policy when comparing disputed domain names and trademarks.

WIPO Overview 3.0, section 1.11 (“The applicable Top Level Domain (“TLD”) in a domain name (e.g., “.com”, “.club”, “.nyc”) is viewed as a standard registration requirement and as such is disregarded under the first element confusing similarity test.”).

Thus, the disputed domain name is identical to the Complainant's trademark BOURSORAMA®.

II. The Respondent does not have any rights or legitimate interest in the domain name(s)

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 UDRP.

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.

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 Paragraph 4(c)(ii) that Respondent is not commonly known by the disputed domain name under Policy paragraph 4(c)(ii).”)

The Respondent is not known by the Complainant. The Complainant contends that the Respondent is not affiliated with nor authorized by the Complainant in any way. The Complainant contends that the 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.link>.

Furthermore, the disputed domain name resolves to a Registrar parking page. Therefore, the Complainant contends that Respondent did not make any use of the 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, the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name <boursorama.link>.

III. The domain name has been registered and is being used in bad faith

The disputed domain name <boursorama.link> is identical 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. 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 <boursorama.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 term "BOURSORAMA" are related to the Complainant.

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

Furthermore, the domain name currently resolves to a Registrar parking page. 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 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.

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

---

#### 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).

It is well established that the specific top level of a domain name such as ".com", ".org" or in case ".link" does not affect the domain name for the purpose of determining whether it is identical or confusingly similar. Therefore the disputed domain name is identical to the Complainant's trademark BOURSORAMA.

---

#### 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 circumstances of the case, including the provided information of the use and reputation of the Complainant's trademark BOURSORAMA and the distinctive nature of this mark, 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.

The Panel therefore finds that the disputed domain name was registered in bad faith.

The disputed domain name does not currently resolve to an active website.

Though no concrete examples of such use have been presented to this Panel, it seems inconceivable that the Respondent will be able to make any good faith use of the disputed domain name. The Panel notes in this connection that passive holding of a domain name does not prevent a finding of bad faith use under 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

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 states and proves that the disputed domain name is identical to its trademarks and its domain names. Indeed, the trademark is fully incorporated in the disputed domain name.

The disputed domain name is therefore deemed identical.

b) 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, nor is there any authorization for the Respondent by the Complainant to use or register the disputed domain name.

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

c) 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. Though no concrete examples of such use have been presented to this Panel, it seems inconceivable that the Respondent will be able to make any good faith use of the disputed domain name. It is concluded that the Respondent by passive holding makes bad faith use of the disputed domain name.

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. **BOURSORAMA.LINK**: Transferred

---

## PANELLISTS

Name	Lars Karnoe
------	-------------

---

DATE OF PANEL DECISION 2021-01-28

Publish the Decision

---