

Decision for dispute CAC-UDRP-104150

Case number	CAC-UDRP-104150
-------------	------------------------

Time of filing	2021-11-11 08:56:51
----------------	----------------------------

Domain names	boursorama.com
--------------	-----------------------

Case administrator

Organization	Denisa Bilík (CAC) (Case admin)
--------------	--

Complainant

Organization	BOURSORAMA SA
--------------	----------------------

Complainant representative

Organization	NAMESHIELD S.A.S.
--------------	--------------------------

Respondent

Name	xianjin hong
------	---------------------

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 a registered owner of a following trademark containing a word element "BOURSORAMA":
- BOURSORAMA (word), EU Trademark, priority (filing) date 13 July 2000, registration date 19 October 2001, trademark application no. 1758614, registered for goods and services in the international classes 4 9, 16, 35, 36, 38, 41, and 42; (referred to as "Complainant's trademark").

Also, the Complainant is the owner of the domain name <boursorama.com>, registered since 1 March 1998.

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

The Complainant was founded in 1995 and 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, online financial information and online banking, Complainant based its growth on innovation, commitment and transparency. In France, Complainant is the online banking reference with more than 2,000,000 customers. Its website has more than 30 million monthly visits.

The disputed domain name <bourasorama.com> was registered on 6 November 2021 and is held by the Respondent.

The disputed domain name website (i.e. website available under internet address containing the disputed domain name) is currently inactive with restricted access. According to evidence provided by the Complainant, it used to redirect to a website related to energy saving water pumps.

The Complainant seeks transfer of the disputed domain name to Complainant.

PARTIES CONTENTIONS

The Parties' contentions are the following:

COMPLAINANT:

CONFUSING SIMILARITY

The Complainant states that:

- Complainant's rights to Complainant's trademark predates registration of the disputed domain name.
- Disputed domain name incorporates Complainant's trademark with some minor changes such as addition of letter "A" to create a confusingly similar word BOURSORAMA.
- The Complainant refers to previous domain name decisions in this regard.

Thus, according to the Complainant the confusing similarity between Complainant's trademarks and the disputed domain name is clearly established.

NO RIGHTS OR LEGITIMATE INTERESTS

The Complainant states that:

- The Respondent has not been commonly known by the disputed domain name.
- The Complainant has not authorized, permitted or licensed the Respondent to use Complainant's trademarks in any manner. The Respondent has no connection or affiliation with the Complainant whatsoever. On this record, Respondent has not been commonly known by the disputed domain name.
- The disputed domain name has been used (at least for some time) to redirect to a website related to energy saving water pumps. The Respondent used the dispute domain name in a way that fails to confer rights and legitimate interests, as it is used to promote unrelated services.
- On the contrary, the disputed domain name was used for attracting internet users to services provided by the Respondent and this why it is free riding on reputation of the Complainant's trademark and its business.
- The Complainant refers to previous domain name decisions in this regard.

BAD FAITH REGISTRATION AND USE

The Complainant states that:

- Seniority of the Complainant's Trademarks predates the disputed domain name registration.

- The disputed domain name was used for attracting internet users to services provided by the Respondent, which are similar to those provided by Complainant, and therefore it is free riding on reputation of the Complainant's trademark and its business.
- Respondent's registration of the dispute domain name constitutes "typosquatting" when the spelling of an existing trademark has been minimally changed by a mere addition of a letter "A".
- The Complainant refers to previous domain name decisions in this regard.

The Complainant presents the following evidence which has been assessed by the Panel:

- Information about the Complainant and its business, its history and reviews concerning the services provided by the Complainant;
- Excerpt from trademark database;
- Excerpt from WHOIS database regarding disputed domain name;
- Screenshots of relevant websites;

RESPONDENT:

The Respondent has not provided any response to the Complaint.

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

RIGHTS

Since the domain name and the Complainant's trademark are not identical, the key element investigated and considered by the Panel is whether the disputed domain name consisting of a term "BOURASORAMA.COM" is confusingly similar to the Complainant's trademarks.

The disputed domain name and the Complainant's trademark are very similar since they differ only in addition of an extra letter "A".

This cannot prevent the association in the eyes of internet consumers between the disputed domain name and the Complainant's trademarks and thus the likelihood of confusion still exists. A misspelled non-distinctive term "writings" cannot

sufficiently distinguish the disputed domain name from the Complainant's trademark.

For sake of completeness, the Panel asserts that the top-level suffix in the domain name (i.e. the ".com") must be disregarded under the identity and confusing similarity tests, as it is a necessary technical requirement of registration.

Therefore, the Panel has decided that there is identity in this case, it also concludes that the Complainant has satisfied paragraph 4(a)(i) of the Policy.

NO RIGHTS OR LEGITIMATE INTERESTS

The Complainant's assertions that the Respondent is not commonly known by either disputed domain name and is not affiliated with nor authorised by the Complainant are sufficient to constitute a prima facie showing of absence of rights or legitimate interest in the disputed domain name on the part of the Respondent.

Therefore, in the absence of the Respondent's response, the Panel concludes that there is no indication that the domain name was intended to be used in connection with a bona fide offering of goods or services as required by UDRP.

Consequently, the evidentiary burden shifts to the Respondent to show by concrete evidence that it does have rights or legitimate interests in that names. However, the Respondent failed to provide any information and evidence that it has relevant rights or legitimate interests in respect of the disputed domain names (within the meaning of paragraph 4(a) (ii) of Policy).

BAD FAITH

It is clear that by adding an extra letter "A" word element of Complainant's Trademark while all other characters of disputed domain name are identical to the Complainant trademark, it was Respondent's intention to target Internet users who incorrectly type a website address into their web browser, an illicit activity recognised as „typosquatting“. There are several different reasons for typosquatting, as for example:

- to try to sell the disputed domain back to the Complainant;
- to monetize the disputed domain through advertising revenues from direct navigation misspellings of the intended domain;
- to redirect the typo-traffic to Complainant's competitor;
- as a phishing scheme to mimic the Complainant's site, while intercepting passwords or other information which the visitor enters unsuspectingly;
- To install drive-by malware or revenue generating adware onto the visitors' devices;
- To harvest misaddressed e-mail messages mistakenly sent to the typo domain.

All of the activities above are considered as malicious activities.

For the reasons described above, since (i) there is only a remote chance that the Respondent has registered the disputed domain name just by a chance and without having a knowledge about the existence of the Complainant's rights and business (ii) there is no legitimate use of the dispute domain name and (iii) the Respondent is engaged in typosquatting, the Panel contends, on the balance of probabilities, that the disputed domain name has been registered and is being used by the Respondent in bad faith.

Thus, the Panel has taken a view that 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).

FOR ALL THE REASONS STATED ABOVE, THE COMPLAINT IS

Accepted

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

1. BOURASORAMA.COM: Transferred

PANELLISTS

Name JUDr. Jiří Čermák

DATE OF PANEL DECISION 2021-12-10

Publish the Decision