

**Decision for dispute CAC-UDRP-104511**

|             |                        |
|-------------|------------------------|
| Case number | <b>CAC-UDRP-104511</b> |
|-------------|------------------------|

|                |                            |
|----------------|----------------------------|
| Time of filing | <b>2022-04-20 09:27:41</b> |
|----------------|----------------------------|

|              |                     |
|--------------|---------------------|
| Domain names | <b>lyxorpro.com</b> |
|--------------|---------------------|

**Case administrator**

|              |  |
|--------------|--|
| Organization | <b>Denisa Bilík (CAC) (Case admin)</b> |
|--------------|--|

**Complainant**

|              |                              |
|--------------|------------------------------|
| Organization | <b>SOCIETE GENERALE S.A.</b> |
|--------------|------------------------------|

**Complainant representative**

|              |                          |
|--------------|--------------------------|
| Organization | <b>NAMESHIELD S.A.S.</b> |
|--------------|--------------------------|

**Respondent**

|              |                                      |
|--------------|--------------------------------------|
| Organization | <b>1337 Services LLC Host Master</b> |
|--------------|--------------------------------------|

## 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 has provided evidence of ownership of the following trademark:

- International trademark LYXOR registered on 19 June 2003 under No. 805274, duly renewed, and covering services in international class 36.

## FACTUAL BACKGROUND

The disputed domain name is confusingly similar to the Complainant's trademark LYXOR, and the addition of the term "pro" in the domain name does not change the overall impression of the designation as being connected to the Complainant's trademark. It is reasonable to infer that the Respondent has registered the domain name with full knowledge of the Complainant's trademark.

The Complainant contends that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the domain name and that he is not related in any way to the Complainant's business. The Complainant contends that the Respondent is not affiliated with him nor authorized by him in any way to use the trademark.

The disputed domain name resolves to a page which content impersonates the Complainant and its business. Previous panels have held that impersonating a complainant in an active webpage is not a bona fide offering of goods or services or a legitimate non-commercial or fair use under the Policy. See *Ripple Labs Inc. v. NGYEN NGOC PHUONG THAO*, FA 1741737.

---

#### 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

Notwithstanding the fact that no Response has been filed, the Panel shall consider the issues present in the case based on the statements and documents submitted by the Complainant.

Paragraph 4(a) of the Policy directs that the Complainant must prove each of the following elements:

- (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 in respect of the disputed domain name; and
- (iii) the disputed domain name was registered and is being used in bad faith.

#### A. Identical or Confusingly Similar

The Complainant must establish that it has a trademark or service mark and that the disputed domain name is identical or confusingly similar to that trademark or service mark to succeed.

The Complainant, Société Générale, is a French multinational banking and financial services company. The Complainant has provided evidence of ownership of an International trademark in the term “LYXOR” for nearly 20 years.

The disputed domain name is <lyxorpro.com>.

As regards the question of identity or confusing similarity for the purpose of the Policy, it requires a comparison of the disputed domain name with the trademarks in which the Complainant holds rights. According to section 1.7 of the WIPO Overview of WIPO Panel Views on Selected UDRP Questions, Third Edition (“WIPO Overview 3.0”), “this test typically involves a side-by-

side comparison of the domain name and the textual components of the relevant trademark to assess whether the mark is recognizable within the disputed domain name”.

Also, according to section 1.7 of the WIPO Overview 3.0, “in cases where a domain name incorporates the entirety of a trademark, or where at least a dominant feature of the relevant mark is recognizable in the domain name, the domain name will normally be considered confusingly similar to that mark for purposes of UDRP standing”.

The disputed domain name wholly incorporates the Complainant’s trademark “LYXOR”, followed by the generic term “pro”. This addition does not prevent a finding of confusing similarity with the Complainant’s trademark. The fact that a domain name wholly incorporates the Complainant’s trademark is sufficient for this Panel to establish identity or confusing similarity for the purpose of the Policy, despite the addition of other words to such marks.

It is well accepted by UDRP panels that a generic Top-Level Domain (“gTLD”), such as “.com”, is typically ignored when assessing whether a domain name is identical or confusingly similar to a trademark.

This Panel concludes that the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to the Complainant’s trademark and therefore finds that the requirement of paragraph 4(a)(i) of the Policy is satisfied.

## B. Rights or Legitimate Interests

Under paragraph 4(c) of the Policy, any of the following circumstances, if found by the Panel, may demonstrate the Respondent’s rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name:

(i) before any notice to it of the dispute, the Respondent’s use of, or demonstrable preparations to use, the disputed domain name or a name corresponding to the disputed domain name in connection with a bona fide offering of goods or services; or

(ii) the Respondent has been commonly known by the disputed domain name, even if it has acquired no trademark or service mark rights; or

(iii) the Respondent is making a legitimate non-commercial or fair use of the disputed domain name, without intent for commercial gain to misleadingly divert consumers or to tarnish the trademark or service mark at issue.

The consensus view of UDRP panels on the burden of proof under paragraph 4(a)(ii) of the Policy is summarized in section 2.1 of the WIPO Overview 3.0, which states: “[...] where a complainant makes out a prima facie case that the respondent lacks rights or legitimate interests, the burden of production on this element shifts to the respondent to come forward with relevant evidence demonstrating rights or legitimate interests in the domain name. If the respondent fails to come forward with such relevant evidence, the complainant is deemed to have satisfied the second element.”

The Panel accepts that, in the absence of rebuttal from the Respondent, is not known by the disputed domain name.

Evidence on the record show that the Complainant has not at any time authorised or licensed the Respondent to use “LYXOR” as a domain name, business or trading name, trade mark or in any other way. In addition, the current use of the disputed domain name does not evidence any bona fide offering of goods or services on the part on the Respondent before the submission of the Complaint, quite to the contrary. The impersonation of the Complainant in the corresponding website cannot be regarded as a bona fide offering of goods or services under the Policy.

The Panel concludes that the Respondent has no right or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name and therefore finds that the requirement of paragraph 4(a)(ii) of the Policy is satisfied.

## C. Registration and Use in Bad faith

For the purpose of Paragraph 4(a) (iii) of the Policy, the following circumstances, in particular but without limitation, if found by

the Panel to be present, shall be evidence of the registration and use of the disputed domain name in bad faith:

- (i) circumstances indicating that the holder has registered or has 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 that Complainant, for valuable consideration in excess of the holders documented out-of-pocket costs directly related to the disputed domain name; or
- (ii) the holder has registered the disputed domain name in order to prevent the owner of the trademark or service mark from reflecting the mark in a corresponding domain name, provided that the holder has engaged in a pattern of such conduct; or
- (iii) the holder has registered the disputed domain name primarily for the purpose of disrupting the business of a competitor; or
- (iv) by using the domain name, the holder has intentionally attempted to attract, for commercial gain, Internet users to the holder's 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 your website or location or of a product or service on the holder's website or location.

The Panel finds the third and fourth elements of Paragraph 4(b) of the Policy applicable in the present case. The evidence on the record shows that the Respondent was certainly aware of the existence of the Complainant and its earlier rights, and that the Respondent, by registering and using the disputed domain name has intentionally attracted internet users by creating a likelihood of confusion with the Complainant's trademark. This is particularly evidenced by the current use of the disputed domain name which impersonates the Complainant and offers similar services.

The Respondent's lack of Response to the Complaint equally corroborates the finding of the Registrant's acting in bad faith.

The Panel concludes that the Respondent has registered and is using the disputed domain name in bad faith, and therefore finds that the requirement of paragraph 4(a)(iii) of the Policy is satisfied.

FOR ALL THE REASONS STATED ABOVE, THE COMPLAINT IS

Accepted

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

- 1. **LYXORPRO.COM**: Transferred

PANELLISTS

|      |              |
|------|--------------|
| Name | Arthur Fouré |
|------|--------------|

DATE OF PANEL DECISION 2022-05-13

Publish the Decision