

Decision for dispute CAC-UDRP-104595

Case number	CAC-UDRP-104595
Time of filing	2022-05-20 09:35:47
Domain names	authbousorama.info, clients-bousorama.info, especclients-bousorama.info

Case administrator

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

Complainant

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

Complainant representative

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

Respondent

Name	francois goubert
------	------------------

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 names.

IDENTIFICATION OF RIGHTS

The Complainant, Boursorama S.A., is the proprietor of several trademarks BOURSORAMA, such as inter alia European Union Trademark N° 1758614 registered since October 19, 2001.

The Complainant also owns a number of domain names, which include the same distinctive word element BOURSORAMA, such as the domain names <boursorama.com>, registered since March 1, 1998, and <boursoramabanque.com>, registered since May 26, 2005.

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

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

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

The Complainant considers itself to be a pioneer and leader in its three core businesses, online brokerage, financial

information on the Internet and online banking, BOURSORAMA S.A., which based its growth on innovation, commitment and transparency.

According to the Complainant, in France, BOURSORAMA is the online banking reference with over 3,3 million customers. The portal www.boursorama.com is the most widely used first national financial and economic information site and first French online banking platform.

The disputed domain names were registered on May 12, 2022 and resolve to parking pages.

PARTIES CONTENTIONS

NO ADMINISTRATIVELY COMPLIANT RESPONSE HAS BEEN FILED.

RIGHTS

The Complainant has, to the satisfaction of the Panel, shown the disputed domain names are 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 names (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 names have been registered and are 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

PRINCIPAL REASONS FOR THE DECISION

According to Paragraph 4(a) of the Policy, the Complainant is required to prove each of the following three elements to obtain an order that the disputed domain names should be transferred or cancelled:

- (i) the disputed domain names are 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 names; and
- (iii) the disputed domain names have been registered and are being used in bad faith.

The Panel has examined the evidence available to it and has come to the following conclusion concerning the satisfaction of the three elements of paragraph 4(a) of the Policy in these proceedings:

RIGHTS

The disputed domain names <authboursorama.info>, <clients-boursorama.info> and <especlients-boursorama.info> are confusingly similar to the Complainant's Trademark, company name and domain. This finding is based on the settled practice in evaluating the existence of a likelihood of confusion of:

a) disregarding the top-level suffix in the domain name (i.e. “.info”), and

b) not finding that the addition of a generic words and terms such as “auth” (i.e. “authorisation” in English), “clients” or “espceclients” (for the combination “espace clients”) would be sufficient to distinguish a domain name from a trademark. This also applies to the insertion of hyphens and other separators or the deletion of one single letter within a complex name. These small differences are hardly noticeable and may easily be misread or be the result of typographical errors.

Instead, it has been held that “a domain name that wholly incorporates a Complainant’s registered trademark may be sufficient to establish confusing similarity for purposes of the UDRP” (WIPO Case No. D2003-0888, Dr. Ing. h.c. F. Porsche AG v. Vasilij Terkin).

Concerning the Complainant, this has also been confirmed in decisions such as CAC Case No. 102278, BOURSORAMA v. yvette cristofoli, <boursorama-ecopret.com>; CAC Case No. 101844, BOURSORAMA SA v. likid french, <client-boursorama.net>; or CAC Case No. 101629, BOURSORAMA SA v. MOHAMED le petit, <m-clients-boursorama.com>.

This also applies to domain names where the difference in spelling is so insignificant that it is hardly noticeable and does not change the distinctive character of the mark in question. Most readers would be hard put to quickly spot the difference between “BOURSORAMA” and “BOUSORAMA”. This takes some analysis, especially at the mind reads what it expects to see from previous experience. In this case, that expectation would be to read the well-known word “BOURSORAMA”.

Therefore, the Panel concludes that the Complainant has satisfied the requirement under paragraph 4(a)(i) of the UDRP.

NO RIGHTS OR LEGITIMATE INTERESTS

The onus to make out a prima facie case that the Respondent lacks rights or legitimate interests is placed on the Complainant. However, once such prima facie case is made, the Respondent carries the burden of demonstrating rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain names. If the Respondent fails to do so, the Complainant is deemed to have satisfied paragraph 4(a)(ii) of the UDRP (see e.g. WIPO case no. D2003-0455, Croatia Airlines d.d. v. Modern Empire Internet Ltd.).

The Complainant has put forward that the Respondent is not commonly known by the disputed domain names. Neither is the Respondent in any way related to the Complainant. Nor has the Respondent been granted an authorization or license to use the disputed domain names by the Complainant. This has not been contested by the Respondent. Instead, the Respondent failed to provide any information and evidence whatsoever that could have shown that it has relevant rights or legitimate interests in respect of the disputed domain names (within the meaning of paragraph 4(a) (ii) of the Policy).

Therefore, the Panel concludes that the Respondent did not establish any right or legitimate interest to the disputed domain names (within the meaning of paragraph 4(a)(ii) of the Policy). The Complainant has therefore also satisfied the requirement under paragraph 4(a)(ii) of the Policy.

BAD FAITH

The Panel finds that the Complainant has established that the disputed domain names were registered by the Respondent and are being used by the Respondent in bad faith. For this purpose, the Complainant has successfully put forward prima facie evidence that the Respondent has not made use, or demonstrable preparations to use, of the disputed domain names in connection with a bona fide offering of goods or services, or of making a legitimate non-commercial or fair use of these disputed domain names. The disputed domain names resolve to parking pages with commercial links. The Complainant contends that Respondent did not make any use of this disputed domain names since their registration, and this confirms that the Respondent has no demonstrable plan to use this disputed domain names. It demonstrates a lack of legitimate

interests in respect of the disputed domain names except in order to create a likelihood of confusion with the Complainant and its trademark.

The Respondent is also in no way commonly known under the disputed domain names.

In the absence of a Response and given the reputation of the Complainant and its trademarks, company name and domain name as supported by the Complainant's evidence, the Panel must conclude that the Respondent was fully aware of the Complainant's trademarks, domain and company name "BOURSORAMA" at the time of registering the disputed domain names <authboursorama.info>, <clients-boursorama.info> and <espceclients-boursorama.info >.

As has been held previously in 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>." or in 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."

Therefore, it has been established to the satisfaction of the Panel that the disputed domain names were registered and are being used (at least passively) in bad faith, in order to prevent the Complainant from making proper use of the mark in the disputed domain names.

The Panel concludes that the Respondent has registered and is using the disputed domain names in bad faith (within the meaning of paragraph 4(a)(iii) of the Policy). The Complainant has therefore also satisfied the requirement under 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. AUTHBOUSORAMA.INFO: Transferred
2. CLIENTS-BOUSORAMA.INFO: Transferred
3. ESPCECLIENTS-BOUSORAMA.INFO: Transferred

PANELLISTS

Name	Udo Pflgar, B.A.
------	------------------

DATE OF PANEL DECISION 2022-06-29

Publish the Decision
