

**Decision for dispute CAC-UDRP-105067**

Case number **CAC-UDRP-105067**

Time of filing **2022-12-20 09:42:16**

Domain names **saint-gobain.com**

**Case administrator**

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

**Complainant**

Organization **COMPAGNIE DE SAINT-GOBAIN**

**Complainant representative**

Organization **NAMESHIELD S.A.S.**

**Respondent**

Name **hidorsir King**

**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 the owner of several trademarks SAINT-GOBAIN, registered worldwide, such as:

- International trademark SAINT-GOBAIN n°740184 registered on July 26, 2000;
- International trademark SAINT-GOBAIN n°740183 registered on July 26, 2000;
- International trademark SAINT-GOBAIN n°596735 registered on November 2, 1992;
- International trademark SAINT-GOBAIN n°551682 registered on July 21, 1989.

**FACTUAL BACKGROUND**

The Complainant (website at: [www.saint-gobain.com](http://www.saint-gobain.com)) is a French company specialized in the production, processing and distribution of materials for the construction and industrial markets.

SAINT-GOBAIN is a worldwide reference in sustainable habitat and construction markets. It takes a long-term view in order to develop products and services for its customers that facilitate sustainable construction. In this way, it designs innovative, high-performance solutions that improve habitat and everyday life.

The disputed domain name <saint-gobain.com> was registered on December 8, 2022 and resolves to a parking page with commercial

links.

---

#### PARTIES CONTENTIONS

The Complainant submits that the requirements of the Policy have been met and that the disputed domain name should be transferred to it.

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).

The disputed domain name <saint-g0bain.com> is confusingly similar to its well-known and distinctive trademark SAINT-GOBAIN. Indeed, the substitution of the letter “O” by the number “0” in the trademark SAINT-GOBAIN is not sufficient to escape the finding that the domain name is confusingly similar to the trademark and branded goods SAINT-GOBAIN.

This is a clear case of *typosquatting*, i.e. the disputed domain name contains an obvious misspelling of the Complainant’s trademark. It is well-established that the slight spelling variations does not prevent a disputed domain name from being confusing similar to the Complainant’s trademark.

Please see *WIPO Jurisprudential Overview 3.0, 1.9* (“A domain name which consists of a common, obvious, or intentional misspelling of a trademark is considered by panels to be confusingly similar to the relevant mark for purposes of the first element.”).

Furthermore, the addition of the gTLD “.COM” does not change the overall impression of the designation as being connected to Complainant’s trademark. It does not prevent the likelihood of confusion between the disputed domain name and Complainant, its trademark and its domain names associated.

Please see *WIPO Jurisprudential Overview 3.0, 1.1* (“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.”).

Finally, Panel have held the Complainant rights over the term “SAINT-GOBAIN”. Please see for instance:

- WIPO Case No. D2022-2422, Compagnie de Saint-Gobain v. Contact Privacy Inc. Customer 7151571251 / Finizza, Heidi J., saint gobain <saint-gobaih.com>;
- CAC Case No. 104500, COMPAGNIE DE SAINT-GOBAIN v. jackson Williams <saint-goibain.com>;
- WIPO Case No. D2021-3664, Compagnie de Saint-Gobain v. Contact Privacy Inc. Customer 1249589662 / Latonya Peterson <saint-gobbain.com>.

**Thus, the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to the Complainant’s trademark SAINT-GOBAIN.**

---

#### 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).

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 Respondent is not identified in the Whois 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 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).”).

The Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the disputed domain name and he is not related in any way with the Complainant. The Complainant does not carry out any activity for, nor has any business with the Respondent.

Neither licence nor authorization has been granted to the Respondent to make any use of the Complainant's trademark SAINT-GOBAIN, or apply for registration of the disputed domain name by the Complainant.

Besides, the disputed domain name is a typosquatted version of the trademark SAINT-GOBAIN. *Typosquatting* is the practice of registering a domain name in an attempt to take advantage of Internet users' typographical errors and can be evidence that a respondent lacks rights and legitimate interests in the domain name.

Please see Forum Case No. 1597465, *The Hackett Group, Inc. v. Brian HERN / The Hackett Group* ("The Panel agrees that typosquatting is occurring, and finds this is additional evidence that Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests under Policy 4(a)(ii).").

Furthermore, the disputed domain name resolves to a parking page with commercial links. Past panels have found it is not a bona fide offering of goods or services or legitimate non-commercial or fair use.

Please see for instance:

- Forum Case No. FA 970871, *Vance Int'l, Inc. v. Abend* (concluding that the operation of a pay-per-click website at a confusingly similar domain name does not represent a bona fide offering of goods or services or a legitimate noncommercial or fair use, regardless of whether or not the links resolve to competing or unrelated websites or if the respondent is itself commercially profiting from the click-through fees);
- WIPO Case No. D2007-1695, *Mayflower Transit LLC v. Domains by Proxy Inc./Yariv Moshe* ("*Respondent's use of a domain name confusingly similar to Complainant's trademark for the purpose of offering sponsored links does not of itself qualify as a bona fide use.*").

**Therefore, the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the disputed domain name.**

---

#### 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).

The disputed domain name is confusingly similar to the Complainant's well-known trademark SAINT-GOBAIN. Please see WIPO Case No. D2020-3549, *Compagnie de Saint-Gobain v. On behalf of saint-gobain-recherche.net owner, Whois Privacy Service / Grigore PODAC* ("*The Panel is satisfied that the Complainant is a well-established company which operates since decades worldwide under the trademark SAINT-GOBAIN.*").

Besides, all the results for a Google search of the terms "SAINT-G0BAIN" refers to the Complainant.

In view of the above evidences, the Respondent obviously knew the prior rights and wide use of SAINT-GOBAIN by the Complainant. That is the sole and only reason why he registered the disputed domain name.

Furthermore, the misspelling of the trademark SAINT-GOBAIN was intentionally designed to be confusingly similar with the Complainant's trademark. Previous UDRP panels have seen such actions as evidence of bad faith.

Please see Forum Case No. FA 877979, *Microsoft Corporation v. Domain Registration Philippines* ("In addition, Respondent's misspelling of Complainant's MICROSOFT mark in the <microsof.com> domain name indicates that Respondent is typosquatting, which is a further indication of bad faith registration and use pursuant to Policy 4(a)(iii).").

Furthermore, the disputed domain name resolves to a parking page with commercial links. The Respondent has attempted to attract Internet users for commercial gain to his own website thanks to the Complainant's trademarks for its own commercial gain, which is evidence of bad faith. Please see for instance WIPO Case No. D2018-0497, *StudioCanal v. Registration Private, Domains By Proxy, LLC / Sudjam Admin, Sudjam LLC* ("In that circumstance, whether the commercial gain from misled Internet users is gained by the Respondent or by the Registrar (or by another third party), it remains that the Respondent controls and cannot (absent some special circumstance) disclaim responsibility for, the content appearing on the website to which the disputed domain name resolve [...] so the Panel presumes that the Respondent has allowed the disputed domain name to be used with the intent to attract Internet users for commercial gain, by creating a likelihood of confusion with the Complainant's trademark as to the source, affiliation, or endorsement of the Respondent's website to which the disputed domain name resolves. Accordingly, the Panel finds that the disputed domain name was registered and is being used in bad faith.").

**In light of the above, the Respondent has registered and is using the disputed domain name <saint-g0bain.com> in bad faith.**

---

#### 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

The disputed domain name is confusingly similar to the Complainant's well-known trademark SAINT-GOBAIN. In view of the above evidences, the Respondent obviously knew the prior rights and wide use of SAINT-GOBAIN by the Complainant. That is the sole and only reason why he registered the litigious domain name.

Furthermore, the misspelling of the trademark SAINT-GOBAIN was intentionally designed to be confusingly similar with the Complainant's trademark. Furthermore, the disputed domain name resolves to a parking page with commercial links.

#### FOR ALL THE REASONS STATED ABOVE, THE COMPLAINT IS

Accepted

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

1. **saint-g0bain.com**: Transferred

#### PANELLISTS

Name	<b>Thomas Hoeren</b>
------	----------------------

DATE OF PANEL DECISION	2023-01-20
------------------------	------------

Publish the Decision