

Decision for dispute CAC-UDRP-105886

Case number **CAC-UDRP-105886**

Time of filing **2023-10-16 10:35:58**

Domain names **amundi-apply.com**

Case administrator

Name **Olga Dvořáková (Case admin)**

Complainant

Organization **AMUNDI ASSET MANAGEMENT**

Complainant representative

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

Respondent

Name **Davey John**

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 bases its Complaint on the International trademark registration "AMUNDI", no. 1024160, registered since 24.09.2009, for services in class 36, designating several countries for protection.

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

The Complainant is an European assets manager, having offices in Europe, Asia-Pacific, the Middle-East and the Americas. With over 100 million retail, institutional and corporate clients, the Complainant ranks in the top 10 globally, as per its assertions.

The Complainant owns the International trademark registration "AMUNDI", no. 1024160, registered since 24.09.2009, for services in class 36, designating several countries for protection and also domain names which include the trademark AMUNDI, such as <amundi.com>, registered since 26.08.2004.

The disputed domain name <amundi-apply.com> was registered on 08.09.2023 and resolves to an index page. In addition, MX servers are configured in relation to the disputed domain name.

PARTIES CONTENTIONS

NO ADMINISTRATIVELY COMPLIANT RESPONSE HAS BEEN FILED.

COMPLAINANT'S CONTENTIONS:

The disputed domain name <amundi-apply.com> is confusingly similar to the Complainant's earlier trademark AMUNDI, that the Respondent lacks rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name for a number of reasons and that the disputed domain name was registered and is being used in bad faith.

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

1. Confusing Similarity

The Panel agrees that the disputed domain name <amundi-apply.com> is confusingly similar to the Complainant's earlier trademark AMUNDI. The disputed domain name incorporates the Complainant's trademark AMUNDI in its entirety followed by a dash and the addition of the term "apply" which is not sufficient to escape the finding that the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to the Complainant's trademark and it does not change the overall impression of the designation as being connected to the trademark AMUNDI.

Moreover, the extension ".com" is not to be taken into consideration when examining the similarity between the Complainant's trademark and the disputed domain name (WIPO Case No. D2005-0016, Accor v. Noldc Inc.). The mere adjunction of a gTLD such as ".com" is irrelevant as it is well established that the generic Top Level Domain is insufficient to avoid a finding of confusing similarity (WIPO Case No. 2013-0820, L'Oréal v Tina Smith, WIPO Case No. D2008-0820 Titoni AG v Runxin Wang and WIPO Case No. D2009-0877, Alstom v. Itete Peru S.A.).

Therefore, the Panel is satisfied that the first condition under the Policy is met.

2. Lack of Respondent's rights or legitimate interests

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 burden of proof shifts to the respondent to come forward with appropriate allegations or evidence demonstrating rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name. If the respondent fails to come forward with such appropriate allegations or evidence, a complainant is generally deemed to have satisfied paragraph 4(a)(ii) of the UDRP.

Based on the available evidence, the Respondent does not appear to be known by the disputed domain name as such is not identified in the WHOIS database as the disputed domain name. The Respondent does not have any kind of relationship with the Complainant. The Complainant has never authorised the Respondent to make use of its trademark, nor of a confusingly similar trademark in the disputed domain name.

The disputed domain resolves to an index page. Such use does not amount to a bona fide offering of goods or services, or to a legitimate noncommercial or fair use of the disputed domain name.

The Panel notes that the Respondent had an opportunity to comment on the Complaint's allegations by filing a Response, which the Respondent failed to do.

Thus, the Panel is satisfied that the Complainant has at least established a *prima facie* case that the Respondent lacks rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name. Accordingly, the Panel takes the view that also the second requirement under the Policy is met.

3. Bad Faith

The Complainant's trademark AMUNDI predates the registration date of the disputed domain name. The Respondent has chosen to register the disputed domain name which incorporates the Complainant's trademark AMUNDI in its entirety followed by a dash and the addition of the term "apply" in order to create a confusion with such trademark. Moreover, considering the evidences available in the file, an internet research revealed that all the results for the denomination "AMUNDI APPLY" are related to the Complainant and its subsidiaries, and notably to the Complainant's pages relating to job offers. Therefore, the Panel concludes that at the time of registration of the disputed domain name, the Respondent was aware of the Complainant's trademark.

In the present case, the following factors should be considered:

- (i) the Complainant's trademark predates the registration date of the disputed domain name;
- (ii) the Respondent failed to submit any response and has not provided any evidence of actual or contemplated good faith use of the disputed domain name;
- (iii) the Respondent registered the disputed domain name which incorporates the Complainant's trademark AMUNDI in its entirety;
- (iv) the Respondent has no business relationship with the Complainant, nor was ever authorised to use a domain name similar to the Complainant's trademark;
- (v) the disputed domain name redirects to an index page, while MX records appear to have been configured which suggests that it may be actively used for email purposes, most probably in order to attract Internet users for the Respondent's commercial gain thanks to the Complainant's trademark. Considering the above, in the Panel's view, it is inconceivable that the Respondent will be able to make any good faith use of the disputed domain name as part of an e-mail address.

In light of the foregoing, the Panel concludes that the Respondent has registered and has been using the disputed domain name in bad faith. Thus, also the third and last condition under 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. **amundi-apply.com**: Transferred

PANELLISTS

Name	Delia-Mihaela Belciu
------	-----------------------------

DATE OF PANEL DECISION	2023-11-22
------------------------	------------

Publish the Decision
