Decision for dispute CAC-UDRP-107248

Case number	CAC-UDRP-107248
Time of filing	2025-01-20 11:15:37
Domain names	bforbanka.com

Case administrator

Name	Olga Slanařová (Case admin)

Complainant

Organization	BFORBANK

Complainant representative

Organization	NAMESHIELD S.A.S.

Respondent

Organization	shira abat

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 relies on EU registered trademark no. 008335598 for the word mark BforBank registered on 8 December 2009 in classes 9, 35, 36 and 38.

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

The Complainant is an online bank launched in October 2009 by Credit Agricole Regional Banks. It has over 230,000 clients and 400 employees. It is the proprietor of the EU registered trademark for BforBank mentioned above and the registrant of the domain name <bforbank.com> which locates its principal website.

The disputed domain name <bforbanka.com> was registered on 13 January 2025 and resolves to a parking page displaying links to commercial websites. MX servers have been configured for the disputed domain name.

PARTIES CONTENTIONS

The Complainant contends 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 Panel finds that the Complainant has registered rights in the mark BforBank. The Panel is also satisfied that the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to this mark, from which it differs only in the added letter "a" and the generic top level domain name suffix.

Accordingly, 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 Panel finds on the undisputed evidence that the Respondent has not used or made demonstrable preparations to use the disputed domain name or any corresponding name for a bona fide offering of goods or services or for any legitimate non-commercial or fair use. The Panel also finds that the Respondent is not commonly known by the disputed domain name or any corresponding name and has not been authorised by the Complainant to use it.

On the basis of the undisputed evidence, 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

On the balance of probabilities, the Panel considers it likely that the links provided on the web page located by the disputed domain name are sponsored and provide revenue to the Respondent. The Panel is also satisfied on the balance of probabilities that the Respondent has intended to attract Internet users to its web page and thereby to derive revenue from the sponsored links through the likelihood of confusion between the disputed domain name and the Complainant's mark.

In accordance with paragraph 4(b)(iv) of the UDRP, this finding constitutes evidence of the registration and use of the disputed domain name in bad faith. There is no evidence displacing this presumption.

Accordingly, 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

The disputed domain name is a typosquatting version of Complainant's primary mark which has been used and registered since 2009. The disputed domain name was registered recently and locates a parking page with apparently sponsored links to commercial sites. The Panel found that the disputed domain name was confusingly similar to the Complainant's mark and had not been used by the Respondent for any bona fide purpose to establish any rights or legitimate interests. The Panel further found that the Respondent used the disputed domain name intentionally to attract Internet users to its web page for commercial gain from the sponsored links. Paragraph 4(b)(iv) of the UDRP applied.

FOR ALL THE REASONS STATED ABOVE, THE COMPLAINT IS

Accepted

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

1. **bforbanka.com**: Transferred

PANELLISTS

Name	**Jonathan Turner**

DATE OF PANEL DECISION 2025-03-03

Publish the Decision