Decision for dispute CAC-UDRP-107601

Case number	CAC-UDRP-107601
Time of filing	2025-05-21 13:44:00
Domain names	sain-gobaint.com

Case administrator

Organization	Iveta Špiclová (Czech Arbitration Court) (Case admin)

Complainant

Organization	COMPAGNIE DE SAINT-GOBAIN

Complainant representative

Organization	NAMESHIELD S.A.S.

Respondent

Organization	OPES, Inc.

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 registered trade marks including the following

- International trademark n°740183 for the word mark SAINT-GOBAIN registered on July 26, 2000 for multiple countries and classes;
- International trademark n°596735 for a logo consisting primarily of the words SAINT-GOBAIN registered on November 2, 1992 for multiple countries and classes;
- International trademark n°551682 for the same logo registered on July 21, 1989 for multiple countries and classes.

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

The Complainant operates a major business based in France specialising in the production, processing and distribution of materials for construction and industrial markets. The business has operated for some 350 years and now has a turnover in excess of 46 billion Euros and 161,000 employees.

The Complainant is the proprietor of registered trademarks for words SAINT-GOBAIN and for a logo consisting primarily of these words, as identified above. The Complainant also owns the domain name <saint-gobain.com> which locates its principal website.

The disputed domain name <sain-gobaint.com> was registered on May 17, 2025 and locates a page of sponsored links.

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 SAINT-GOBAIN. The disputed domain name differs from this mark only in that the letter 't' has been moved from the end of the first word to the end of the second word, followed by the generic top level domain name suffix. The Panel regards this as an example of typosquatting and considers that the disputed domain name is confusingly to marks in which the Complainant has rights.

The Complainant has, to the satisfaction of the Panel, shown the disputed domain name is identical or confusingly similar to trademark 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 of the Complainant that the Respondent has not used or made demonstrable preparations to use the disputed domain name in connection with a bona fide offering of goods or services or any legitimate non-commercial or fair use, and that the Respondent is not commonly known by the disputed domain name or any corresponding name and is not authorised by the Complainant to use it.

In all the circumstances, 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 Panel finds that by using the disputed domain name the Respondent has intentionally attempted to attract Internet users of his web page for commercial gain in the form of click-through commissions on sponsored links by creating a likelihood of confusion with the Complainant's mark as to the source of the web page. In accordance with paragraph 4(b)(iv) of the UDRP this constitutes evidence of registration and use of the disputed domain name. There is no contrary evidence rebutting this presumption.

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 confusingly similar to the Complainant's registered marks; it is a clear case of typosquatting. There has been no bona fide use of the disputed domain name and the Respondent is not commonly known by it and not authorised by the Complainant to use it. The disputed domain locates a page of 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. **sain-gobaint.com**: Transferred

PANELLISTS

Name	**Jonathan Turner**

DATE OF PANEL DECISION 2025-06-30

Publish the Decision