Decision for dispute CAC-UDRP-107671

Case number	CAC-UDRP-107671
Time of filing	2025-06-19 11:18:33
Domain names	bnpparibas.top

Case administrator

Name	Olga Slanařová (Case admin)

Complainant

Organization	BNP PARIBAS

Complainant representative

Organization	NAMESHIELD S.A.S.

Respondent

Name	Lama

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 has proved to own the following trademark rights, inter alia:

- International trademark: “BNP Paribas” No. 728598 dated February 23, 2000, duly renewed, covering services in class 35, 36 and 38, and registered inter alia in France, Australia, Norway, China, Cuba and Russia;
- International trademark: “ BNP Paribas + LOGO” No. 745220 dated September 18 2000, duly renewed, covering goods and services in class 09, 35, 36 and 38, and registered inter alia in France, Japan, Switzerland, Cuba, Czech Republic, Russia and Vietnam;
- International trademark: “BNP Paribas” No. 876031 dated November 25, 2005, covering goods and services in class 09, 35, 36 and 38, registered inter alia in France, South Korea, Singapore and United States.

The Complainants also own the following domain names:

<bnpparibas.com>, registered since September 2, 1999;

<bnpparibas.net>, registered since December 29, 1999;

<bnpparibas.pro>, registered since July 23, 2008.

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

The Complainant, BNP Paribas is a banking group formed in 2000 through the merger of Banque Nationale de Paris (BNP) and Paribas. Present in 64 countries, the group employs around 178,000 people. It operates across three main areas: retail banking, financial services, and corporate and investment banking.

The Respondent registered the disputed domain name <bnpparibas.top> on June 11 ,2025.

The Complainant submitted the following documents to prove the abovementioned facts:

- Annex-1: Information regarding the Complainant
- Annex-2: Complainant's trademark registrations
- Annex-3: Complainant's domain names
- Annex-4: Whois of the disputed domain name
- Annex-5: Website of 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 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

Identity (paragraph 4(a)(i) of the Policy)

The Panel finds that the disputed domain name <bnpparibas.top> is confusingly similar to the Complainant's BNP Paribas trademarks.

Indeed, the Complainant's BNP Paribas trademark is incorporated in the disputed domain name in its entirety.

The addition of the ".top" gTLD does not reduce the likelihood of confusion with the Complainant's BNP Paribas trademarks.

Thus, the Panel finds that the disputed domain name is identical to Complainant's trademarks.

Absence of Rights or Legitimate Interests (paragraph 4(a)(ii) of the Policy)

The Panel finds that the Respondent has not been authorized or granted a license by the Complainant.

Additionally, the Respondent is not commonly known by the disputed domain name. Therefore, the Panel concludes that the Respondent did not intend to use the disputed domain name in connection with any legitimate purpose, nor has the Respondent demonstrated a bona fide offer of services.

The disputed domain name resolves to a website offering training services. Therefore, the Panel finds that the Respondent used the disputed domain name in a way that does not confer rights and legitimate interests, as it is used to promote unrelated services. Besides the BNP Paribas is well-known throughout the world.

Furthermore, the Respondent had the opportunity to provide arguments supporting its rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name. However, by failing to file a response, the Respondent has missed this opportunity, and the Panel is entitled to draw such inferences from the Respondent's failure as it considers appropriate in accordance with Paragraph 14 of the Rules.

Accordingly, the Panel finds that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests with respect to the disputed domain name.

Bad faith (paragraph 4(a)(iii) of the Policy.)

The Panel finds that the Respondent could not have been unaware of the renowned BNP Paribas trademarks, given their extensive and exclusive use by the Complainant. Moreover, the BNP Paribas trademarks are highly distinctive, making it improbable that the Respondent was unaware of their existence.

Besides, the Respondent operates a website under the disputed domain name that resolves to a platform offering unrelated services. The Panel finds that this demonstrates the Respondent's intent to divert Internet users to its own website by exploiting the confusing similarity between the disputed domain name and the Complainant's trademark. By doing so, the Respondent seeks to unfairly benefit from the goodwill associated with the Complainant's mark. Such conduct constitutes registration and use in bad faith under the Policy (See, CAC-UDRP Case N° CAC-UDRP-102921, ARCELORMITTAL v. liu shuai, <mittalferroalloys.com>, February 18, 2020).

To the Panel's opinion, this shows that the disputed domain name was registered and is being used in bad faith.

FOR ALL THE REASONS STATED ABOVE, THE COMPLAINT IS

Accepted

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

1. **bnpparibas.top**: Transferred

PANELLISTS

Name	**Nathalie Dreyfus**

DATE OF PANEL DECISION 2025-07-18

Publish the Decision