Decision for dispute CAC-UDRP-107663

Case number	CAC-UDRP-107663
Time of filing	2025-06-17 09:52:26
Domain names	saint-gobina.com

Case administrator

Name	Olga Slanařová (Case admin)

Complainant

Organization	COMPAGNIE DE SAINT-GOBAIN

Complainant representative

Organization	NAMESHIELD S.A.S.

Respondent

Organization	YHF

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 owns several trademark registrations for “SAINT-GOBAIN”, including the EU trademark n° 001552843 “SAINT-GOBAIN” (word), registered since 9 March 2000 for numerous goods and services in classes 1, 2, 3, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 17, 19, 20, 21, 22, 23, 24, 37, 38, 40, and 42.

The Complainant also owns various domain names incorporating the term “saint-gobain”, including the domain name <saint-gobain.com> which was registered on 29 December 1995 and is used for the Complainant’s main corporate website.

The disputed domain name <saint-gobina.com> was registered on 12 June 2025, i.e., the Complainant’s trademark registration cited above predates the registration of the disputed domain name.

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

FACTS ASSERTED BY THE COMPLAINANT AND NOT CONTESTED BY THE RESPONDENT:

The Complainant is a French company specialized in the production, processing and distribution of materials for construction and industrial markets.

The Complainant contends that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the domain names and that he is not related in any way to the Complainant's business. The Respondent is not affiliated with him nor authorized by the Complainant in any way to use the trademark "SAINT-GOBAIN". The Complainant does not carry out any activity for, nor has any business with the Respondent.

The Respondent has used the disputed domain name impersonate an employee of the Complainant's subsidiary Saint-Gobain PAM Canalisation: On 12 June 2025, immediately after the disputed domain name was registered, it was used to send an e-mail in the name of said employee. The e-mail claimed to send a "corrected invoice" from Saint-Gobain PAM Canalisation to one of its customers, asking the customer to transfer the invoice amount to a designated UK bank account. This account was not controlled by the Complainant or its subsidiary, Saint-Gobain PAM Canalisation, but – presumably – by the Respondent.

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

The disputed domain name is confusingly similar to the "SAINT-GOBAIN" trademark. Shifting the letter "a" from its 10th position in "SAINT-GOBAIN" to the 12th position in "saint-gobina" does not render the domain name sufficiently different from the trademark "SAINT-GOBAIN" to escape the finding of similarity. It is actually a typical case of "'typosquatting".

The Panel further finds that the Complainant successfully submitted prima facie evidence that the Respondent has neither made any use of, or demonstrable preparations to use, the disputed domain name in connection with a bona fide offering of goods or services, nor is making a legitimate non-commercial or fair use of the disputed domain name, nor is commonly known under the disputed domain name. This prima facie evidence was not challenged by Respondent.

Registration and use of the disputed domain name for scam e-mail communication, namely for a fraudulent misrepresentation of the Respondent as an employee of the Complainant's subsidiary, is an evident case of registration and use of the domain name in bad faith for the purposes of paragraphs 4(a)(iii) of the Policy (cf. CAC Case No. 100909 - ArcelorMittal S.A. v. Chugh Davinder - <ARCELORMTTAL.COM>).

FOR ALL THE REASONS STATED ABOVE, THE COMPLAINT IS

Accepted

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

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

PANELLISTS

Name	**Dr. Thomas Schafft**

DATE OF PANEL DECISION 2025-07-22

Publish the Decision