Decision for dispute CAC-UDRP-107674

Case number	CAC-UDRP-107674
Time of filing	2025-06-20 10:45:19
Domain names	bollroe.net

Case administrator

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

Complainant

Organization	BOLLORE SE

Complainant representative

Organization	NAMESHIELD S.A.S.

Respondent

Name	stgcompta mark

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 demonstrated ownership of rights in the trademark BOLLORÉ for the purposes of standing to file a UDRP complaint.

The Complainant is the owner of the International trademark registration No. 704697 for BOLLORÉ (semi-figurative mark), registered on December 11, 1998, in classes 16, 17, 34, 35, 36, 38 and 39.

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

The Complainant was founded in 1822 and is one amongst the 500 largest companies in the world, being also listed on the Paris Stock Exchange.

The Complainant is active in the fields of Transportation and Logistics, Communication and Media, Electricity Storage and Solutions. In addition to its activities, the Bolloré Group manages financial assets including plantations and financial investments.

The Complainant has more than 3,204 employees and had a turnover of 3 billion EUR in 2024.

The Complainant operates its main website at the domain name <bollore.com>, registered on July 25, 1997.

The disputed domain name <bollroe.net> was registered on June 16, 2025, and resolves to a parking page with commercial links. The disputed domain name has MX records configured.

PARTIES CONTENTIONS

COMPLAINANT

The Complainant contends that the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to the Complainant's trademark BOLLORÉ, as it includes the trademark in its entirety with the mere inversion of the letters "o" and "r" in the mark, which constitutes an obvious misspelling of the mark and is characteristic of a typosquatting practice.

Moreover, the Complainant contends that the addition of the generic Top Level Domain ("gTLD") ".net" is not sufficient to escape the finding that the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to the Complainant's trademark.

The Complainant also asserts that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the disputed domain name because: i) the Respondent is not commonly known by the disputed domain name; ii) the Respondent is in no way affiliated with, licensed or authorized by the Complainant to use its BOLLORÉ mark or register a domain name using its mark; iii) the Respondent does not carry out any activity for, nor has any business with the Complainant; iv) the disputed domain name is a typosquatted version of the Complainant's mark and v) the disputed domain name currently resolves to a parking page with commercial links, which is not a bona fide offering of goods or services or legitimate non-commercial or fair use.

The Complainant submits that the Respondent registered the disputed domain name in bad faith because, since the Complainant's trademark is distinctive and well-known, the Respondent registered the disputed domain name having knowledge of the Complainant. The Complainant also states that its registration of the disputed domain name consisting of a misspelling of the trademark was intentionally designed due to its confusing similarity with the Complainant's trademark.

As to the use of the disputed domain name, the Complainant states that, since the disputed domain name resolves to a parking page with commercial links, the Respondent has attempted to attract Internet users for commercial gain to its own website for its own commercial gain, by creating a likelihood of confusion with the Complainant's trademark as to the source, affiliation, or endorsement of the Respondent's website.

The Complainant further submits that the Respondent's configuration of MX records in connection with the disputed domain name demonstrates the Respondent's bad faith, since no email sent from e-mail addresses based on the disputed domain name could be used for any good faith purpose.

RESPONDENT

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

1. The Complainant has provided evidence of ownership of a valid trademark registration for BOLLORÉ (semi-figurative mark).

The Panel finds that the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to the Complainant's trademark as it consists of a clear misspelling of the denominative element reproduced in the Complainant's trademark BOLLORÉ, since the two letters "o" and "r" have been inverted and the accent on the last letter "e" has been removed. As stated in a prior decisions rendered under the UDRP, these minor changes and the addition of the gTLD ".net" are not sufficient to prevent a finding of confusing similarity.

2. With reference to the Respondent's rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name, the Panel finds that the Complainant has made a prima facie case and that the Respondent, by not submitting a Response, has failed to provide any element from which a Respondent's right or legitimate interest in the disputed domain name could be inferred.

The Panel notes that, based on the records, the Respondent has been in no way authorized or licensed by the Complainant to use its trademark BOLLORÉ or to register and use the disputed domain name. Moreover, there is no evidence that the Respondent might be commonly known by the disputed domain name or a name corresponding to the disputed domain name.

As highlighted above, the disputed domain name resolves to a parking page with commercial links. The Panel finds that that such use of the disputed domain name does not amount to a bona fide offering of goods or services or a legitimate non-commercial or fair use.

Therefore, the Panel finds that the Complainant has demonstrated that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the disputed domain name according to paragraph 4(a)(i) of the Policy.

3. As to bad faith at the time of the registration, the Panel finds that, in light of the Complainant's prior registration and use of the trademark BOLLORÉ and considering the well-known character of the trademark, the Respondent was or should have been aware of the Complainant's trademark when it registered the disputed domain name in June 2025.

In view of the redirection of the disputed domain name, which consists of a misspelling of the Complainant's trademark, to a parking page with sponsored links, the Panel finds that the Respondent intentionally attempted to attract internet users to its website for commercial gain, by creating a likelihood of confusion with the Complainant's trademark as to the source, sponsorship, affiliation or endorsement of its website according to paragraph 4(b)(iv) of the Policy.

Therefore, the Panel finds that the Complainant has also demonstrated that Respondent registered and is using the disputed domain name in bad faith according to paragraph 4(a)(iii) of the Policy.

FOR ALL THE REASONS STATED ABOVE, THE COMPLAINT IS

Accepted

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

1. **bollroe.net**: Transferred

PANELLISTS

Name	**Luca Barbero**

DATE OF PANEL DECISION 2025-08-01

Publish the Decision