Decision for dispute CAC-UDRP-107842

Case number	CAC-UDRP-107842
Time of filing	2025-08-11 10:29:52
Domain names	leroymerlinofficial.com

Case administrator

Name	Olga Dvořáková (Case admin)

Complainant

Organization	GROUPE ADEO

Complainant representative

Organization	NAMESHIELD S.A.S.

Respondent

Name	Julien Ivanov

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

1)International trademark LEROY-MERLIN 591251 registered on July 15, 1992, and duly renewed for classes 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 11, 16, 17, 19, 20, 21, 22, 25, 27, 28, 31 and 37;

2) International trademark LEROY MERLIN (dev.); 701781 registered on August 14, 1998, and duly renewed for classes 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 11, 12, 14, 16, 17, 18, 19, 20, 21, 22, 24, 25, 26, 27, 28, 31, 35, 36, 37, 38, 39, 40, 41 and 42;

3) European Union trademark LEROY MERLIN n°10843597 registered on December 7, 2012, and duly renewed for classes 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 11, 12, 14, 16, 17, 18, 19, 20, 21, 22, 24, 25, 26, 27, 28, 31, 35, 36, 37, 40, 41, 42 and 44;

4) European Union trademark LEROY MERLIN (dev.) n°11008281 registered on October 2, 2013, and duly renewed for classes 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 11, 12, 14, 16, 17, 18, 19, 20, 21, 22, 24, 25, 26, 27, 28, 31, 35, 36, 37, 40, 41, 42, 44.",

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

The Complainant (GROUPE ADEO) is a French company specializing in the sale of several goods and articles mainly DIY but generally for homes and gardening, both for individuals and professionals The pioneering company of GROUPE ADEO is LEROY MERLIN, created in 1923. LEROY MERLIN is the leading DIY retailer in the home improvement and living environment market, with

30,000 employees in France. Complainant is the owner of several trademarks LEROY MERLIN is also the owner of numerous domain names comprising the wording LEROY MERLIN

The disputed domain name <leroymerlinofficial.com>; was registered on August 5, 2025

The Complainant states that the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to its trademark LEROY MERLIN. In particular, the addition of the term "official" is not sufficient to avoid the likelihood of confusion and on the contrary, contributes to misleading because it conveys the idea that the domain name refers to a legitimate official site.

The Complainant states that the Respondent is not one of its licensees or affiliated with him nor authorized by it in any way, and even more worrying it is not identified in the Whois database; therefore the Respondent is not known as the disputed domain name. The Complainant cites a very precise previous panel's decisions on this very point.

The Complainant states that the Respondent has no right or legitimate interest in the disputed domain name and it is not related in any way to its business. The Complainant is not linked whatsoever with the Respondent. The Complainant also notes that the domain name leroymerlinofficial.com resolves to an error page and evidence of that was rightly filed in by the Complaint. Therefore, it is reasonable to infer that the Respondent has registered the disputed domain name with the full knowledge of the Complainant's trademarks and above with the intent to distort the Complainant's commercial and business life and to attract Internet users for commercial gain.

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 Complainant successfully proves that the three conditions are met: 1) the disputed domain name is confusingly similar , almost identical, to the trademarks LEROY MERLIN registered by the Complainant; 2) the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests. Infact the domain name leroymerlinofficial.com and the Respondent are not related in any way with the Complainant. The Complainant does not carry out any activity for, nor does any business with the Respondent. Neither license nor authorization has been granted to the Respondent to make any use of the Complainant's trademark LEROY MERLIN, or apply for registration of the disputed domain name by the Complainant.3) The Respondent is in bad faith, in fact, as established by several Decision of this Arbitration Court, the incorporation of a famous mark into a domain name, coupled with an inactive website, may be evidence of bad faith registration and use. Furthermore, the disputed domain name has been set up with MX records which suggests that it may be actively used for email purposes which is a clear evidence that it is inconceivable that the Respondent will be able to make any good faith use of the disputed domain name as part of an e-mail address (CAC Case No. 102827, JCDECAUX SA v. Handi Hariyono).

FOR ALL THE REASONS STATED ABOVE, THE COMPLAINT IS

Accepted

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

1. **leroymerlinofficial.com**: Transferred

PANELLISTS

Name	**Massimo Cimoli**

DATE OF PANEL DECISION 2025-09-08

Publish the Decision