Decision for dispute CAC-UDRP-107929

Case number	CAC-UDRP-107929
Time of filing	2025-09-09 09:30:51
Domain names	boursobank-assurance.com

Case administrator

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

Complainant

Organization	BOURSORAMA

Complainant representative

Organization	NAMESHIELD S.A.S.

Respondent

Name	johon

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 is the owner of the international trademark BOURSOBANK n°1757984 registered since August 28, 2023. The Complainant also owns the domain name <boursobank.com>, registered since November 23, 2005.

The disputed domain name <boursobank-assurance.com> was registered on September 4, 2025, and resolves to a login page.

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

The Complainant, operating under the name BOURSOBANK, is the online financial institution, pioneer and leader in three core businesses, online brokerage, financial information on the Internet and online banking. In France, BOURSORAMA is the online banking reference with nearly 8 million customers and its portal www.boursorama.com is the first national financial and economic information site and first French online banking platform.

PARTIES CONTENTIONS

The Complainant asserts rights in the international trademark BOURSOBANK (No. 1757984, registered since 28 August 2023) and in the domain name <boursobank.com> (registered since 23 November 2005). The disputed domain name <boursobank-assurance.com> wholly incorporates the Complainant's trademark BOURSOBANK. The addition of the generic term "ASSURANCE" (meaning "INSURANCE") does not prevent a finding of confusing similarity, nor does the ".com" suffix. The Complainant cites established UDRP precedent that a domain name incorporating a complainant's trademark is sufficient to establish confusing similarity (see WIPO Case No. D2003-0888; WIPO Case No. D2006-0451).

The Complainant contends that the Respondent is not identified in the Whois database as the disputed domain name and is not commonly known by it. The Respondent is neither affiliated with nor authorized by the Complainant, and no license or authorization has been granted to use the BOURSOBANK trademark or register the disputed domain name. The disputed domain name resolves to a login page of a third-party company, and is used to promote unrelated services by leveraging the BOURSOBANK name. Such use does not confer rights or legitimate interests and is not a bona fide offering of goods or services.

The Complainant argues that the disputed domain name was registered and is being used in bad faith. The BOURSOBANK trademark enjoys significant reputation in France and abroad in connection with online financial services (see WIPO Case No. D2024-5075). The Respondent registered the disputed domain name with full knowledge of the Complainant's rights. The domain name redirects users to a login page of a third-party company, creating a likelihood of confusion and obtaining commercial gain from such use. This constitutes bad faith registration and use under UDRP Policy 4(b)(iv).

NO ADMINISTRATIVELY COMPLIANT RESPONSE HAS BEEN FILED.

RIGHTS

The Complainant has, to the satisfaction of the Panel, shown the disputed domain name is 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

For the Complainant to succeed it must prove, within the meaning of paragraph 4(a) of the Policy, that:
(i) The domain name is identical or confusingly similar to a trademark or service mark in which the complainant has rights; and
(ii) The respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the domain name; and
(iii) The domain name has been registered and is being used in bad faith.

I. The disputed domain name is identical or confusingly similar to a trademark or service mark in which the Complainant has rights

The Complainant has established the fact that it has valid rights for the international trademark BOURSOBANK n°1757984 registered since August 28, 2023, and that it owns domain name <boursobank.com>, registered since November 23, 2005. The disputed domain name wholly incorporates the Complainant's trademark and is therefore confusingly similar to it.

The generic term "ASSURANCE" in the disputed domain name does not distinguish the disputed domain name from the Complainant's trademark and strengthens the likelihood of confusion between the disputed domain name and Complainant's trademark as the "ASSURANCE" could be considered as the "assurance" of the Complainant's financial products or services. The addition of the generic top level domain ".COM" does not change the overall impression of the designation as being connected to Complainant's trademark.

The Panel therefore considers the disputed domain name to be confusingly similar to the Complainant's trademark which the Complainant has rights in accordance with paragraph 4(a)(i) of the Policy.

II. The Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the disputed domain name

The Complainant has established a prima facie case (not challenged by the Respondent) that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name. The Respondent is not commonly known by the domain name, is not affiliated with the Complainant, and has not been authorized to use the trademark. The use of the domain name to resolve to a third-party login page and promote unrelated services does not constitute a bona fide offering of goods or services.

The Panel therefore considers that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the disputed domain name within the meaning of paragraph 4(a)(ii) of the Policy.

III. The disputed domain name has been registered and is being used in bad faith

Given the distinctiveness of the Complainant's trademark and reputation (as confirmed in several UDRP proceedings in the past) it is evident that the Respondent had the Complainant and its trademark in mind when registering the disputed domain name. Furthermore, the website in connection with the disputed domain name is a login page of unrelated third party and the Respondent, therefore, is using the disputed domain name to attract users for commercial gain by creating a likelihood of confusion.

The Panel therefore considers that 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.

The Panel finally considers that the Complainant has shown that the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to a trademark in which the Complainant has rights, the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the disputed domain name and the disputed domain name has been registered and is being used in bad faith. The Complainant has thus established all three elements of paragraph 4(a) of the Policy.

FOR ALL THE REASONS STATED ABOVE, THE COMPLAINT IS

Accepted

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

1. **boursobank-assurance.com**: Transferred

PANELLISTS

Name	**Petr Hostaš**

DATE OF PANEL DECISION 2025-10-07

Publish the Decision