Decision for dispute CAC-UDRP-107994

Case number	CAC-UDRP-107994
Time of filing	2025-09-24 09:19:35
Domain names	bouyguestravaux-publics.com

Case administrator

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

Complainant

Organization	BOUYGUES

Complainant representative

Organization	NAMESHIELD S.A.S.

Respondent

Name	Luc James

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 submitted evidence that it is the owner of several trademarks consisting of or including the term “BOUYGUES”, including:

- International trademark BOUYGUES No. 390771, registered on September 1, 1972, for Nice classes 6, 19, 37, and 42;
- French trademark BOUYGUES No. 1197244, registered on March 4, 1982, for Nice classes 6, 16, 19, 28, 35, 37, 40, 41, 42, 43, 44, and 45.

These trademarks are hereafter referred to as the “Trademarks.”

The Complainant also owns, through its subsidiaries, a number of domain names containing the word element “BOUYGUES,” including <bouygues-travaux-publics-region.com>, registered since July 6, 2010.

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

The Complainant, Bouygues, is a major French industrial group founded in 1952 by Francis Bouygues. The Bouygues Group operates in over 80 countries and is active in several sectors including construction, energies and services, media, and telecommunications. Its net profit attributable to the Group in 2023 amounted to approximately 973 million euros.

Its subsidiary Bouygues Construction is a world leader in building, public works, energy, and services, while Bouygues Travaux Publics, one of its subsidiaries, specialises in complex infrastructure projects involving tunnels, bridges, roads, ports, and rail systems.

The Complainant's name BOUYGUES enjoys long-standing and widespread recognition, both in France and internationally, and has been recognized as a well-known mark in previous UDRP decisions (for example, CAC Case No. 103800, Bouygues v. Eric Denis).

The disputed domain name <bouyguestravaux-publics.com> was registered on September 19, 2025. The domain name resolves to a parking page, and MX records are configured for the domain name.

PARTIES CONTENTIONS

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. **Confusing Similarity**

The disputed domain name <bouyguestravaux-publics.com> incorporates in its entirety the Complainant's registered Trademark BOUYGUES, followed by the descriptive French words "travaux publics," which translate to "public works."

The Panel finds that the addition of the descriptive terms "travaux publics" does not prevent a finding of confusing similarity under paragraph 4(a)(i) of the Policy. On the contrary, those terms directly refer to the Complainant's subsidiary Bouygues Travaux Publics, thereby reinforcing the association between the disputed domain name and the Complainant.

As confirmed by established UDRP precedent, the addition of descriptive or generic terms to a trademark in a domain name does not avoid a finding of confusing similarity.

The gTLD ".com" is disregarded when assessing similarity under the first element.

For these reasons, the Panel concludes that the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to a trademark in which the Complainant has rights within the meaning of paragraph 4(a)(i) of the Policy.

2. **Rights or Legitimate Interests**

The Complainant has made a prima facie case that the Respondent lacks rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name.

The Respondent has not filed any administratively compliant response and has therefore failed to rebut the Complainant's prima facie showing.

The Respondent did not provide evidence that it has rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name (the Respondent could, inter alia, have provided evidence of the factors mentioned in paragraph 4(c) of the Policy, but failed to do so.

The Panel finds as follows:

- The Respondent is not commonly known by the disputed domain name or by the term "Bouygues".
- There is no evidence that the Respondent holds any registered or unregistered rights (such as a trademark or trade name) incorporating "Bouygues".
- The Respondent has not been licensed or otherwise authorised by the Complainant to use the BOUYGUES mark or to register the disputed domain name.
- There is no evidence that the Respondent has made demonstrable preparations to use the disputed domain name in connection with a bona fide offering of goods or services.
- The disputed domain name resolves to a parking page, and there is no evidence of any legitimate non-commercial or fair use.

Therefore, on the balance of probabilities and in the absence of any evidence to the contrary, the Panel concludes that the Respondent does not have any rights or legitimate interests in respect of the disputed domain name.

3. **Registration and Use in Bad Faith**

The Panel finds that the disputed domain name was registered and is being used in bad faith, for the following reasons:

- The Complainant's BOUYGUES Trademarks have been registered well before the Respondent's registration of the disputed domain name. The combination of the Complainant's Trademark with the French terms "travaux publics" (public works) directly corresponds to the Complainant's subsidiary Bouygues Travaux Publics. It is therefore inconceivable that the Respondent was unaware of the Complainant's rights when registering and using the disputed domain name.
- The registration of the disputed domain name demonstrates actual knowledge of the Complainant's Trademark and its business. In light of the Respondent's prior knowledge of the Complainant and its Trademarks, it is not necessary for the Panel to make a finding on the notoriety of these Trademarks.
- It is not possible to conceive of any plausible good faith use of the domain name by the Respondent.

In the absence of any evidence to the contrary (or any administratively compliant response) being put forward by the Respondent, the Panel believes from the facts in this case that the Respondent had the Trademarks of the Complainant in mind when registering and using the disputed domain name.

For all the reasons stated above, the Panel concludes that the Complainant did prove that the disputed domain name was registered and is being used in bad faith within the meaning of paragraph 4(1)(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. **bouyguestravaux-publics.com**: Transferred

PANELLISTS

Name	**Bart Van Besien**

DATE OF PANEL DECISION 2025-10-31

Publish the Decision