# Decision for dispute CAC-UDRP-108013

| | |
|---|---|
| Case number | CAC-UDRP-108013 |
| Time of filing | 2025-10-02 08:33:15 |
| Domain names | saint-gobaln.net |

## Case administrator

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

## Complainant

| | |
|---|---|
| Organization | COMPAGNIE DE SAINT-GOBAIN |

## Complainant representative

| | |
|---|---|
| Organization | NAMESHIELD S.A.S. |

## Respondent

| | |
|---|---|
| Organization | saint-gobaln |

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

IDENTIFICATION OF RIGHTS

The Complainant is the owner of the following trademarks:

- International trademark SAINT-GOBAIN No. 740184 registered on 26 July 2000;
- International trademark SAINT-GOBAIN No. 740183 registered on 26 July 2000;
- International trademark SAINT-GOBAIN No. 596735 registered on 2 November 1992; and
- International trademark SAINT-GOBAIN No. 551682 registered on 21 July 1989.

("**Complainant's Trademarks**").

The disputed domain name <saint-gobaln.net> was registered on 29 September 2025.

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

As the Respondent did not file any response to the complaint, the Panel took into account the following facts asserted by the

Complainant (and supported by the documentary evidence submitted by the Complainant) and unchallenged by the Respondent:

(a) The Complainant is a French company specialized in the production, processing and distribution of materials for the construction and industrial markets. For 350 years, the Complainant has consistently demonstrated its ability to invent products that improve quality of life. It is now one of the top industrial groups in the world with around 46.6 billion euros in turnover in 2024 and 161,000 employees;

(b) Moreover, the Complainant also owns many domain names including its trademark SAINT-GOBAIN, such as the domain name <saint-gobain.com> registered on 29 December 1995;

(c) The disputed domain name <saint-gobaln.net> was registered on 29 September 2025 and is inactive. Besides, the disputed domain name has been used in a phishing attempt to receive undue payment by impersonating an employee of the Complainant's subsidiary Saint-Gobain Portugal, S.A.

---

PARTIES CONTENTIONS

COMPLAINANT:

In addition to the above factual assertions, the Complainant also contends the following:

(a) The disputed domain name is confusingly similar to Complainant's Trademarks. The slight spelling variation of substituting the "i" with "l" is not sufficient to escape the finding that the domain name is confusingly similar to the trademark and branded goods SAINT-GOBAIN. It is well-established that the slight spelling variations do not prevent a disputed domain name from being confusingly similar to Complainant's Trademarks;

(b) The Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the disputed domain name, and he is not related in any way to the Complainant. The Complainant does not carry out any activity for, nor has any business with the Respondent. Neither license nor authorization has been granted by the Complainant to the Respondent to make any use of the Complainant's Trademarks or apply for registration of the disputed domain name. Besides, the Complainant also claims that the disputed domain name is a typosquatted version of the trademark SAINT-GOBAIN. Typosquatting is the practice of registering a domain name to take advantage of Internet users' typographical errors and which shows that the Respondent lacks rights and legitimate interests in the domain name;

(c) Furthermore, the misspelling of the trademark SAINT-GOBAIN was intentionally created by the Respondent to establish confusing similarity of the disputed domain name to Complainant's Trademarks. The Complainant contends the Respondent has attempted to attract Internet users for commercial gain to his own website which is evidence of bad faith. Moreover, the disputed domain name was used for fraudulent (phishing) activity. Consequently, the disputed domain name has been registered and is being used in bad faith.

RESPONDENT:

The Respondent did not provide any response to the complaint.

---

RIGHTS

The Panel concluded that the disputed domain name is identical or confusingly similar to Complainant's Trademarks within the meaning of paragraph 4(a)(i) of the Uniform Domain Name Dispute Resolution Policy ("**UDRP**" or "**Policy**").

For details, please see "Principal Reasons for the Decision".

---

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).

For details, please see "Principal Reasons for the Decision".

---

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).

For details, please see "Principal Reasons for the Decision".

---

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

PRINCIPAL REASONS FOR THE DECISION

Paragraph 4(a) of the Policy requires that the Complainant proves each of the following three elements to obtain an order that the disputed domain name should be transferred or revoked:

(i) the disputed 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 disputed domain name; and

(iii) the disputed domain name has been registered and is being used in bad faith.

The Panel will proceed to analyse whether the three elements of paragraph 4(a) of the Policy are satisfied in these proceedings.

RIGHTS

The disputed domain name is confusingly similar to Complainant’s Trademarks. It contains the word element of Complainant's Trademarks (SAINT GOBAIN) with slight spelling variation (SAINT-GOBALN). The Panel believes that such slight spelling variation is not sufficient to avoid confusing similarity of the disputed domain name to Complainant’s Trademarks.

For sake of completeness, the Panel asserts that the top-level suffix in the domain name (i.e. the ".net") must be disregarded under the identity / confusing similarity test as it is a necessary technical requirement of registration.

Therefore, the Panel concludes that the Complainant satisfied the requirement under paragraph 4(a)(i) of the Policy.

NO RIGHTS OR LEGITIMATE INTERESTS

The Complainant is required to make out a prima facie case that the Respondent lacks rights or legitimate interests in respect of the disputed domain name. Once such prima facie case is made, the Respondent carries the burden of demonstrating rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name. If the Respondent fails to do so, the Complainant is deemed to have satisfied paragraph 4(a)(ii) of the Policy (for example, WIPO case no. D2003-0455, Croatia Airlines d.d. v. Modern Empire Internet Ltd.).

As asserted by the Complainant (and unchallenged by the Respondent), the Respondent is not commonly known by the disputed domain name. Neither is the Respondent in any way related to the Complainant. The Respondent failed to provide any information and evidence that it has relevant rights or legitimate interests in respect of the disputed domain name (within the meaning of paragraph 4(a) (ii) of the Policy). Moreover, the disputed domain name was used for fraudulent activity (phishing) by the Respondent. Such conduct certainly cannot establish Respondent’s legitimate interest in the disputed domain name.

Therefore, the Panel concludes 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).

BAD FAITH

The Panel believes that this case is a prima facie example of typosquatting (i.e. intentional attempt to attract, for commercial gain, Internet users to the web site by creating a likelihood of confusion with Complainant's Trademarks) which is one of the model situations of bad faith registration / use of a domain name (paragraph 4(b)(iv) of the Policy). As numerous previous decisions have held, typosquatting as such is evidence of bad faith (please see, for example, WIPO Case No. D2011-1079 bwin.party services (Austria) GmbH v. Interagentur AG; WIPO Case No. D2002-0568, Go Daddy Software, Inc. v. Daniel Hadani; WIPO Case No. D2002-0423 Dell Computer Corporation v. Clinical Evaluations, or WIPO Case No. D2001-0970, Briefing.com Inc v. Cost Net Domain

Manager). Moreover, the disputed domain name was used for fraudulent activity (phishing) by the Respondent. This further contributes to the conclusion of apparent bad faith on the side of the Respondent.

As a result, the Panel found that the disputed domain name has been registered and is being used in bad faith by the Respondent (within the meaning of 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. **saint-gobaln.net**: Transferred

## PANELLISTS

| Name | **Michal Matějka** |
|---|---|

DATE OF PANEL DECISION 2025-10-31

Publish the Decision