Decision for dispute CAC-UDRP-108138

Case number	CAC-UDRP-108138
Time of filing	2025-11-07 10:08:00
Domain names	saint-gobain.one

Case administrator

Name	Olga Slanařová (Case admin)

Complainant

Organization	COMPAGNIE DE SAINT-GOBAIN

Complainant representative

Organization	NAMESHIELD S.A.S.

Respondent

Organization	Nacht ltd

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 several trademarks SAINT-GOBAIN, registered worldwide, one of them, international trademark SAINT-GOBAIN (Reg. No. 551682), registered on July 21, 1989.

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

The Complainant, COMPAGNIE DE SAINT-GOBAIN, is a French company specialized in the production, processing and distribution of materials for the construction and industrial markets. Saint-Gobain has been operating for more than 350 years and is globally known for its important inventions of products that improve the quality of life. It is one of the top industrial groups in the world with around 46.6 billion euros in turnover in 2024 and 161,000 employees.

The Complainant also owns multiple domain names consisting in the wording “SAINT-GOBAIN”, such as the domain name <saint-gobain.com> registered on December 29, 1995.

The disputed domain name <saint-gobain.one> was registered on November 4, 2025, and resolves to a parking page with commercial links. MX servers are configured as well.

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 Panel agrees with the Complainant that the disputed domain name <saint-gobain.one> is identical to the Complainant's trademark SAINT-GOBAIN. Considering the renown of the Complainant and its trademark, it becomes evident that the addition of the generic TLD <.one> does not impact this conclusion: “the applicable Top Level Domain (“TDL”) in a domain name (e.g., “.com”, “.club”, “.nyc”) is viewed as a standard registration requirement and as such is disregarded under the first element confusion similarity test” (see WIPO Overview 3.0, §1.11.1)

The Panel acknowledges that the Complainant presented prima facie evidence that the Respondent is not sponsored by or affiliated with Complainant in any way. Furthermore, Complainant has not licensed, authorized, or permitted Respondent to use Complainant’s trademark in any manner, including in domain names. The Respondent's name does not resemble the disputed domain name in any manner. Respondent’s use of the disputed domain name does not constitute a bona fide offering of goods or services or a legitimate non-commercial or fair use (Policy Para. 4(c)).

As no administratively compliant response has been provided to the Panel and the prima facie evidence was not challenged by the Respondent, the Panel concludes that the Respondent, when he (she) registered the disputed domain name, meant nothing else except the Complainant's trademark SAINT-GOBAIN (see WIPO Overview 3.0, para. 3.1.1). Previous UDRP panels have consistently found that the mere registration of a domain name that is identical or confusingly similar (particularly domain names comprising typos) to a famous or widely-known trademark by an unaffiliated entity can by itself create a presumption of bad faith. Accordingly, the Panel finds that the disputed domain name was registered in bad faith.

The disputed domain name resolves to a parking page with commercial links. Having regard to the notoriety of the Complainant’s trademark and the failure of the Respondent to submit a response, it is evident that the Respondent has attempted to attract Internet users for commercial gain to his own website thanks to the Complainant’s trademark for its own commercial gain, which is evidence of bad faith. Therefore, the Panel concludes that the disputed domain name is being used in bad faith (section 3.3 of WIPO Overview 3.0).

Moreover, MX servers were configured, which suggests that the disputed domain name may be actively used for e-mail purposes (see WIPO Overview 3.0, para. 3.4). This is indicative of bad faith use because any e-mail emanating from the disputed domain name could not be used for any good faith purpose (CAC Case No. 102827, JCDECAUX SA v. Handi Hariyono).

On these bases, the Panel concludes that the Respondent has both registered and used the disputed domain name in bad faith.

FOR ALL THE REASONS STATED ABOVE, THE COMPLAINT IS

Accepted

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

1. **saint-gobain.one**: Transferred

PANELLISTS

Name	**Darius Sauliūnas**

DATE OF PANEL DECISION 2025-12-07

Publish the Decision