# Decision for dispute CAC-UDRP-108150

| | |
|---|---|
| Case number | CAC-UDRP-108150 |
| Time of filing | 2025-11-14 10:25:55 |
| Domain names | ca-languedoc.online |

## Case administrator

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

## Complainant

| | |
|---|---|
| Organization | CREDIT AGRICOLE S.A. |

## Complainant representative

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

## Respondent

| | |
|---|---|
| Name | Henock Feu |

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 owns several trademarks for CA (fig.) in several countries among them the International Registration 933604 in classes 9, 16, 35, 36, 38 and 42 registered since March 23, 2007 and in effect.

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

The Complainant is the leader in retail banking in France and one of the largest banks in Europe. First financing the French economy and major European player, Complainant assists its clients' projects in France and around the world, in all areas of banking and trades associated with it: insurance management, asset leasing and factoring, consumer credit, corporate and investment. Complainant’s regional bank is called CREDIT AGRICOLE DU LANGUEDOC.

The disputed domain name was registered on September 26, 2025 and has been set up with MX records necessary for e-mail purposes.

The disputed domain name resolves to a parking page with commercial links to companies active in the financial area.

PARTIES CONTENTIONS

The Complainant contends that it has satisfied each of the elements required under the Policy for a transfer of the disputed domain name.

The Complainant, inter alia, contends, that the domain name contains in its entirety Complainant´s mark CA and the geographical term „Languedoc“ is not sufficient to escape the finding that the disputed domain name is confusingly similar. The Respondent has no legitimate interest in the domain name in question, since he is not known under the name and was never authorised or licensed to use the trademark of the Complainant. The domain name in question has been both acquired and is being used in bad faith as the Complainant was known already at the time of the registration of the disputed domain name.

The Respondent did not reply to the Complainant's contentions.

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

In order to succeed in its claim, the Complainant must demonstrate that all of the elements enumerated in paragraph 4(a) of the Policy have been satisfied:

(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 with respect to the disputed domain name; and

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

**A. Identical or Confusingly Similar**

The Complainant has established the fact that it has valid trademark rights for „CA“ for several countries.

The disputed domain name is confusingly similar to the distinctive CA marks of the Complainant since the addition of the geographical indication „Languedoc“ at the end does not prevent a finding of a sufficient confusing similarity.

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

**B. Rights or Legitimate Interests**

The Respondent has no rights in the disputed domain name since the Respondent was not authorised by the Complainant to use its trademarks. Furthermore, the Respondent has no legitimate interest in the domain name since there is no indication that the Respondent is commonly known by the name “CA” or „CA-languedoc.online“ nor that the Respondent is using the domain name in

connection with a bona fide offering of related goods or services.

The Panel therefore finds that the Respondent does not have rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name.

**C. Registered and Used in Bad Faith**

In view of the size of the Complainant, the full incorporation of the trademark of the complainant as well as the addition of the geographical term “languedoc” being used by the complainant for a regional bank, the Respondent must have been aware of the Complainant and its trademarks when registering the disputed domain name. The Complainant has not authorised the Respondent to make use of a designation which is highly similar to its marks. This Panel does not see any conceivable legitimate use that could be made by the Respondent of this particular disputed domain name without the Complainant’s authorization.

The circumstances of this case, in particular the advertising links to competitors furthermore indicate that the Respondent registered and uses the disputed domain names primarily with the intention of attempting to attract, for commercial gain, Internet users to its potential website or other online locations, by creating a likelihood of confusion with the Complainant’s mark as to the source, sponsorship, affiliation, or endorsement of such website or location, or of a product or service on such website or location. The Panel therefore considers the disputed domain name to have been registered and used in bad faith in accordance with 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. **ca-languedoc.online**: Transferred

## PANELLISTS

| Name | **Dietrich Beier** |
|---|---|

DATE OF PANEL DECISION 2025-12-17

Publish the Decision