Decision for dispute CAC-UDRP-108203

Case number	CAC-UDRP-108203
Time of filing	2025-12-04 09:20:36
Domain names	bouygues-construction-group.com

Case administrator

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

Complainant

Organization	BOUYGUES

Complainant representative

Organization	NAMESHIELD S.A.S.

Respondent

Organization	Domain Administrator

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

BOUYGUES S.A. (the “Complainant”) is the owner of the EU trademark BOUYGUES CONSTRUCTION (Reg. No. 001589159), registered on May 16, 2001, and the international trademark BOUYGUES CONSTRUCTION (Reg. No. 732339), registered on April 13, 2000 (Nice class 37).

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

The Complainant was founded by Francis Bouygues in 1952. Currently, the Complainant is a diversified group of industrial companies, operating in over 80 countries centered on four sectors of activity: construction, energies and services, media and telecoms. Its subsidiary BOUYGUES CONSTRUCTION is a world player in the fields of building, public works, energy and services.
The Complainant owns domain name composed of its trademark, namely <bouygues-construction.com> (registered since May 10, 1999).

Previous UDRP Panels have acknowledged that the trademark BOUYGUES CONSTRUCTION is well-known (e.g. CAC case No. 101387, BOUYGUES v. Laura Clare <bouygeus-construction.com>.

The disputed domain name <bouygues-construction-group.com> was registered on December 1, 2025 and resolves to a parking page with commercial links. Besides, 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 is confusingly similar to the Complainant's trademark BOUYGUES CONSTRUCTION. The Complainant’s trademark is included in its entirety. The addition of the generic term “group” is not sufficient to escape the finding that the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to the trademark. It does not change the overall impression of the designation as being connected to the Complainant’s trademark. On the contrary, the mark composed with the reference to the group of entities may only strengthen the impression that this mark is linked with the Complainant.

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, the Complainant has not licensed, authorized, or permitted Respondent to use Complainant’s trademarks 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.

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 meant Complainant's trademark BOUYGUES CONSTRUCTION when he/she registered the disputed domain name <bouygues-construction-group.com> (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 incorporating the mark plus a descriptive term) 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. This means the Respondent has attempted to attract Internet users to his/her own website by taking advantage of the Complainant’s trademark for commercial gain, which constitutes evidence of bad faith use (see para. 4(b)(iv) of the Policy). Moreover, the disputed domain name has been set up with MX records

which suggests that it may be actively used for email purposes. As it was stated in CAC case No. 102827 (JCDECAUX SA v. Handi Hariyono), "<…> it is inconceivable that the Respondent will be able to make any good faith use of the disputed domain name as part of an e-mail address.").

The Panel is, therefore, convinced that the disputed domain name was used in bad faith.

FOR ALL THE REASONS STATED ABOVE, THE COMPLAINT IS

Accepted

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

1. **bouygues-construction-group.com**: Transferred

PANELLISTS

Name	**Darius Sauliūnas**

DATE OF PANEL DECISION 2026-01-06

Publish the Decision