Decision for dispute CAC-UDRP-108228

Case number	CAC-UDRP-108228
Time of filing	2025-12-10 09:29:37
Domain names	jcdecaaux.com

Case administrator

Name	Olga Slanařová (Case admin)

Complainant

Organization	JCDECAUX SE

Complainant representative

Organization	NAMESHIELD S.A.S.

Respondent

Organization	CVC Conveyancing

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 has submitted evidence, which the Panel accepts, showing that it is the registered owner of the IR trademark “JCDecaux” (registration n°803987) dated November 27, 2001.

Moreover, the Complainant is also the owner of the domain name bearing the sign “JCDECAUX”, <jcdecaux.com>, since June 23, 1997.

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

The Complainant, JCDECAUX, is a company operating worldwide in outdoor advertising including street furniture, transport advertising and billboard since 1964. It has more than 1,091,811 advertising panels in Airports, Rail and Metro Stations, shopping malls, on Billboards and Street Furniture. Employing a total of 12,026 people, the Complainant is present in more than 80 different countries and 3,894 cities and has generated revenues of €3,935.3m in 2024.

The Complainant holds “JCDECAUX” trademark and also holds the domain name bearing the trademark.

On December 8, 2025, the Respondent registered the disputed domain name <jcdecaaux.com>. The disputed domain name resolves to a parking page.

PARTIES CONTENTIONS

COMPLAINANT:

THE DISPUTED DOMAIN NAME IS IDENTICAL OR CONFUSINGLY SIMILAR

The Complainant contends that the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to the Complainant's trademark "JCDECAUX" as it represents its typo-squatting version, intended to create confusing similarity with the Complainant's trademark. The Complainant refers to previous panel decisions supporting this argument.

NO RIGHTS OR LEGITIMATE INTERESTS IN RESPECT OF THE DISPUTED DOMAIN NAME

The Complainant states that the Respondent has no rights on the disputed domain name and the Respondent is not known as the disputed domain name.

The Complainant also alleges that neither license nor authorization has been granted to the Respondent to use the Complainant's trademark "JCDECAUX".

The Complainant argues that the Respondent is not using the disputed domain name in connection with non-commercial or fair use.

Besides, the Complainant also claims that the disputed domain name is a typosquatted version of the Complainant's trademark JCDECAUX and typosquatting is the practice of registering a domain name in an attempt to take advantage of Internet users' typographical errors and can be evidence that a respondent lacks rights and legitimate interests in the domain name.

Finally, since the disputed domain name points to a parking page, the Complainant argues that the Respondent did not use the disputed domain name, and which it confirms that the Respondent has no demonstrable plan to use the disputed domain name.

Therefore, the Complainant contends that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the disputed domain name.

THE DISPUTED DOMAIN NAME WAS REGISTERED AND IS USED IN BAD FAITH

The Complainant asserts that its trademark JCDECAUX was already known for decades and protected in several countries at the time of the registration and also the Complainant is doing business in more than 80 countries worldwide and is listed at the Euronext Paris stock exchange.

Besides, the Complainant stated that past panels have held that the JCDECAUX trademark is well-known and referred to WIPO Case No. DCC2017-0003 (JCDecuax SA v. Wang Xuesong, Wangxuesong), where the Panel was satisfied that the Respondent must have been aware of the Complainant's well-known JCDecuax trademark when it registered the disputed domain name. The Complainant claims that, given the distinctiveness and reputation of the Complainant's business and trademarks worldwide, the Respondent could not have registered the disputed domain name without actual knowledge of the Complainant and its trademarks.

Moreover, the Complainant states the misspelling of the trademark JCDECAUX was intentionally designed to be confusingly similar to the Complainant's trademark and refers to previous panel decisions finding such actions as evidence of bad faith.

Furthermore, since the disputed domain name points to a parking page, the Complainant contends that the Respondent has not demonstrated any activity in respect of the disputed domain name, and it is not possible to conceive of any plausible actual or contemplated active use of the domain name by the Respondent that would not be illegitimate, such as by being a passing off, an infringement of consumer protection legislation, or an infringement of the Complainant's rights under trademark law.

It was referred to previous panel decisions, where the incorporation of a famous mark into a domain name, coupled with an inactive website, may be evidence of bad faith registration and use.

Finally, the Complainant asserts that the disputed domain name has been set up with MX records, which suggests that it may be actively used for e-mail purposes. This is claimed to be also indicative of bad faith registration and use because any e-mail emanating from the disputed domain name could not be used for any good faith purpose. The Complainant referred to the previous case of CAC Case No. 102827 (JCDECAUX SA v. Handi Hariyono), where it was decided that there was no present use of the disputed domain name but there are several active MX records connected to the disputed domain name and it was 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.

Accordingly, the Complainant alleges that the disputed domain name was registered and is being used in bad faith.

RESPONDENT:

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

Paragraph 15 of the Rules provides that the Panel is to decide the Complaint on the basis of the statements and documents submitted and in accordance with the Policy, the Rules and any rules and principles of law that it deems applicable.

In this context, the Panel also notes that the burden of proof is on the Complainant to make out its case and past UDRP panels have consistently said that a Complainant must show that all three elements of the Policy have been made out before any order to transfer a domain name.

For the Complainant to succeed it must prove, within the meaning of paragraph 4(a) of the Policy, that:

the disputed domain name is identical or confusingly similar to a trademark or service mark in which the Complainant has rights;

the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the disputed domain name; and

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

The Panel will therefore deal with each of these requirements in turn.

IDENTICAL OR CONFUSINGLY SIMILAR

The Policy simply requires the Complainant to demonstrate that the disputed domain name is identical or confusingly similar to a trademark in which the Complainant has rights. The Panel is satisfied that the Complainant is the owner of the registration of the “JCDECAUX” trademark.

The Panel finds that the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to the Complainant’s “JCDECAUX” trademark and the addition of the letter “A” next to the other “A” in the middle part is not sufficient to vanish the similarity, as it is barely even recognizable.

In particular, this case represents a clear example of typo-squatting, where the disputed domain name is one letter more than the Complainant's mark.

Moreover, the addition of the gTLD ".COM" is not enough to abolish the similarity.

The Panel is of the opinion that the Internet users will easily fall into the false impression that the disputed domain name is a domain name of the Complainant. The Panel recognizes the Complainant's rights and concludes that the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to the Complainant's trademark. Therefore, the Panel concludes that the requirements of paragraph 4(a)(i) of the Policy are provided.

NO RIGHTS OR LEGITIMATE INTERESTS

Under paragraph 4(a)(ii) of the Policy, the complainant has the burden of establishing that the respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the domain name.

It is open to a respondent to establish its rights or legitimate interests in a domain name, among other circumstances, by showing any of the following elements:

(i) before any notice to the respondent of the dispute, the use or making demonstrable preparations to use the domain name or a name corresponding to the domain name in connection with a bona fide offering of goods or services; or

(ii) the respondent of the dispute (as an individual, business, or other organization) has been commonly known by the domain name, even if it has acquired no trademark or service mark rights; or

(iii) the respondent of the dispute is making a legitimate non-commercial or fair use of the domain name, without an intent for commercial gain to misleadingly divert consumers or to tarnish the trademark or service mark at issue.

Thus, if the respondent proves any of these elements or indeed anything else that shows that it has a right or legitimate interest in the domain name, the complainant will have failed to discharge its burden of proof and the complaint will fail. The burden is on the complainant to demonstrate a prima facie case that the respondent does not have rights or legitimate interests in the domain name. Once the complainant has made out a prima facie case, then the respondent may, inter alia, by showing one of the above circumstances, demonstrate rights or legitimate interests in the domain name.

The Complainant contends that the Respondent has nothing to do with the Complainant and any use of the trademarks "JCDECAUX" has to be authorized by the Complainant and there is no such authorization. Moreover, the disputed domain name has no relation to the Respondent and the Respondent is not commonly known as the disputed domain name.

In the absence of a response, the Panel accepts the Complainant's allegations as true that the Respondent has no authorization to use the Complainant's trademarks in the disputed domain name.

Hence, as the Complainant has made out its prima facie case, and as the Respondent has not demonstrated any rights or legitimate interests as illustrated under paragraph 4(c) of the Policy, nor has the Panel found any other basis for finding any rights or legitimate interests of the Respondent in the disputed domain name, the Panel concludes that the Complainant has satisfied the requirements of paragraph 4(a)(ii) of the Policy.

BAD FAITH

The Panel concludes that the Complainant's "JCDECAUX" trademark is of distinctive character. Therefore, the Panel is of the opinion that due to the earlier rights of the Complainant in the "JCDECAUX" trademark, the Respondent, was aware of the Complainant and its trademark at the time of registration of the disputed domain name (see e.g., Ebay Inc. v. Wangming, WIPO Case No. D2006-1107). Referring to Parfums Christian Dior v. Javier Garcia Quintas and Christiandior.net, WIPO Case No. D2000-0226, the Panel believes that the awareness of the Complainant's trademark at the time of the registration of the disputed domain name is to be considered an inference of bad faith registration.

Moreover, the disputed domain name <jcdecaaux.com> is currently inactive and resolves to a parking page. Regarding inactive domain names, section 3.3 of the WIPO Overview 3.0 provides the following: "From the inception of the UDRP, panelists have found that the non-use of a domain name (including a blank or 'coming soon' page) would not prevent a finding of bad faith under the doctrine of passive holding." Besides, although there is no present use of the disputed domain name, the fact that there is an MX record connected to the disputed domain name suggests that the Respondent will not be able to make any good faith use of the disputed domain name as part of an e-mail address.

The Respondent did not provide any evidence of any possible good faith use of the disputed domain name.

Therefore, in light of the above-mentioned circumstances in the present case, the Panel finds that the disputed domain name has been registered and is being used in bad faith and that the Complainant has established the third element under 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. **jcdecaaux.com**: Transferred

PANELLISTS

Name	**Mrs Selma Ünlü**

DATE OF PANEL DECISION 2026-01-13

Publish the Decision