Decision for dispute CAC-UDRP-108220

Case number	CAC-UDRP-108220
Time of filing	2025-12-10 08:01:07
Domain names	carglasss.com

Case administrator

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

Complainant

Organization	Belron International Limited

Complainant representative

Organization	HSS IPM GmbH

Respondent

Name	syed shoaib Hashmi

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, comprising the word CARGLASS, which trademarks are registered for a wide range of products and services and which offer protection in many territories throughout the world. The list of trademarks includes for instance:

- the EU trademark CARGLASS, applied for on 30 November 2000 and registered under No. 001997097 namely for glass for vehicle windows;

- the Benelux trademark CARGLASS, applied for on 25 May 1989 and registered under No. 461610 namely for glass for vehicle windows.

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

The Complainant, part of the Belron Group, is a global leader in vehicle glass repair and replacement services, operating under the CARGLASS brand across multiple jurisdictions.

The Belron Group has a presence in approximately forty countries across six continents and counted around 30,000 employees in 2024.

The Complainant is the owner of numerous domain names comprising the trademark CARGLASS, such as <carglass.com>, registered on 25 September 1998, and <carglass.ch>, registered on 3 May 1999.

The disputed domain name <carglasss.com> was registered on 9 June 2025 by the Respondent.

PARTIES CONTENTIONS

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

The disputed domain name incorporates the Complainant's well-known and long-established trademark CARGLASS, with the only difference being the addition of an extra letter "s". The Complainant's CARGLASS trademark is the main and clearly recognizable element of the disputed domain name. The insertion of an additional "s" does not create any meaningful distinction and is insufficient to avoid a finding of confusing similarity between the disputed domain name and Complainant's trademarks. The Complainant refers to past panels that held that slight spelling variations do not prevent a domain name from being confusingly similar to the Complainant's trademark (see WIPO case No. D2021-1806, Comair Limited v. Domain Administrator, Super Privacy Service LTD c/o Dynadot / song lan: "This Panel considers that the addition of the letter "A" to the Complainant's KULULA trademark in the disputed domain name is irrelevant in assessing the confusing similarity between the Complainant's trademark and the disputed domain name. In addition, the Panel agrees with the Complainant's view that this is a case of typo-squatting.").

These findings are not being disputed by the Respondent and the Panel concludes that the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to the Complainant's trademark.

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

The Complainant states that the Respondent is not authorized in any way to make any use of the Complainant's trademark, including in the disputed domain name. In addition, there is no evidence that the Respondent is known by the disputed domain name or owns any corresponding registered trademarks.

The Complainant demonstrates that the disputed domain name resolves to a website presenting itself as being associated with the Complainant—employing the CARGLASS mark, automotive imagery, and an official-looking copyright notice—together with a contact form collecting personal data, which the Complainant characterizes as passing off and potentially phishing. Such use does not constitute a bona fide offering of goods or services or a legitimate non-commercial or fair use.

The Panel finds that the Complainant has shown that the Respondent has not made legitimate use of the disputed domain name for a bona fide offering of goods or services. In lack of any Response from the Respondent, or any other information indicating the contrary, the Panel concludes that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the domain name.

The disputed domain name is registered and is being used in bad faith

The Complainant asserts that that the term “carglass” is highly specific and has no dictionary meaning in the English language. The Complainant further states that its CARGLASS trademarks significantly predate the registration of the disputed domain name. It is therefore inconceivable that the Respondent was unaware of the existence of the Complainant’s trademarks when it registered the disputed domain name. By conducting a simple online search regarding the disputed domain name on popular search engines, the Respondent would have inevitably learnt about the Complainant, its trademarks and its business.

Further, the Respondent’s use of the website to mimic the Complainant—displaying the CARGLASS mark (correctly spelled), automotive imagery associated with windshield services, a misleading copyright notice, and a contact form—demonstrates an intentional attempt to attract users for commercial gain by creating a likelihood of confusion as to source, sponsorship, affiliation, or endorsement. Past Panels have found that impersonation of a trademark owner, particularly when combined with data collection, strongly supports a finding of bad faith and may indicate phishing or fraudulent intent (see WIPO Case No. D2022-0336 Fenix International Limited v. Roman: “4) The disputed domain name directs to a website purporting to offer access to Complainant services in what appears to be a phishing attempt to collect users email addresses; (...). The Panel finds that registration and use of the disputed domain name were in bad faith.”).

In light of the above and given the lack of response by the Respondent, the Panel finds that the disputed domain name was registered and is being 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. **carglasss.com**: Transferred

PANELLISTS

Name	**Tom Heremans**

DATE OF PANEL DECISION 2026-01-20

Publish the Decision