Decision for dispute CAC-UDRP-108301

Case number	CAC-UDRP-108301
Time of filing	2026-01-07 10:14:55
Domain names	jcdecuaxs.com

Case administrator

Name	Olga Slanařová (Case admin)

Complainant

Organization	JCDECAUX SE

Complainant representative

Organization	NAMESHIELD S.A.S.

Respondent

Organization	Asamco

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 (the "Domain Name").

IDENTIFICATION OF RIGHTS

The Complainant is the owner of international trade mark registration n° 803987 for "JCDecaux" with a registration date of 27 November 2001 in classes 6, 9, 11, 19, 20, 35, 37, 38, 39, 41, and 42. This international mark is based on an earlier French trade mark and has proceeded to registration to at least some degree in over 10 other jurisdictions.

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

FACTS ASSERTED BY THE COMPLAINANT AND NOT CONTESTED BY THE RESPONDENT

The Complainant is part of a group whose business dates back to 1964, and which describes itself as the "worldwide number one in outdoor advertising". It is currently the only group present in the three principal segments of outdoor advertising market: street furniture, transport advertising and billboard advertising. The group operates more than 1 million advertising panels in airports, rail and metro stations, shopping malls, on billboards and street furniture.

The Complainant's group is listed on the Premier Marché of the Euronext Paris stock exchange and is part of the Euronext 100 index. Employing a total of 12,026 people, it is present in more than 80 different countries and 3,894 cities, and has generated revenues of €3,935.3m in 2024.

The Complainant is the owner of the domain name <jcdecaux.com> registered since 23 June 1997 and which is used for a website that promotes the business of the Complainant's group.

The Domain Name was registered on 23 December 2025 and resolves to a parking page with commercial links. MX servers for the Domain Name have been configured.

PARTIES CONTENTIONS

The Complainant contends that the requirements of the Policy have been met and that the 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 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 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 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 accepts (as the Complainant alleges) that this is a case of deliberate typosquatting. The only sensible reading of the Domain Name is as a misspelling of the Complainant's name and trade mark, with the swapping of the letters "a" and "u" and an additional letter “s”, combined with the ".com" Top Level Domain. The swapping of the letters "a" and "u" and the additional letter "s" are also the only differences between the Domain Name and the domain name used by Complainant for its business.

It follows from this that the Complainant's mark is clearly recognisable in the Domain Name and that the Complainant thereby holds a mark that is "confusingly similar" to the Domain Name as that term is understood under the Policy. In this respect see section 1.7 and 1.9 the WIPO Overview of WIPO Panel Views on Selected UDRP Questions, Third Edition (the “WIPO Overview 3.0”). The Complainant has, therefore, made out the requirements of paragraph 4(a)(i) of the Policy.

Further, typosquatting usually signals an intention on the part of the respondent to confuse users seeking or expecting the complainant (see section 1.9 of the WIPO Overview 3.0). There is no right or legitimate interest in holding a domain name for that purpose and this also usually constitutes evidence that no such right or legitimate interest exists. Also, the registration and holding of a domain name to take advantage of such actual or potential confusion will usually involve bad faith registration and use (see sections 3.1.4 and 3.2.1 of WIPO Overview 3.0) and the Panel holds that this is so in this case.

Further, the Panel is satisfied that the parking page use made of the Domain Name falls within the scope of the example of circumstances evidencing bad faith registration and use set out in paragraph 4(b)(iv) of the Policy.

The Complainant has, therefore, made out the requirements of paragraph 4(a)(ii) and 4(a)(iii) of the Policy.

The Panel also notes the Complainant's contentions about the Domain Name being set up with MX records, but there is no evidence before it that the Domain Name has been used for email. Further, the Panel understands that many registrars configure those records as a matter of course and that this is not necessarily a reliable indicator of a complainant's intentions. However, the Panel does not need to make any findings in this respect for it to come to its decision in this case.

FOR ALL THE REASONS STATED ABOVE, THE COMPLAINT IS

Accepted

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

1. **jcdecuaxs.com**: Transferred

PANELLISTS

Name	**Matthew Harris**

DATE OF PANEL DECISION 2026-01-30

Publish the Decision