Decision for dispute CAC-UDRP-108305

Case number	CAC-UDRP-108305
Time of filing	2026-01-08 11:14:59
Domain names	saintgobainabrasives.online

Case administrator

Name	Olga Slanařová (Case admin)

Complainant

Organization	COMPAGNIE DE SAINT-GOBAIN

Complainant representative

Organization	NAMESHIELD S.A.S.

Respondent

Name	Saleem alsamhoore

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 the

- International trademark SAINT-GOBAIN n°740184 registered on July 26, 2000;
- International trademark SAINT-GOBAIN n°740183 registered on July 26, 2000;
- International trademark SAINT-GOBAIN n°596735 registered on November 2, 1992;
- US trademark SAINT-GOBAIN n°1648605 registered on June 25, 1991;
- International trademark SAINT-GOBAIN n°551682 registered on July 21, 1989.

The disputed domain name <saintgobainabrasives.online> was registered on January 4, 2026.

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

The Complainant is a French company operating for more than 350 years in the production, processing, and distribution of materials for the construction and industrial sectors. It is presented as a global leader in sustainable habitat and construction solutions, with a significant international presence, a 2024 turnover of approximately EUR 46.6 billion, and about 161,000 employees.

The Complainant, owner of the “SAINT-GOBAIN” trademarks, alleges that the Respondent registered the disputed domain name <saintgobainabrasives.online> in a manner that is confusingly similar to the Complainant’s marks, without any rights and legitimate

interest and in bad faith. The disputed domain name resolves to a website providing information regarding the company SAINT-GOBAIN ABRASIVES A/S, allegedly a part of the Complainant's group of companies.

PARTIES CONTENTIONS

The Complainant asserts that its trademark SAINT-GOBAIN is widely recognized and that it also uses SAINT-GOBAIN as its company name. The Complainant owns numerous domain names incorporating its SAINT-GOBAIN mark, including <saint-gobain.com> registered in 1995.

According to the Complaint, the Respondent registered the disputed domain name on 4 January 2026. The Respondent is not identified in the WHOIS data under a name corresponding to the disputed domain name and is alleged to have no affiliation with the Complainant. The website to which the disputed domain name resolves presents itself as relating to "SAINT-GOBAIN ABRASIVES A/S," allegedly suggesting an association within the Complainant's corporate group, which the Complainant denies.

The Complainant relies on several SAINT-GOBAIN trademark registrations, including multiple international registrations dating from 1989, 1992, and 2000, as well as a U.S. registration dating from 1991. These trademarks predate the registration of the disputed domain name by several decades. The Complaint asserts that SAINT-GOBAIN is a well-known and distinctive mark worldwide.

The Complainant argues that the disputed domain name wholly incorporates its registered trademark SAINT-GOBAIN and is therefore confusingly similar to it. The addition of the term "abrasives" is said not to dispel the confusion; to the contrary, the Complainant asserts that it exacerbates confusion because abrasives are among the Complainant's product categories, including through its subsidiary Saint-Gobain Abrasive Grains. The Complainant relies on prior decisions stating that incorporating a complainant's entire mark is sufficient to establish confusing similarity (e.g., WIPO Case No. D2003-0888). The Top-Level Domain ".online" is considered irrelevant for the purposes of the first element under established UDRP practice.

The Complainant submits that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name. The Respondent is not commonly known by the name reflected in the disputed domain name, as evidenced by the WHOIS data. The Complainant has not authorised, licensed, or otherwise permitted the Respondent to use the SAINT-GOBAIN trademarks or to register the disputed domain name. The Complainant further argues that the Respondent's use of the disputed domain name to impersonate or falsely affiliate with the Complainant—by hosting a website purporting to represent an entity allegedly within the Complainant's group—constitutes clear evidence of a lack of rights or legitimate interests.

The Complainant argues that the disputed domain name was registered and is being used in bad faith. It states that its SAINT-GOBAIN mark is not only distinctive but well-known worldwide, and the Respondent must have been aware of it at the time of registration given its long-standing use and global recognition. The Complainant claims that the Respondent deliberately created a likelihood of confusion by suggesting affiliation with the Complainant's group, particularly by using the term "abrasives," an area in which the Complainant actively operates.

The Complainant contends that the Respondent's website imitates the Complainant's identity and activities to attract Internet users for commercial gain, falling squarely within the example of bad-faith conduct under paragraph 4(b)(iv) of the Policy. The Respondent's activities are also said to compete directly with the Complainant's operations in the abrasives sector, thereby disrupting the Complainant's business, which has been considered evidence of bad faith in prior UDRP cases.

No administratively compliant Response has been filed.

RIGHTS

The Complainant has, to the satisfaction of the Panel, shown the disputed domain name is 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

For the Complainant to succeed it must prove, within the meaning of paragraph 4(a) of the Policy, that:
(i) The 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 in respect of the domain name; and
(iii) The domain name has been registered and is being used in bad faith.

I. The domain name is identical or confusingly similar to a trademark or service mark in which the Complainant has rights

The Complainant has demonstrated ownership of several SAINT-GOBAIN trademarks, including multiple international registrations dating from 1989, 1992, and 2000, as well as a U.S. registration from 1991. These registrations significantly predate the Respondent's registration of the disputed domain name. The Complainant also uses SAINT-GOBAIN as its company name and holds corresponding domain names.

The disputed domain name wholly incorporates the Complainant's SAINT-GOBAIN mark, with the omission of the hyphen being insufficient to prevent a finding of confusing similarity. The addition of the descriptive term "abrasives" is argued to increase, rather than reduce, the likelihood of confusion, given the Complainant's established activities in the abrasives industry. Under consistent UDRP precedent, the addition of dictionary or descriptive terms does not avoid a finding of confusing similarity. The gTLD ".online" is disregarded for the purposes of the first element.

On the basis of the Complainant's submissions, the Panel considers that the Complainant has made out its case under paragraph 4(a)(i) of the Policy.

II. The respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the domain name

For the Complainant to succeed it must prove, within the meaning of paragraph 4(a) of the Policy, that (ii) the respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the domain name.

The Complainant has established a prima facie case (not challenged by the Respondent who did not file any response to the complaint) that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name.

While failure to respond does not per se demonstrate that the Respondent does not have rights or legitimate interests, it allows the Panel to draw such inferences as it considers appropriate, see paragraph 14(b) of the Rules and CAC-UDRP-101284 or CAC-UDRP-106228 "A respondent is not obliged to participate in a proceeding under the Policy, but if it fails to do so, reasonable inferences may be drawn from the information provided by the complainant".

There is no evidence that the Respondent is related in any way with the Complainant, is a distributor, agent, or business partner of the Complainant, and that the Respondent has been authorized or licensed to use the SAINT-GOBAIN trademark or any domain name incorporating it.

The Complainant provided evidence that the disputed domain name was used to resolve to a website with the information about "SAINT-GOBAIL ABRASIVES A/S" as the Danish company and member of the global Saint-Gobain Group.

Under WIPO Overview 3.0 "panels have categorically held that the use of a domain name for illegal activity (e.g., the sale of counterfeit goods or illegal pharmaceuticals, phishing, distributing malware, unauthorized account access/hacking, impersonation/passing off, or other types of fraud) can never confer rights or legitimate interests on a respondent" (see section 2.13.1). Besides, as reflected in WIPO Overview 3.0 "a respondent's use of a domain name will not be considered "fair" if it falsely suggests affiliation with the trademark owner" (see 2.5), and the Panel finds that this applies to the present dispute since the disputed domain name incorporate the Complainant's trademark and its use impersonates the Complainant or its subsidiaries.

Given the Respondent's failure to respond and the absence of any apparent legitimate use of the disputed domain name, the Panel considers that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the disputed domain name within the meaning of paragraph 4(a)(ii) of the Policy.

III. The domain name has been registered and is being used in bad faith

For the Complainant to succeed it must prove, within the meaning of paragraph 4(a) of the Policy, that (iii) the domain name has been registered and is being used in bad faith.

The Respondent has registered the disputed domain name which consists of the Complainant's trademark SAINT-GOBAIN with the addition of the generic term ABRASIVES whereas the abrasive materials are part of the Complainant's products. Therefore, it is reasonable to infer that the Respondent was aware of the existence and reputation of the Complainant's trademark at the time of registering the disputed domain name.

The disputed domain name was further used to resolve to a website with information about the company declared to be part of the Complainant's group. Such resolving not only supports the finding that the Respondent was aware of the existence of the Complainant's trademark at the time of registering the disputed domain name, but further confirms that the disputed domain name was used to create a likelihood of confusion with the Complainant's mark by impersonating the Complainant.

Such use could, therefore, disrupt the business of the Complainant (paragraph 4(b)(iii) of the Policy) or attract the internet users to the corresponding web page by creating a likelihood of confusion with the Complainant's trademarks (paragraph 4(b)(iv) of the Policy).

The Panel therefore considers that 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.

The Panel finally considers that the Complainant has shown that the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to a trademark 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 Complainant has thus established all three elements of paragraph 4(a) of the Policy.

FOR ALL THE REASONS STATED ABOVE, THE COMPLAINT IS

Accepted

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

1. **saintgobainabrasives.online**: Transferred

PANELLISTS

Name	**Petr Hostaš**

DATE OF PANEL DECISION 2026-02-09

Publish the Decision