Decision for dispute CAC-UDRP-108287

Case number	CAC-UDRP-108287
Time of filing	2025-12-29 10:36:04
Domain names	salnt-gobains.com

Case administrator

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

Complainant

Organization	COMPAGNIE DE SAINT-GOBAIN

Complainant representative

Organization	NAMESHIELD S.A.S.

Respondent

Name	Lucas Monique

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 owns multiple trademark registrations for SAINT-GOBAIN, including but not limited to:

1. EUTM 001552843, for the SAINT-GOBAIN word mark, registered on 18 December 2001 in classes 1, 2, 3, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 17, 19, 20, 21, 22, 23, 24, 37, 38, 40, 42;
2. International Registrations for the figurative marks including the word mark No. 551682 (registered 21 July 1989), No. 596735 (registered 2 November 1992), and Nos. 740183 and 740184 (both registered 26 July 2000), all based on French national marks.

The Complainant also owns and uses domain names incorporating its SAINT-GOBAIN mark, including <saint-gobain.com> (registered 29 December 1995).

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

The Complainant is a long-established French industrial group specialized in the production, processing and distribution of materials for construction and industrial markets. The Complainant states that in 2024 it achieved turnover of approximately EUR

46.6 billion and employed about 161,000 people worldwide.

The disputed domain name was registered on 22 December 2025. According to the evidence submitted, it resolved to a parking page displaying commercial links. The evidence also indicates that MX records were configured for the disputed domain name.

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

Under paragraph 4(a) of the Policy, the Complainant must prove each of the following: (i) the disputed domain name is identical or confusingly similar to a trademark or service mark in which the Complainant has rights; (ii) the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the disputed domain name; and (iii) the disputed domain name has been registered and is being used in bad faith.

1. Identical or Confusingly Similar

The Complainant has established rights in the SAINT-GOBAIN trademark through the registrations and use described above. The disputed domain name <salnt-gobains.com> differs from SAINT-GOBAIN only by an obvious typographical substitution (the letter “i” replaced by “l” in “saint”) and by the addition of the letter “s” to “gobain”. Such minor variations are classic indicia of typosquatting and do not prevent a finding of confusing similarity under the Policy. The generic Top-Level Domain “.com” is disregarded for the purpose of this element.

The Panel finds that the Complainant has satisfied paragraph 4(a)(i) of the Policy.

2. Rights or Legitimate Interests

It is well established that once a complainant makes out a prima facie case that a respondent lacks rights or legitimate interests, the burden of production shifts to the respondent to come forward with evidence demonstrating rights or legitimate interests. See, e.g., Croatia Airlines d.d. v. Modern Empire Internet Ltd., WIPO Case No. D2003-0455.

The Complainant states that it has not licensed or otherwise authorized the Respondent to use the SAINT-GOBAIN mark, and there is no evidence of any relationship between the Parties. The Respondent’s name in the available registration data (“Lucas Monique”)

does not correspond to the disputed domain name, and there is no evidence that the Respondent has been commonly known by the disputed domain name within the meaning of paragraph 4(c)(ii) of the Policy.

The evidence indicates that the disputed domain name resolved to a parking page displaying PPC links. These are all construction related. Panels have repeatedly found that using a domain name confusingly similar to a complainant's mark to host PPC links does not constitute a bona fide offering of goods or services or a legitimate noncommercial or fair use under paragraph 4(c) of the Policy, particularly where the domain name itself is a typosquatted version of the complainant's mark.

In the absence of any Response, the Panel finds that the Respondent has not rebutted the Complainant's prima facie case. Accordingly, the Expert finds that the Complainant has satisfied paragraph 4(a)(ii) of the Policy.

3. Registered and Used in Bad Faith

The SAINT-GOBAIN mark is distinctive mark with a reputation from its long use in trade. The composition of the disputed domain name—an obvious misspelling of SAINT-GOBAIN—supports an inference that the Respondent registered the disputed domain name with the Complainant and its mark in mind. Typosquatting is widely recognized by UDRP panels as evidence of bad faith registration and use.

The use of the disputed domain name for a PPC parking page in the same field as the business of the Complainant further supports bad faith under paragraph 4(b)(iv) of the Policy, as it indicates an attempt to attract Internet users for commercial gain by creating a likelihood of confusion with the Complainant's mark. This is paradigm free-riding.

The evidence also shows that MX records were configured for the disputed domain name. While the mere configuration of MX records does not, by itself, prove e-mail misuse, in the context of a typosquatted domain name targeting a well-known corporate mark, it compounds the risk of impersonation, phishing, or other fraudulent e-mail activity. Panels have treated such circumstances as supporting bad faith, especially where no plausible good-faith use for e-mail is apparent.

Taking all of the circumstances together—including the typosquatting nature of the disputed domain name, the PPC parking use, the configuration of MX records, and the Respondent's failure to participate in the proceeding—the Panel finds that the disputed domain name was registered and is being used in bad faith within the meaning of paragraph 4(a)(iii) of the Policy.

Decision

For the foregoing reasons, the Panel finds that the Complainant has satisfied each of the three elements required under paragraph 4(a) of the Policy.

The Panel orders that the disputed domain name <salnt-gobains.com> be TRANSFERRED to the Complainant.

FOR ALL THE REASONS STATED ABOVE, THE COMPLAINT IS

Accepted

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

1. **salnt-gobains.com**: Transferred

PANELLISTS

Name	**Victoria McEvedy**

DATE OF PANEL DECISION 2026-02-09

Publish the Decision