Decision for dispute CAC-UDRP-108334

Case number	CAC-UDRP-108334
Time of filing	2026-01-19 09:46:00
Domain names	jcdacauxs.com

Case administrator

Name	Olga Slanařová (Case admin)

Complainant

Organization	JCDECAUX SE

Complainant representative

Organization	NAMESHIELD S.A.S.

Respondent

Organization	Disnay

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 several trademarks on JCDECAUX. As such, the International trademark for JCDECAUX with registration number 803987, registered on November 27, 2001.

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

The Complainant is a French company specializing in outdoor advertising. With approximately 12,026 employees is present in more than 80 different countries and 3,894 cities and has generated revenues of €3,935.3m in 2024.

The JCDECAUX trademark is to be considered well-known for UDRP purposes.

The disputed domain name <jcdacauxs.com> was registered on January 14, 2026 and resolves to an error page.

PARTIES CONTENTIONS

THE COMPLAINANT

The Complainant contends that the requirements of the Policy have been met and that the disputed domain name should be transferred to it.

In particular, the Complainant contends that the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to its JCDECAUX trademark. The obvious misspelling of Complainant's trademark (i.e. the substitution of the letter "e" by the letter "a" and the addition of the letter "s") is a typosquatting practice intended to create confusing similarity between Complainant's trademark and the disputed domain name.

The Complainant also asserts that the Respondent is not identified in the WHOIS database as the disputed domain name and thus is not commonly known by the disputed domain name. The Respondent has not been authorized or licensed to use its marks or, to apply for a domain name using them. Further, by registering a domain name under a typosquatting practice the Respondent attempted to take advantage of Complainant´s trademark rights.

The Respondent must have had full knowledge of the Complainant's well-known JCDECAUX trademark when it registered the disputed domain name.

Furthermore, since the disputed domain name resolves to an error page, the Respondent is not using the disputed domain name which confirms that he has no demonstrable plan to use the disputed domain name and is evidence of registration and use in bad faith.

And finally, the Complainant alleges that the disputed domain has been set up with MX records which suggests that it may be actively used for email purposes. Indeed, these records are indicative of bad faith registration and use because any email from the disputed domain name cannot be for a good purpose.

THE 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

1. Identical or Confusingly Similar

The Complainant has shown rights in respect of the JCDECAUX trademark for the purposes of the Policy. It is apparent that the mark JCDECAUX is reproduced in the disputed domain name <jcdacauxs.com>. From a comparison between the disputed domain name and the Complainant´s trademark it seems clear that the former contains sufficiently recognizable aspects of the relevant mark. The Respondent simply substitute the letter "e" for "a" and added the letter "s" to the Complainant´s trademark. That is to say, the Respondent seemingly typosquatted the Complainant´s JCDECAUX trademark in the disputed domain name.

The applicable Top Level Domain ('TLD') in a domain name is viewed as a standard registration requirement and as such is

disregarded under the first element test.

The Panel finds the first element of the Policy has been established.

2. Rights or Legitimate Interest

Paragraph 4(c) of the Policy sets out non-exclusive examples in which the Respondent may establish rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name. However, while the burden of proof in UDRP proceedings rests on the complainant, panels have recognized that proving a respondent lacks rights or legitimate interests in a domain name may result in the often-impossible task of "proving a negative". Accordingly, panels have established, since the inception of the UDRP, that it is sufficient to raise a prima facie case against the respondent and then the evidential burden of production shifts to the respondent. See CAC-UDRP-106452

The Panel finds that the circumstances referred in paragraph 4(c) do not apply to the Respondent or, even any other legitimate circumstance that may apply in favour to the Respondent. Indeed, the composition of the disputed domain name suggests impersonation which cannot grant rights or legitimate interests.

The Panel finds the second element of the Policy has been established.

3. Register and Used in Bad Faith

Noting that bad faith under the UDRP is broadly understood to occur where a respondent takes unfair advantage of or otherwise abuses a complainant's mark, the Panel now looks at the third requirement of the test.

As noted, the Respondent misspelled the Complainant´s trademark when registering the disputed domain name. Further, the Complainant´s trademark is to be considered well-known. Under these circumstances, the Panel finds that the Respondent targeted the Complainant and its trademark seemingly for its well-known value. Accordingly, the Panel determines that the Respondent knew or should have known about the Complainant and its trademark when registering the disputed domain name.

Besides, the Panel notes the short period of time between the registration of the disputed domain name and the filing of the Complaint. The Panel also notes that both parties have the right either, to register a domain name or, to submit a complaint based on the UDRP procedure. Likewise, the Panel takes note of the following circumstances of the case file: the well-known value of the Complainant´s trademark, the targeting of the Complainant´s trademark by the Respondent and, the lack of response filed by the Respondent. Accordingly, the Panel accepts that the Complainant has made out a prima facie case for this third requirement and, thus, the evidential burden of production shifts to the Respondent. However, the lack of response prevents the Panel from having in the file a credible explanation for the Respondent's choice of the disputed domain or demonstrable preparations to use in a bona fide manner.

The foregoing allows the Panel to apply the Passive Holding Doctrine and, therefore, the registration and use of the disputed domain name was in bad faith.

Further, the misspelling of the Complainant´s trademark in the disputed domain name strengthens the conclusion of bad faith use and registration pursuant to paragraph 4(a)(iii) of the Policy.

The Panel finds that the Complainant has established the third element of the Policy.

FOR ALL THE REASONS STATED ABOVE, THE COMPLAINT IS

Accepted

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

1. **jcdacauxs.com**: Transferred

PANELLISTS

Name	**Manuel Moreno-Torres**

DATE OF PANEL DECISION 2026-02-11

Publish the Decision