Decision for dispute CAC-UDRP-108322

Case number	CAC-UDRP-108322
Time of filing	2026-01-15 09:51:41
Domain names	boursobank-immo.com

Case administrator

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

Complainant

Organization	BOURSORAMA

Complainant representative

Organization	NAMESHIELD S.A.S.

Respondent

Name	La blonde Rose

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 international trademark BOURSOBANK, Reg. No. 1757984, registered on August 28, 2023, for inter alia “Financial affairs; monetary affairs; real estate affairs; financial information services including on the Internet”, in Class 36.

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

The Complainant, Boursorama, operating under the name BOURSOBANK, is a leader in three core businesses: online brokerage, financial information on the Internet and online banking. Its portal “www.boursorama.com” is the first national financial and economic information site and the first French online banking platform. The Complainant registered the domain name <boursobank.com> on November 23, 2005.

The disputed domain name <boursobank-immo.com> was registered on January 8, 2026. It resolves to a parking page. MX servers are configured.

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

Paragraph 15(a) of the Rules instructs this Panel to "decide a complaint on the basis of the statements and documents submitted in accordance with the Policy, these Rules and any rules and principles of law that it deems applicable."

Paragraph 4(a) of the Policy requires that the Complainant must prove each of the following three elements to obtain an order that a domain name should be cancelled or transferred:

(1) the disputed domain name registered by the Respondent is identical or confusingly similar to a trademark or service mark in which the Complainant has rights; and

(2) the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the disputed domain name; and

(3) the disputed domain name has been registered and is being used in bad faith.

In view of the Respondent's failure to submit a response, the Panel shall decide this administrative proceeding on the basis of the Complainant's undisputed representations pursuant to paragraphs 5(f), 14(a) and 15(a) of the Rules and draw such inferences as it considers appropriate pursuant to paragraph 14(b) of the Rules. The Panel is entitled to accept all reasonable allegations set forth in a complaint; however, the Panel may deny relief where a complaint contains mere conclusory or unsubstantiated arguments.
See WIPO Jurisprudential Overview 3.0 at paragraph 4.3; see also eGalaxy Multimedia Inc. v. ON HOLD By Owner Ready To Expire, FA 157287 (Forum June 26, 2003) (“Because Complainant did not produce clear evidence to support its subjective allegations [. . .] the Panel finds it appropriate to dismiss the Complaint”).

As to the first element, the Complainant has shown that it has rights in the BOURSOBANK mark and that the mark is very well-known. The Panel finds the disputed domain name <boursobank-immo.com> to be confusingly similar to the Complainant’s BOURSOBANK mark because it incorporates the mark in its entirety and merely adds a hyphen and the generic term “immo” (short for “immobilier”, French for “real estate”), which differences do nothing to distinguish the domain name from the mark. The inconsequential top-level domain “.com” may be ignored under this element.

The Complainant has established this element.

As to the second element, paragraph 4(c) of the Policy sets out three illustrative circumstances as examples which, if established by the Respondent, shall demonstrate rights to or legitimate interests in a disputed domain name for the purposes of paragraph 4(a)(ii) of the Policy, i.e.

(i) before any notice to the Respondent of the dispute, the use by the Respondent of, or demonstrable preparations to use, the domain name or a name corresponding to the disputed domain name in connection with a bona fide offering of goods or services; or

(ii) the Respondent (as an individual, business or other organization) has been commonly known by the disputed domain name, even if the Respondent has acquired no trademark or service mark rights; or

(iii) the Respondent is making a legitimate noncommercial or fair use of the disputed domain name, without intent for commercial gain to misleadingly divert customers or to tarnish the trademark or service mark at issue.

The Complainant contends that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the disputed domain name, saying that the Respondent is not known as the disputed domain name; the Complainant does not carry out any activity for, nor has any business with the Respondent; neither licence nor authorization has been granted to the Respondent to make any use of the Complainant's trademark BOURSOBANK nor to apply for registration of the disputed domain name, which resolves to a parking page. The Complainant contends that the Respondent has not made any use of the disputed domain name since its registration, confirming that the Respondent has no demonstrable plan to use it.

The Panel notes that the disputed domain name <boursobank-immo.com> was registered on January 8, 2026, long after the Complainant has shown that its BOURSOBANK trademark had become very well-known. It resolves to a parking page. MX servers are configured. These circumstances, together with the Complainant's assertions, are sufficient to constitute a prima facie showing of absence of rights or legitimate interests in respect of the disputed domain name on the part of the Respondent. The evidentiary burden therefore shifts to the Respondent to show that it does have rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name. See JUUL Labs, Inc. v. Dryx Emerson / KMF Events LTD, FA1906001849706 (Forum July 17, 2019). The Respondent has made no attempt to do so.

The Panel finds that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the disputed domain name.

The Complainant has established this element.

As to the third element, Paragraph 4(b) of the Policy sets out some circumstances which shall be evidence of the registration and use of a domain name in bad faith for purposes of paragraph 4(a)(iii) of the Policy. As noted in the WIPO Overview 3.0, Section 3.1, those circumstances are not exclusive and a complainant may demonstrate bad faith under paragraph 4(a)(iii) by showing that a respondent seeks to take unfair advantage of, abuse, or otherwise engage in behaviour detrimental to the complainant's trademark.

In the absence of any Response, the circumstances set out above in relation to the second element satisfy the Panel that the Respondent was fully aware of the Complainant and its BOURSOBANK mark when the Respondent registered the <boursobank-immo.com> domain name and that the Respondent did so in bad faith with intent to take unfair advantage of the Complainant's mark.

Although the <boursobank-immo.com> domain name does not resolve to an active website, as in the leading case of Telstra Corporation Limited v. Nuclear Marshmallows, WIPO Case No. D2000-0003, there is no conceivable active use that could be made of the domain name that would not amount to an infringement of the Complainant's rights in its distinctive and very well-known mark. Accordingly, the Panel finds that the Respondent's hitherto passive use of the domain name demonstrates registration and use in bad faith.

Further, the Panel finds that, by setting up MX records, the Respondent is able to send e-mails falsely purporting to emanate from the Complainant. This also demonstrates registration and use in bad faith.

The Complainant has established this element.

FOR ALL THE REASONS STATED ABOVE, THE COMPLAINT IS

Accepted

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

1. **boursobank-immo.com**: Transferred

PANELLISTS

Name	**Alan Limbury**

DATE OF PANEL DECISION 2026-02-13

Publish the Decision