Decision for dispute CAC-UDRP-108318

Case number	CAC-UDRP-108318
Time of filing	2026-01-13 09:40:16
Domain names	profileintakebouygueconstruction.com

Case administrator

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

Complainant

Organization	BOUYGUES

Complainant representative

Organization	NAMESHIELD S.A.S.

Respondent

Name	Jimasa Lmaospa

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 "BOUYGUES CONSTRUCTION" trademarks, including International Trademark Registration No. 732339 for the word mark "BOUYGUES CONSTRUCTION". This mark was registered on April 13, 2000, has been duly renewed, and covers various construction-related services in Class 37.

The disputed domain name was registered on January 9, 2026. The Complainant’s trademark rights therefore significantly predate the registration of the disputed domain name.

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

FACTS ASSERTED BY THE COMPLAINANT AND NOT CONTESTED BY THE RESPONDENT:

Founded by Francis Bouygues in 1952, the Complainant is a diversified group of industrial companies. Its businesses are centered on four sectors of activity: Construction, Energies and services, Media and Telecoms. The Complainant’s group of companies operates in over 80 countries with approximately 35,600 employees. One of its subsidiaries operates under the company name and brand BOUYGUES CONSTRUCTION, see https://www.bouygues-construction.com/.

The disputed domain name resolves to a parking page displaying commercial advertising links. The Complainant contends that the

Respondent is exploiting the Complainant's trademarks to attract Internet users to this website for commercial gain, which constitutes evidence of bad faith.

The Complainant further contends that the Respondent is not identified in the Whois database by a name identical or similar to the disputed domain name. The Complainant asserts that the Respondent therefore has no rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name, noting that the Respondent has no affiliation with, or business relationship to, the Complainant or its subsidiary BOUYGUES CONSTRUCTION. Furthermore, the Complainant has not granted the Respondent any license or other authorization to use the "BOUYGUES CONSTRUCTION" trademark or to register 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

The disputed domain name differs from the Complainant's "BOUYGUES CONSTRUCTION" trademark only by the addition of the descriptive prefix "PROFILE INTAKE" and the omission of the letter "S" from "BOUYGUES". These alterations are insufficient to the overall impression of a connection with the Complainant's trademark. Accordingly, the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to the Complainant's trademark within the meaning of paragraph 4(a)(i) of the Policy.

The Panel also finds that the Complainant successfully submitted prima facie evidence that the Respondent has not used, or made demonstrable preparations to use, the disputed domain names in connection with a bona fide offering of goods or services, nor is the Respondent making a legitimate non-commercial or fair use of the disputed domain names, nor is the Respondent commonly known under the disputed domain name. This prima facie evidence was not challenged by the Respondent. The Respondent's display of sponsored advertising links does not constitute a bona fide offering of goods and services within the meaning of paragraph 4(c)(i) of the Policy.

Given (i) the Respondent's display of sponsored listings under the disputed domain name and (ii) the high degree of similarity between the disputed domain name and the Complainant's distinctive "BOUYGUES CONSTRUCTION" trademark, it is most likely that the Respondent had the Complainant and its trademarks in mind when registering the disputed domain name. In the absence of a Response, the Panel infers that by using the disputed domain names, the Respondent has intentionally attempted to attract, for commercial gain, internet users to his website by creating a likelihood of confusion with the Complainant's marks as to the source, sponsorship, affiliation, or endorsement of this website and the products advertised on it (within the meaning of paragraph 4(b)(iv) of the Policy).

FOR ALL THE REASONS STATED ABOVE, THE COMPLAINT IS

Accepted

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

1. **profileintakebouygueconstruction.com**: Transferred

PANELLISTS

Name	**Dr. Thomas Schafft**

DATE OF PANEL DECISION 2026-02-18

Publish the Decision