Decision for dispute CAC-UDRP-108368

Case number	CAC-UDRP-108368
Time of filing	2026-02-03 10:16:36
Domain names	boursobank-antifraude.com

Case administrator

Name	Olga Slanařová (Case admin)

Complainant

Organization	BOURSORAMA

Complainant representative

Organization	NAMESHIELD S.A.S.

Respondent

Name	mario balloteli

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 BOURSOBANK (device mark) n°1757984 registered since August 28, 2023.

The Complainant also owns a number of domain names, including its mark BOURSOBANK such as the domain name <boursobank.com>, registered since November 23, 2005.

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

The Complainant with eight million customers in France operates a portal at www.boursorama.com, the first national financial and economic information site and first French online banking platform.

The disputed domain name <boursobank-antifraude.com> was registered on January 21st, 2026 and resolved to a website displaying the Complainant's mark in its logo form as a masthead.

PARTIES CONTENTIONS

Complainant

The Complainant's contentions can be summarised as follows

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

The disputed domain name is confusingly similar to the Complainant's trademark BOURSOBANK and its associated domain names. Indeed, the trademark BOURSOBANK is entirely contained within it.

The addition of the generic term “ANTIFRAUDE” (meaning “ANTI-FRAUD” in French) is not sufficient to escape the finding that the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to the trademark BOURSOBANK. It does not change the overall impression of the designation as being connected to the Complainant’s trademark. It is well-established that a domain name that wholly incorporates a Complainant’s registered trademark may be sufficient to establish confusing similarity for purposes of the UDRP.

The addition of the suffix “.COM” does not change the overall impression of the designation as being connected to the trademark BOURSOBANK. It does not prevent the likelihood of confusion between the disputed domain name and the Complainant, its trademark and its associated domain names.

Thus, the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to the Complainant's trademark.

B. The Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the domain name

The Complainant is required to make out a prima facie case that the Respondent lacks rights or legitimate interests. Once such a prima facie case is made, the Respondent carries the burden of demonstrating rights or legitimate interests in the domain name. If the Respondent fails to do so, the Complainant is deemed to have satisfied paragraph 4(a) (ii) of the UDRP.

Past panels have held that a Respondent was not commonly known by a disputed domain name if the Whois information was not similar to the disputed domain name. Thus, the Respondent is not known as the owner of the disputed domain name.

The Respondent is not known by the Complainant. Respondent is not affiliated with or authorized by the Complainant in any way. The Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of 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 or apply for registration of the disputed domain name.

Finally, the disputed domain name resolved to a page displaying the Complainant’s mark in its logo form as a masthead. This page may be used for the purpose of collecting personal information from the Complainant's customers. This use cannot be considered a bona fide offer of services or a legitimate use of domain names, since the website misleads consumers into believing that they are accessing the Complainant's website.

Accordingly, the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name.

C. The domain name was registered and is being used in bad faith

The Complainant and its trademark BOURSOBANK have a significant reputation in France and abroad in connection with online financial services.

The disputed domain name resolves to a website displaying the Complainant’s mark in its logo form as a masthead.

The Respondent has registered the domain name with full knowledge of the Complainant's trademarks.

Therefore, by using the disputed domain name, the Respondent has intentionally attempted to attract, for commercial purposes, internet users to his website, by creating a likelihood of confusion with the Complainant's trademark as to the source, sponsorship, affiliation or endorsement of the Respondent's website. In addition, the Respondent may collect personal information through this website, including passwords.

Using a confusingly similar domain name to impersonate the Complainant to create confusion as to the source or affiliation of competing content in order to conduct a phishing campaign is evidence of bad faith under the Policy.

On this basis, the Complainant concludes that the Respondent has registered and is using the disputed domain name in bad faith.

Respondent

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

The disputed domain name is confusingly similar to the Complainant's prior trade mark merely adding the generic term "antifraude", a hyphen and the gTLD ".com" none of which prevents said confusing similarity.

The Respondent is not commonly known by the disputed domain name or authorised by the Complainant.

The Respondent has not answered the Complaint or rebutted the prima facie case as evidenced by the Complainant.

The disputed domain name has been used for a site impersonating the Complainant for obvious phishing purposes.

The use of the Complainant's logo shows that the Respondent was aware of the Complainant and its rights, business and services. The Respondent has intentionally attempted to attract, for commercial purposes, internet users to his website, by creating a likelihood of confusion with the Complainant's trademark as to the source, sponsorship, affiliation or endorsement of the Respondent's website, thereby disrupting the Complainant's business.

FOR ALL THE REASONS STATED ABOVE, THE COMPLAINT IS

Accepted

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

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

PANELLISTS

Name	**Dawn Osborne**

DATE OF PANEL DECISION 2026-03-02

Publish the Decision