Decision for dispute CAC-UDRP-108353

Case number	CAC-UDRP-108353
Time of filing	2026-01-22 11:38:29
Domain names	jcdecux.com

Case administrator

Organization	Iveta Špiclová (Czech Arbitration Court) (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 the International trademark registration number 803987 for JCDECAUX, which was registered on 27 November 2001.

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

The Complainant is the leading outdoor advertising market provider. It has been involved in outdoor advertising since 1964, and is present in more than 80 countries. Its three principal business segments are street furniture, transport advertising and billboard advertising.

JCDECAUX owns several trademarks registrations for JCDECAUX. It also owns a large domain names portfolio, including the distinctive word JCDECAUX, such as <jcdecaux.com> registered since 23 June 1997.

The disputed domain name was registered on 19 January 2026 using a privacy service. It links to a parking page. MX servers are configured.

PARTIES CONTENTIONS

The Complainant

The Complainant asserts that the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to its trademark, JCDECAUX. It states the obvious misspelling of the Complainant's trademark by the deletion of the letter "A" is typosquatting, intended to create confusing similarity between the Complainant's trademark and the disputed domain name.

The Complainant also asserts that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the domain name and states that:

i. the Respondent is not identified in the WHOIS database as the disputed domain name;
ii. the Respondent is not affiliated with nor authorised by JCDECAUX in any way, nor related in any way to the Complainant's business;
iii. the Complainant does not carry out any activity for, nor has any business with the Respondent;
iv. the Respondent is not licenced nor authorised to make any use of the Complainant's trademark or to apply for registration of the disputed domain name by the Complainant; and
v. the disputed domain name resolves to a page without any content, which confirms that Respondent has no demonstrable plan to use the disputed domain name.

Next the Complainant contends that the disputed domain name was registered and is being used in bad faith and asserts that:

i. the disputed domain name is identical to the Complainant's trademark JCDECAUX;
ii. given the distinctiveness of the Complainant's trademark and reputation, the Respondent must have registered the disputed domain name with full knowledge of the Complainant's trademark;
iii. the misspelling of the trademark JCDECAUX was intentionally designed to be confusingly similar with the Complainant's trademark;
iv. the disputed domain name resolves to a page without any content. The Complainant contends that the Respondent has not demonstrated any activity in respect of the disputed domain name, and it is not possible to conceive of any plausible actual or contemplated active use of the domain name by the Respondent that would not be illegitimate, such as by being a passing off, an infringement of consumer protection legislation, or an infringement of the Complainant's rights under trademark law; and
v. the disputed domain name has been set up with MX records, which suggests that it may be actively used for e-mail purposes.

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

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

i. 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

Decision

Paragraph 4(a) of the Policy requires the Complainant to prove each of the following three elements:

i. the disputed domain 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 the disputed domain name; and
iii. the disputed domain name has been registered and used in bad faith.

IDENTICAL OR CONFUSINGLY SIMILAR

Ignoring the top-level suffix ".com", the only difference between the disputed domain the Complainant's trademark is the omission of the letter "A".

An obvious misspelling of a trademark is generally considered by panels to be confusingly similar to that mark for purposes of the first element. See WIPO Jurisprudential Overview 3.0 at paragraph 1.9. The Complainant's trademark is recognisable in the disputed domain name and the Panel concludes that the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to the Complainant's trademark and that the requirements of Paragraph 4(a)(i) of the Policy have been met.

NO RIGHTS OR LEGITIMATE INTERESTS

The Complainant has provided evidence to establish a prima facie case that the Respondent lacks rights or legitimate interest in the disputed domain name. The burden of proof now shifts now shifts to the Respondent to show that he has relevant rights.

The Respondent has not filed a Response, nor challenged any of the Complainant's assertions, nor provided and evidence of legitimate interests of his own. The Respondent is not commonly known as the disputed domain name, nor authorised by the Complainant to use its trademark. The disputed domain name resolves to a page without any content and there is no evidence that it was being used for a bona fide offering of goods or services or a legitimate noncommercial or fair use.

Considering these factors, the Panel concludes that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interest in the disputed domain name and that the Complainant has met the requirements of paragraph 4(a)(ii) of the Policy.

REGISTERED AND BEING USED IN BAD FAITH

The Complainant's trademark is distinctive and predates the registration of the disputed domain name by over 20 years. The Respondent has used a privacy service. The misspelling of the Complainant's trademark appears intentionally designed to confuse internet users who are seeking the Complainant. It is inconceivable that the Respondent did not know of the Complainant and its rights when he registered the disputed domain name that is confusingly similar to the Complainant's trademark.

Although there is no active associated website, the disputed domain name has been set up with MX records. There appears to be no good faith use of the disputed domain name as part of an e-mail address.

The Panel concludes that the disputed domain name was both registered and is being used in bad faith and that the requirements of paragraph 4(a)(iii) of the Policy have been met.

FOR ALL THE REASONS STATED ABOVE, THE COMPLAINT IS

Accepted

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

1. **jcdecux.com**: Transferred

PANELLISTS

Name	**Veronica Bailey**

DATE OF PANEL DECISION 2026-03-01

Publish the Decision