# Decision for dispute CAC-UDRP-108428

| | |
|---|---|
| Case number | CAC-UDRP-108428 |
| Time of filing | 2026-02-20 09:54:44 |
| Domain names | saints-gobaing.com |

## Case administrator

| | |
|---|---|
| Name | Olga Slanařová (Case admin) |

## Complainant

| | |
|---|---|
| Organization | COMPAGNIE DE SAINT-GOBAIN |

## Complainant representative

| | |
|---|---|
| Organization | NAMESHIELD S.A.S. |

## Respondent

| | |
|---|---|
| Name | Gudbjorg Fjola Halldorsdottir |

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 trademark registrations for SAINT-GOBAIN including:

- International trademark number 740184, registered on 26 July 2000;
- International trademark number 740183, registered on 26 July 2000;
- International trademark number 596735, registered on 2 November 1992;
- International trademark number 551682, registered on 21 July 1989; and
- US trademark registration number 1648605, registered 25 June 1991.

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

The Complainant is a French company that designs, manufactures and distributes materials and services for the construction and industrial markets. It has a presence in over 80 countries and in 2024 had a turnover of around €46.6 billion and over 161,000 employees.

The Complainant owns several International trademark registrations for SAINT-GOBAIN that predate the registration of the disputed domain name. The Complainant also owns many domain names including its trademark SAINT-GOBAIN, such as the domain name <saint-gobain.com> registered on 29 December 1995. SAINT-GOBAIN is also commonly used to designate the Complainant's

company name.

The disputed domain name was created on 12 February 2026 using a privacy service. It has been registered to the Respondent since at least 19 February 2026. MX servers are configured.

## PARTIES CONTENTIONS

### Complainant

The Complainant contends that the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to its well-known and distinctive trademark SAINT-GOBAIN. It states that the obvious misspelling of the Complainant's trademark by adding the letters "S" and "G" is characteristic of typo squatting, which is intended to create confusing similarity between the Complainant's trademark and the disputed domain name. See WIPO Case No. D2020-3457, ArcelorMittal (Société Anonyme) v. Name Redacted <arcelormltal.com>.

The Complainant submits that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name and states:

i. that the Respondent is not identified in the Whois as the disputed domain name nor commonly known by that name;
ii. the Respondent is not related in any way with the Complainant and the Complainant does not carry out any activity for, nor has any business with the Respondent;
iii. the Respondent is not licensed or authorised by the Complainant to use the Complainant's trademark or apply for registration of the disputed domain name;
iv. the disputed domain name is a typo squatted version of the trademark SAINT-GOBAIN; and
v. the disputed domain name randomly resolves to unrelated websites that fail to confer rights and legitimate interests.

The Complainant also asserts that the disputed domain name was registered and is being used in bad faith and states that:

i. the Complainant used its trademark worldwide well before the Respondent registered the disputed domain name;
ii. the Complainant has a long-standing worldwide website under the <saint-gobain.com> domain name;
iii. the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to the Complainant's trademark and asserts that the misspelling of its trademark was intentionally designed to be confusingly similar to the Complainant's mark;
iv. the disputed domain name randomly redirects to unrelated websites offering media services similar to those provided by the Complainant; and
v. the disputed domain name has been set up with MX records which suggests that it may be actively used for email purposes.

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

### 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

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 and the Complainant's trademark is the addition of the letter "s" at the end of the first word of the Complainant's mark and the letter "g" at the end of the second.

The Complainant's trademark is clearly recognisable in the disputed domain name. The obvious misspelling indicates an intention by the Respondent to confuse internet users seeking the Complainant. 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 long standing rights in the trademark Saint Gobain and has established a prima facie case that the Respondent lacks rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name. The burden of proof now shifts to the Respondent to show that he has relevant rights. See WIPO Case No. D2003-0455, Croatia Airlines d .d. v. Modern Empire Internet Ltd.

The Respondent has not filed a Response, nor challenged any of the Complainant's assertions, nor provided any evidence of legitimate interests of his own. There is no evidence to suggest that the Respondent is commonly known as the disputed domain name. The Respondent is not licensed or authorised by the Complainant to use the Complainant's trademark and has no business with the Complainant. There is no evidence that the disputed domain name was being used for a bona fide offering of goods or services or for a legitimate noncommercial or fair use.

Taking these factors into consideration, 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 30 years. The Respondent has used a privacy service and the misspelling of the Complainant's trademark indicates that the Respondent knew of the Complainant and its trademark when he registered the disputed domain name. The disputed domain name appears intentionally designed to confuse internet users who are seeking the Complainant.

The Panel notes that 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 email 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. **saints-gobaing.com**: Transferred

## PANELLISTS

| | |
|---|---|
| Name | **Veronica Bailey** |

DATE OF PANEL DECISION 2026-03-24

Publish the Decision