Decision for dispute CAC-UDRP-108462

Case number	CAC-UDRP-108462
Time of filing	2026-03-05 09:37:32
Domain names	saint-gobain.ltd

Case administrator

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

Complainant

Organization	COMPAGNIE DE SAINT-GOBAIN

Complainant representative

Organization	NAMESHIELD S.A.S.

Respondent

Name	NEIL HARRISON

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 SAINT-GOBAIN mark, which enjoys thorough protection through many registrations worldwide.

The Complainant is, inter alia, the owner of:

SAINT-GOBAIN (figurative), International Registration No. 740184, registered on July 26, 2000;

SAINT-GOBAIN (figurative), International Registration No. 740183, registered on July 26, 2000;

SAINT-GOBAIN (figurative), International Registration No. 596735, registered on November 2, 1992;

SAINT-GOBAIN (figurative), International Registration No. 551682, registered on July 21, 1989.

In addition, the name “Saint-Gobain” is part of the registered company name of the Complainant, and the domain name <saint-gobain.com>, held by the Complainant since at least December 29, 1995, is used internationally.

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

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

The Complainant is a French company specializing in the production, processing and distribution of materials for the construction and industrial markets.

For more than 360 years, the Complainant has consistently demonstrated its ability to invent products that improve quality of life. The Complainant is one of the top industrial groups in the world with around 46.5 billion euros in turnover in 2025 and more than 161,000 employees.

Past panels have confirmed the notoriety of the SAINT-GOBAIN trademark.

The disputed domain name <saint-gobain.ltd> was registered on February 26, 2026, and currently redirects to the Complainant's website www.saint-gobain.com. However, based on the evidence submitted by the Complainant, it appears that previously (at least on March 4, 2026) the disputed domain name resolved to an error page.

PARTIES CONTENTIONS

COMPLAINANT:

The Complainant contends that:

1. The disputed domain name is confusingly similar to the Complainant's trademarks

The Complainant asserts that the addition of a gTLD such as ".ltd" in a domain name is a technical requirement and thus such element may be disregarded when assessing whether a domain name is identical or confusingly similar to a trademark (see Proactiva Medio Ambiente, S.A. v. Proactiva, WIPO Case No. D2012-0182).

The Complainant concludes that the disputed domain name is identical to its SAINT-GOBAIN trademark.

2. The Respondent does not have any rights or legitimate interest in the disputed domain name

The Complainant contends that the Respondent is not commonly known by the disputed domain name and that the Respondent is not affiliated with or authorized by the Complainant in any way. The Complainant contends that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the disputed domain name, and is not related to the Complainant's business in any way. The Complainant does not carry out any activity for, nor does it have any business dealings with, the Respondent.

3. The disputed domain name has been registered and is being used in bad faith

The Complainant contends that the Respondent could not be unaware of the existence of the SAINT-GOBAIN trademark at the time of the registration of the disputed domain name, not only because SAINT-GOBAIN is a very well-known trademark, but also in consideration of the nature of the domain name, i.e. identical to the Complainant's trademark and trade name.

In addition, the Complainant affirms (quoting previous UDRP decisions) that prior panels have held that the incorporation of a famous trademark into a domain name, coupled with an inactive website, may be evidence of bad faith registration and use.

The Complainant further states 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 passing off, infringement of consumer protection legislation, or infringement of the Complainant's rights under trademark law.

Finally, the Complainant states that a further indicator of bad faith may be inferred by the fact that the Respondent is using a privacy protection service in order to shield its contact information.

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

A) Confusing similarity

The disputed domain name contains and perfectly corresponds to the Complainant's trademark SAINT-GOBAIN with the sole addition of the Top Level Domain ".ltd".

The ".ltd" is a technical element, and as such should be disregarded when assessing whether a domain name is identical or confusingly similar to a trademark.

Consequently, the disputed domain name appears to be identical to and thus confusingly similar with the Complainant's trademark.

B) Lack of legitimate rights or interests

The disputed domain name is a distinctive, non-descriptive name. It is unlikely that the Respondent registered the disputed domain name without having the Complainant firmly in mind. The Complainant's assertions that the Respondent is not commonly known by the disputed domain name and is not affiliated with nor authorized by the Complainant are sufficient to constitute a prima facie demonstration of the absence of rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name on the part of the Respondent. The burden of evidence therefore shifts to the Respondent to show, using tangible evidence, that it does have rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name. The Respondent has made no attempt to do so.

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

C) Registered or Used in Bad Faith

The Complainant gives sound bases for its contention that the disputed domain name was registered and has been used in bad faith.

Firstly, owing to the distinctiveness of the Complainant's trademark and reputation, it is reasonable to infer that the Respondent registered the disputed domain name with full knowledge of the Complainant's trademarks, and so the Panel finds on the balance of probabilities that the Respondent was aware of the Complainant's trademark when registering the disputed domain name.

Secondly, the Panel accepts the Complainant's unchallenged assertion that the Respondent registered the disputed domain name with the aim of creating a likelihood of confusion with the Complainant's trademark.

Thirdly, as underlined by the Complainant, prior UDRP panels have held that the incorporation of a famous trademark into a domain name, coupled with an inactive website, may be evidence of bad faith registration and use.

Fourthly, owing to the circumstances of the present case, the Respondent's use of a privacy shield registration constitutes further inference of bad faith registration.

Finally, the Respondent has not responded to nor denied any of the assertions made by the Complainant in this proceeding.

FOR ALL THE REASONS STATED ABOVE, THE COMPLAINT IS

Accepted

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

1. **saint-gobain.ltd**: Transferred

PANELLISTS

Name	**Fabrizio Bedarida**

DATE OF PANEL DECISION 2026-04-01

Publish the Decision