Decision for dispute CAC-UDRP-108436

Case number	CAC-UDRP-108436
Time of filing	2026-02-24 14:52:53
Domain names	client-boursobank-login.com

Case administrator

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

Complainant

Organization	BOURSORAMA

Complainant representative

Organization	NAMESHIELD S.A.S.

Respondent

Organization	Netlify Inc

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 proved to be the owner of:

International reg. no. 1757984 for BOURSOBANK (device) since August 28, 2023;

the domain name <boursobank.com>, registered since November 23, 2005.

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

I - The Complainant

The Complainant, BOURSORAMA S.A., is active in online brokerage, financial information on the Internet and online banking.

According to the Complainant's submissions, BOURSORAMA is the online banking reference with over 8 million customers in France. The portal www.boursorama.com is the first national financial and economic information site and first French online banking platform.

II-The Disputed Domain Name

The disputed domain name <client-boursobank-login.com> was registered on February 20, 2026 and resolves to a blank page.

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

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

The Panel agrees that <client-boursobank-login.com> is confusingly similar to the BOURSOBANK trademark owned by the Complainant. As a matter of fact, the disputed domain name entirely contains the Complainant's trademark.

Moreover, the addition of generic terms such as "client" or "login" does not affect the confusing similarity assessment as these terms could be easily associated to the Complainant's business.

Last the disputed domain name's extensions ".com" has only a technical function and consequently it should be disregarded for the purpose of assessing the first element of the Policy.

B. Rights and legitimate interests.

Under paragraph 4(a)(ii) of the Policy, a complainant has the burden of establishing that a respondent lacks rights or legitimate interests in respect of a domain name, but this burden is light. It is sufficient in the first instance for Complainant to allege a prima facie case, and if the evidence presented is persuasive or yields a positive inference that Respondent lacks rights or legitimate interests, the burden shifts to Respondent to rebut the allegations.

In this case, the Panels finds that the Complainant’s submitted evidence and allegations, to which the Respondent did not reply, are sufficient to establish a prima facie case of lack of rights and legitimate interests in the disputed domain name.

In particular the Complainant denies that the Respondent has ever been authorized to use the BOURSOBANK trademark as a domain name. Moreover, the WHOIS information excludes that the Respondent could be commonly known with the sign BOURSOBANK.

Moreover, according to the evidence submitted by the Complainant the disputed domain name was never actively used. Therefore,

the domain name <client-boursobank-login.com> has not been used in connection with a bona fide offering of goods and services nor in a legitimate noncommercial or fair manner.

C. Registration and use in bad faith.

As far as registration in bad faith is concerned, the Panel finds particularly relevant the following circumstances:

i) the disputed domain name entirely contains the Complainant trademark "BOURSOBANK" which is also used as a domain name (boursobank.com). The Complainant's trademark and domain name were registered long before the registration of the disputed domain name;

ii) the disputed domain name combines the Complainant's trademark BOURSOBANK with descriptive terms ("client" and "login") which are clear references to the Complainant's field of activity.

These circumstances, in the absence of a reasonable justification by the Respondent, suggest that the Respondent was perfectly aware of the Complainant's trademarks and business at the time of the registration of the disputed domain name.

As regards the use in bad faith, the leading case (Telstra Corporation Limited v. Nuclear Marshmallows Case No. D2000-0003) states that passive holding of a domain name does not prevent a bad faith finding. In order to assess bad faith, all the circumstances of the case must be considered. In this case, the facts suggest that the disputed domain name is also used in bad faith as it entirely contains the BOURSOBANK trademark which is combined with descriptive terms related to the Complainant's business. Therefore, it is hard to see how the disputed domain name could be used in a way that does not infringe the Complainant's trademark rights.

In the Panel's view, the disputed domain name in this case is passively held, but for no conceivably lawful use (see also National Football League v. Thomas Trainer, D2006-1440 (WIPO December 29, 2006) <nflnetwork.com>) holding that "when a registrant, such as respondent here, obtains a domain name that is [confusingly similar] to a famous mark, with no apparent rights or legitimate interests in the name, and then fails to respond to infringement claims and a UDRP Complaint, an inference of bad faith is warranted).

FOR ALL THE REASONS STATED ABOVE, THE COMPLAINT IS

Accepted

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

1. **client-boursobank-login.com**: Transferred

PANELLISTS

Name	**Andrea Mascetti**

DATE OF PANEL DECISION 2026-04-03

Publish the Decision