Decision for dispute CAC-UDRP-108459

Case number	CAC-UDRP-108459
Time of filing	2026-03-03 10:25:43
Domain names	bourso-service-antifraude.com

Case administrator

Name	Olga Slanařová (Case admin)

Complainant

Organization	BOURSORAMA

Complainant representative

Organization	NAMESHIELD S.A.S.

Respondent

Name	Jean Louis

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 various trademark registrations for “BOURSO”, including the following:

- French Trademark for BOURSO, No. 3009973, registered on February 22, 2000; and

- International Trademark for BOURSOBANK, No. 1757984, registered on August 28, 2023.

The Complainant owns and operates a number of domain names incorporating its distinctive mark, including <boursorama.com> (registered since 1998-03-01), <bourso.com> (registered since 2000-01-11), and <boursobank.com> (registered since 2005-11-23).

The disputed domain name <bourso-service-antifraude.com> was registered on February 26, 2026, and at the time of filing the Complaint, resolved to a website copying the Complainant's official customer access page. The website appears designed to collect personal information, including login credentials, of the Complainant's customers.

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

The Complainant, BOURSORAMA, operates in France under the name BOURSOBANK.

It is a pioneer and leader in online brokerage, financial information, and online banking.

In France, BOURSORAMA is the leading online bank with nearly 8 million customers, and the portal www.boursorama.com is the first national financial and economic information site and the first French online banking platform.

PARTIES CONTENTIONS

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. Identical or Confusingly Similar

Paragraph 4(a)(i) of the Policy requires a complainant to show that a domain name is identical or confusingly similar to a trademark or service mark in which the complainant has rights.

The Complainant has provided evidence that it owns registered trademark rights in the BOURSO mark.

In this case, the disputed domain name <bourso-service-antifraude.com> incorporates the Complainant's BOURSO trademark in its entirety. The addition of the generic descriptive terms "service" and "antifraude" (meaning "anti-fraud" in French) and connecting hyphens do not avoid a finding of confusing similarity. It is well established that the addition of generic or descriptive terms to a complainant's mark does not dispel confusing similarity (see WIPO Overview 3.0, section 1.8). The term "antifraude" is suggestive of the Complainant's banking services and adds to, rather than diminishes, the likelihood of confusion by implying an official security service of the Complainant.

As for the generic Top-Level Domain (“gTLD”) “.com”, it is well established that the gTLD is not relevant to the issue of identity or confusing similarity between the Complainant’s trademark and the domain name in dispute (see WIPO Overview 3.0, section 1.11.1).

Consequently, the Panel finds that the Complainant has shown that the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to a trademark in which the Complainant has rights.

B. Rights or Legitimate Interests

Once the complainant establishes a prima facie case that the respondent lacks rights or legitimate interests in the domain name, the burden of production shifts to the respondent to show that it has rights or legitimate interests in respect to the domain name

(see WIPO Overview 3.0, section 2.1).

In the present case, the Complainant has demonstrated a prima facie case that the Respondent lacks rights or legitimate interests in respect of the disputed domain name and the Respondent has failed to assert any such rights or legitimate interests.

The Complainant has provided evidence that it has been the registered owner of the BOURSO mark long before the date that the disputed domain name was registered and that it has not authorised the Respondent to use the Complainant's trademark. There is no evidence that the Respondent is commonly known by the disputed domain name.

The Respondent did not submit a Response and did not provide any explanation for its choice of the disputed domain name nor evidence to show rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name which would be sufficient to rebut the Complainant's prima facie case.

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

C. Registered and Used in Bad Faith

The Complainant must also show that the respondent registered and is using the disputed domain name in bad faith (see Policy, paragraph 4(a)(iii)). Paragraph 4(b) of the Policy provides circumstances that may evidence bad faith under paragraph 4(a)(iii) of the Policy.

The Complainant's trademark was registered years before the registration of the disputed domain name. The disputed domain name incorporates the entirety of the Complainant's BUORSO mark, and resolves to a website that mimics the Complainant's official customer login portal. This is a paradigmatic example of a phishing scheme: the Respondent is using the disputed domain name to impersonate the Complainant and to fraudulently obtain personal information, including login credentials, from the Complainant's customers. Such conduct falls squarely within paragraph 4(b)(iv) of the Policy, as the Respondent is intentionally attempting to attract, for commercial gain, Internet users to its website by creating a likelihood of confusion with the Complainant's mark as to the source, sponsorship, affiliation, or endorsement of its website. The Respondent's use of the term "antifraude" heightens the deceptive nature of the scheme and amounts to particularly egregious conduct. It is the Panel's view that the Respondent was aware of the Complainant and its trademarks and is targeting the Complainant and its customers.

Given the particular circumstances of this case, and the distinctive nature of the Complainant's trademark, the Panel is persuaded by the evidence that the Respondent was aware of the Complainant and its BUORSO trademark at the time of registering the disputed domain name and specifically targeted the Complainant.

Further, the Panel cannot conceive any plausible good faith use to which the disputed domain name may be put. The Respondent failed to submit a response and provided no evidence to rebut the Complainant's case. The Respondent also registered the disputed domain name under a fictitious name. This is also an indication of bad faith.

Further, the Panel cannot conceive any plausible good faith use to which the disputed domain name may be put. The Respondent failed to submit a response and provided no evidence to rebut the Complainant's case. The Respondent also registered the disputed domain name under a fictitious name. This is also an indication of bad faith.

Accordingly, having regard to the circumstances of this case, the Panel finds that the Complainant has met its burden under paragraph 4(a)(iii) of the Policy.

FOR ALL THE REASONS STATED ABOVE, THE COMPLAINT IS

Accepted

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

1. **bourso-service-antifraude.com**: Transferred

PANELLISTS

Name	**Jonathan Agmon**

DATE OF PANEL DECISION 2026-04-07

Publish the Decision