Decision for dispute CAC-UDRP-108464

Case number	CAC-UDRP-108464
Time of filing	2026-03-05 09:36:31
Domain names	saint-gobain.shop

Case administrator

Name	Olga Slanařová (Case admin)

Complainant

Organization	COMPAGNIE DE SAINT-GOBAIN

Complainant representative

Organization	NAMESHIELD S.A.S.

Respondent

Organization	Mazambat

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 various international trade mark registrations for its SAINT-GOBAIN mark including International trade mark registration 551682 for SAINT - GOBAIN word and device mark registered on July 21, 1989 and International registration 740183 for the word mark SAINT GOBAIN registered on July 26, 2000. The Complainant also owns various domain names including its SAINT-GOBAIN trade mark and in particular <saint-gobain> registered on December 29, 1995.

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

The Complainant is a French company specialised in the production, processing and distribution of materials for the construction and industrial markets. It is one of the leading industrial groups in the world with around 46.5 billion euros in turnover in 2025 and around 161,000 employees.

The disputed domain name was registered on March 2, 2026 and resolves to an error 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

The Complainant owns registered trade mark rights for its SAINT-GOBAIN mark as set out above and the word SAINT-GOBAIN is the key and dominant element of combined word and device International registration 551682 designated in numerous jurisdictions. The Panel finds, as submitted by the Complainant, that the SAINT-GOBAIN trade mark is wholly incorporated into the disputed domain name and is therefore confusingly similar to it. As submitted by the Complainant, the TLD ".SHOP" does not change the overall impression given by the disputed domain name and does not prevent a finding of confusing similarity.

The Complainant has asserted that the Respondent is not identified by the "Whois" information as being the disputed domain name and the Panel notes that there is no other indication that it trades in or has rights under that name. In circumstances that the Complainant's SAINT-GOBAIN mark was very well reputed at the date of registration of the disputed domain name the Respondent must have been aware of it at that time and that it was registered it in order to take advantage of the Complainant's mark and reputation.

The Complainant has also contended that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the disputed domain name and that the Respondent is not related in any way with the Complainant and carries out no activity or business with the Respondent. The Complainant has also submitted that it has granted neither a licence nor authorisation to the Respondent to make any use of the Complainant's SAINT-GOBAIN trade mark, or to apply for registration of the disputed domain name. The Complainant has noted that the disputed domain name resolves to an error page and contends that the Respondent has not made any use of the disputed domain name since its registration.

The Panel finds that the Complainant has established a prima facie case that the Respondent lacks rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name. The Respondent has not rebutted the Complainant's prima facie showing and has not come forward with any relevant evidence demonstrating rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name and therefore the Complaint succeeds under the second element of the Policy.

The disputed domain name was registered in March 2026 long after the Complainant's registration of its trade mark rights. As noted by the Complainant, its SAINT – GOBAIN mark was by this time very well reputed and its business was very well established in France and internationally, including in the United Kingdom, where the Respondent appears to reside. The Complainant's mark also enjoys a high level of distinctiveness. It is therefore more likely than not that the Respondent was well aware of the Complainant's

mark and business by the time of registration of the disputed domain name.

Panels have previously found that the non-use of a domain name, including for an error page as in this case, does not prevent a finding of bad faith under the doctrine of passive holding. Although panelists consider the overall circumstances of the case, the factors that have been considered relevant in applying the passive holding doctrine include: (i) the degree of distinctiveness or reputation of the complainant's mark, (ii) the failure of the respondent to submit a response or to provide any evidence of actual or contemplated good-faith use, and (iii) the respondent's concealing its identity or use of false contact details and (iv) the plausibility of the Respondent's use of the disputed domain name in good faith.

In this case the SAINT-GOBAIN mark is distinctive and appears to be very well reputed internationally based upon the size and breadth of the Complainant's international materials and construction business. The Respondent has failed to provide a response or to otherwise explain its registration and non-use of the disputed domain name. The Panel also notes that the Respondent initially provided what appears to be a false contact address in Iceland in circumstances that the Registrar's verification identified that the Respondent was based in the United Kingdom.

The use in the disputed domain name of the Complainant's SAINT-GOBAIN mark in the <.shop> top level domain name space can only have been calculated to ultimately confuse Internet users, or to be used for bad faith purposes, such as re-sale to the Complainant or to a competitor. As submitted by the Complainant, the Respondent has not demonstrated any legitimate 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 disputed domain name by the Respondent that would not be illegitimate. As a result, the Panel finds that the factors of the passive holding doctrine have been fulfilled in this case and that the disputed domain name was registered and has been used in bad faith and therefore that the Complaint also succeeds under the third element of the Policy.

FOR ALL THE REASONS STATED ABOVE, THE COMPLAINT IS

Accepted

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

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

PANELLISTS

Name	**Mr Alistair Payne**

DATE OF PANEL DECISION 2026-04-07

Publish the Decision