Decision for dispute CAC-UDRP-108475

Case number	CAC-UDRP-108475
Time of filing	2026-03-10 09:20:38
Domain names	boursorama-securite.com

Case administrator

Name	Olga Slanařová (Case admin)

Complainant

Organization	BOURSORAMA

Complainant representative

Organization	NAMESHIELD S.A.S.

Respondent

Name	Julien leroux

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 relies on registered rights in the mark BOURSORAMA in particular, the Complainant's EUTM (European Union Trade Mark) Reg. No. 001758614 for the word mark BOURSORAMA, registered on 19 October 2001 in class 36 and other classes.

The Complainant says its BOURSORAMA mark is a well-known mark in the field of financial services and banking, and it has millions of customers and a substantial online presence. Previous UDRP panels have recognised the reputation of the BOURSORAMA mark arising from its longstanding use of the word mark BOURSORAMA in trade in connection with online banking, online brokerage and financial information services.

It makes online use at the related domain names including <boursorama.com>, registered on 1 March 1998, and <boursoramabanque.com>, registered on 26 May 2005.

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

The Complainant is a major French online banking and financial services provider. It has used the BOURSORAMA name for many years and operates its principal online presence through the domain name <boursorama.com>.

The disputed domain name reproduces the Complainant's mark in its entirety and adds the French word "securite" for "security".

The context is online banking.

The Respondent is a Julien Leroux, of Paris, France. Nothing else is known about him. The disputed domain name <boursorama-securite.com> was registered on 4 March 2026. According to the complaint, the disputed domain name resolved to a parking page displaying commercial pay-per-click links as of 9 March 2026.

PARTIES CONTENTIONS

The Complainant contends, in summary, that: (1) the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to the BOURSORAMA mark because it incorporates that mark in its entirety, with the addition only of the descriptive word “securite” and the “.com” suffix; (2) the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name, is not commonly known by it, and has never been authorised to use the BOURSORAMA mark; and (3) the disputed domain name was registered and is being used in bad faith because it targets a well-known banking mark and resolves to a monetised parking page with pay per click links likely to attract Internet users by confusion.

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

Under paragraph 4(a) of the Uniform Domain Name Dispute Resolution Policy (the “Policy”), the Complainant must establish each of the following: (i) that the disputed domain name is identical or confusingly similar to a trade mark or service mark in which the Complainant has rights; (ii) that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the disputed domain name; and (iii) that the disputed domain name has been registered and is being used in bad faith. The Policy does not provide for an automatic or default victory. Even in the absence of a Response, the Panel must be satisfied on the evidence that each element of paragraph 4(a) has been proved.

1. Identical or Confusingly Similar

The Panel is satisfied that the Complainant has rights in the mark BOURSORAMA by virtue of its registered EUTM and its longstanding use. Prior decisions involving this Complainant and its mark have found it is a well-known mark, and the Panel is satisfied it is a mark with a reputation.

The disputed domain name reproduces the word mark BOURSORAMA in its entirety as its distinctive and dominant element. The additional generic word “securite” does not prevent a finding of confusing similarity. On the contrary, in the banking context, it

reinforces an association with the Complainant, because Internet users are accustomed to security-related notices, authentication pages and account-protection messaging from financial institutions.

The overall impression conveyed by the disputed domain name is of an official and authorised domain name connected with the Complainant, and more particularly with the security of the Complainant's online banking services. This conclusion is consistent with prior UDRP authority, including CAC-UDRP-105096 case <securite-boursorama.site>, where the panel held that the addition of the word "securite" compounded rather than reduced confusion by suggesting a login or security-related page of the Complainant.

The hyphen is immaterial, and the generic Top-Level Domain ".com" is ordinarily disregarded for the purpose of the first limb of the Policy but relevant to the factors below and can reinforce the impression of an official and authorised commercial site.

The first element of paragraph 4(a) of the Policy is therefore satisfied.

2. Rights or Legitimate Interests

It is well established that a complainant is required to make out a prima facie case that a respondent lacks rights or legitimate interests. Once that is done, the burden of proof shifts to a respondent to come forward with relevant evidence demonstrating rights or legitimate interests. See Croatia Airlines d.d. v. Modern Empire Internet Ltd., WIPO Case No. D2003-0455.

The Complainant has made out a prima facie case here. The record does not show that the Respondent, Julien Leroux, has been commonly known by the disputed domain name. Past panels have held a Respondent is not commonly known by a domain name if the WHOIS information was not similar to the domain name and here the Respondent is not known as "BOURSORAMA". See the Forum Case - FA699652 - Braun Corp. v. Loney and Forum Case -FA139720 - Tercent Inc. v. Lee Yi. The Respondent has not come forward and asserted any basis on which we could conclude that he has a right or legitimate interest in the domain name, and none is obvious on the face of the matter. There is no evidence that the Respondent has any trademark rights corresponding to BOURSORAMA, or any licence, permission or other authorisation from the Complainant to use that mark. Nor does the use shown in the record support rights or legitimate interests. The disputed domain name resolves to a parking page with commercial links first referring to the Complainant and then with links like "online bank account" and "online bank login" and "online banking services" and "protect boursorama account."

Parking pages and pay-per-click use are not per se illegitimate but their fair use requires a focused and fact sensitive inquiry. Context is key and use of a domain name that appropriates another party's distinctive banking mark and couples it with the term "security" is not a plausible basis for a bona fide offering of goods or services. The pay-per-click use appears deliberately targeted to suggest an official security function of the Complainant. Such a presentation is inherently misleading and is inconsistent with legitimate non-commercial or fair use. We do not know if the MX records have been configured but that can be highly relevant and suggest a use that is not legitimate and possibly for phishing or fraud. In the absence of any rebuttal or any credible indication of a genuine good-faith purpose, the Panel finds that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name.

The second element of paragraph 4(a) of the Policy is satisfied.

3. Registered and Used in Bad Faith

The Panel also finds bad faith registration and use. The finding on this third Policy limb will often follow from the second limb on fair and legitimate use. The BOURSORAMA mark is highly distinctive and well known. It is not a dictionary term. The Respondent selected a domain name that reproduces that mark exactly and appends the word "securite", a term with an obvious and specific application for an online banking business. It is implausible that the disputed domain name was registered without knowledge of the Complainant and its rights. The previous CAC-UDRP-105096 case relating to <securite-boursorama.site> is especially instructive. There, as here, the combination of the BOURSORAMA mark with the word "securite" was found to compound the conceptual link to the Complainant's services and to suggest an official login or security page. The same reasoning applies with equal force here. The actual use shown in the complaint reinforces the inference of bad faith. Panels have repeatedly found bad faith where a respondent uses a confusingly similar domain name to attract Internet users for commercial gain through pay-per-click or similar monetised parking, particularly where the domain name targets a distinctive mark. Here, Internet users searching for a BOURSORAMA security page or responding to a perceived security-related prompt are likely to be drawn to the disputed domain name because of its confusing implication of affiliation. Even aside from the pay-per-click links, the Panel considers that the disputed domain name carries a heightened risk of abuse in the banking context. A domain name suggesting "Boursorama security" is apt for impersonation, credential harvesting, or fraudulent customer communications. While the record does not establish such further misuse, the inherent risk and implausibility of any good-faith use form part of the overall bad-faith assessment. Taking all of these circumstances together - the distinctiveness and reputation of the Complainant's mark, the targeted composition of the disputed domain name, the absence of any rights or legitimate interests, and the commercial pay per click use - the Panel concludes that the disputed domain name was registered and is being used in bad faith within the meaning of paragraph 4(a)(iii) and paragraph 4(b)(iv) of the Policy.

The third element of paragraph 4(a) of the Policy is satisfied.

FOR ALL THE REASONS STATED ABOVE, THE COMPLAINT IS

Accepted

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

1. **boursorama-securite.com**: Transferred

PANELLISTS

Name	**Victoria McEvedy**

DATE OF PANEL DECISION 2026-04-13

Publish the Decision