Decision for dispute CAC-UDRP-108452

Case number	CAC-UDRP-108452
Time of filing	2026-03-02 09:23:41
Domain names	saint-gobiam.com

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 several trademarks SAINT-GOBAIN, registered worldwide, such as:

- International trademark "SAINT-GOBAIN" No. 740184, registered on July 26, 2000;
- International trademark "SAINT-GOBAIN" No. 740183, registered on July 26, 2000;
- International trademark "SAINT-GOBAIN" No. 596735, registered on November 2, 1992;
- International trademark "SAINT-GOBAIN" No. 551682, registered on July 21, 1989.

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

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

Saint-Gobain is a worldwide reference in sustainable habitat and construction markets. It takes a long-term view in order to develop products and services for its customers that facilitate sustainable construction. In this way, it designs innovative, high-performance solutions that improve habitat and everyday life. For 350 years, the Complainant has consistently demonstrated its ability to invent products that improve quality of life. It is now one of the top industrial groups in the world with around 46.6 billion euros in turnover in 2024 and more than 161,000 employees.

The Complainant also owns many domain names including its trademark SAINT-GOBAIN, such as the domain name <saint-gobain.com> registered on December 29, 1995.

The disputed domain name <saint-gobiam.com> was registered on February 23, 2026 and redirects to the Complainant's official website https://www.saint-gobain.com. Besides, the domain name has been used in a phishing scheme.

PARTIES CONTENTIONS

The Complainant contends that the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to the Trademark.

Furthermore, the Complainant contends that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name. In this regard, the Complainant states that the Respondent is not commonly known by the disputed domain name, that it is not affiliated with nor authorized by the Complainant in any way, that the Complainant does not carry out any activity for, nor has any business with the Respondent, and that neither license nor authorization has been granted to the Respondent to make any use of the Trademark or apply for registration of the disputed domain name by the Complainant.

Finally, the Complainant contends that the disputed domain name was registered and is being used in bad faith. It contends that the Respondent must have been aware of the Complainant and its Trademark at the time of registration of the disputed domain name as the Trademark is well-known and the disputed domain name redirects to the Complainant's website. Further, that the Respondent's use of the disputed domain name is evidence of bad faith, as it was used for phishing and it intentionally tried to attract users by creating a likelihood of confusion with the Complainant's trademark as to the source of the website associated to the disputed domain name.

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

Under paragraph 4(a) of the Policy, the Complainant must prove that each of the following three elements is present:

(i) the disputed domain name is identical or confusingly similar to the Complainant's trademark; and

(ii) the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the disputed domain name; and

(iii) the disputed domain name has been registered and is being used in bad faith.

1. The Panel accepts that the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to the Trademark, as it is a clear case of typosquatting.

2. Although the overall burden of proof in UDRP proceedings is on the complainant, panels have recognized that proving a respondent lacks rights or legitimate interests in a domain name may result in the difficult task of “proving a negative”, requiring information that is often primarily within the knowledge or control of the respondent. As such, where a complainant makes out a prima facie case that the respondent lacks rights or legitimate interests, the burden of production on this element shifts to the respondent to come forward with relevant evidence demonstrating rights or legitimate interests in the domain name. If the respondent fails to come forward with such relevant evidence, the complainant is deemed to have satisfied the second element.

The Respondent does not appear to have operated any bona fide or legitimate business under the disputed domain name and is not making a noncommercial or fair use of the disputed domain name. Instead, the disputed domain name has been used as part of a fraudulent phishing scheme targeting the Complainant’s business. The Respondent used the disputed domain name to pass itself off as one of the employees of the Complainant. The use of the disputed domain name for such fraudulent purposes clearly demonstrates that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name.

Consequently, the Panel finds that the Complainant has fulfilled its obligations under paragraph 4(a)(ii) of the Policy. The Respondent did not deny these assertions in any way and therefore failed to prove any rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name.

3.1 The Panel is satisfied that the Respondent registered the disputed domain name with full knowledge of the Complainant and its rights in the Trademark as the Trademark is well-established and well-known.

3.2 Furthermore, the Panel accepts the Complainant's contentions that the disputed domain name has been used in bad faith under para. 4(b)(iv) of the Policy. The Respondent has used the disputed domain to intentionally attract users to its website by creating a likelihood of confusion with the Trademark as to the source, sponsorship, affiliation, or endorsement of the website and by capitalising on Complainant's reputation.

Consequently, by using the disputed domain name in such a manner, the Respondent has fulfilled the elements and requirements for a finding under paragraph 4(a)(iii) of the Policy. The Panel finds that the Complainant has also established the third element of the Policy successfully.

FOR ALL THE REASONS STATED ABOVE, THE COMPLAINT IS

Accepted

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

1. **saint-gobiam.com**: Transferred

PANELLISTS

Name	**Stefanie Efstathiou LL.M. mult.**

DATE OF PANEL DECISION 2026-04-13

Publish the Decision