Decision for dispute CAC-UDRP-108510

Case number	CAC-UDRP-108510
Time of filing	2026-03-23 10:43:11
Domain names	globalsaintgobainpartner.com

Case administrator

Name	Olga Slanařová (Case admin)

Complainant

Organization	COMPAGNIE DE SAINT-GOBAIN

Complainant representative

Organization	NAMESHIELD S.A.S.

Respondent

Name	Dome Jamsa

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 several trademarks SAINT-GOBAIN, registered worldwide, including:

• International trademark SAINT-GOBAIN n°740184 registered on July 26, 2000;
• International trademark SAINT-GOBAIN n°740183 registered on July 26, 2000;
• International trademark SAINT-GOBAIN n°596735 registered on November 2, 1992; and
• International trademark SAINT-GOBAIN n°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. The Complainant owns many domain names including its trademark SAINT-GOBAIN, such as the domain name <saint-gobain.com> registered on December 29, 1995. SAINT-GOBAIN is also commonly used to designate the company name of the Complainant.

The disputed domain name <globalsaintgobainpartner.com> was registered on March 16, 2026. It resolves to a blank page. MX servers are configured.

PARTIES CONTENTIONS

As set out below in the Principal Reasons for the Decision, 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

Paragraph 15(a) of the Rules instructs this Panel to "decide a complaint on the basis of the statements and documents submitted in accordance with the Policy, these Rules and any rules and principles of law that it deems applicable."

Paragraph 4(a) of the Policy requires that the Complainant must prove each of the following three elements to obtain an order that a domain name should be cancelled or transferred:

(1) the disputed domain name registered by the Respondent is identical or confusingly similar to a trademark or service mark in which the Complainant has rights; and

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

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

In view of the Respondent's failure to submit a response, the Panel shall decide this administrative proceeding on the basis of the Complainant's undisputed representations pursuant to paragraphs 5(f), 14(a) and 15(a) of the Rules and draw such inferences as it considers appropriate pursuant to paragraph 14(b) of the Rules. The Panel is entitled to accept all reasonable allegations set forth in a complaint; however, the Panel may deny relief where a complaint contains mere conclusory or unsubstantiated arguments. See WIPO Jurisprudential Overview 3.1 at paragraph 4.3; see also eGalaxy Multimedia Inc. v. ON HOLD By Owner Ready To Expire, FA 157287 (Forum June 26, 2003) (“Because Complainant did not produce clear evidence to support its subjective allegations [. . .] the Panel finds it appropriate to dismiss the Complaint”).

As to the first element, the Complainant has shown that it has rights in the SAINT-GOBAIN mark and that the mark is very well-known. The Panel finds the disputed domain name <globalsaintgobainpartner.com> to be confusingly similar to the Complainant’s trademark SAINT-GOBAIN because, apart from omitting the hyphen, it incorporates the mark in its entirety and merely adds the descriptive words “global” and “partner” which do nothing to distinguish the domain name from the mark, together with the inconsequential top-level domain “.com”, which may be ignored under this element.

The Complainant has established this element.

As to the second element, paragraph 4(c) of the Policy sets out three illustrative circumstances as examples which, if established by the Respondent, shall demonstrate rights to or legitimate interests in a disputed domain name for the purposes of paragraph 4(a)(ii) of the Policy, i.e.

(i) before any notice to the Respondent of the dispute, the use by the Respondent of, or demonstrable preparations to use, the domain name or a name corresponding to the disputed domain name in connection with a bona fide offering of goods or services; or

(ii) the Respondent (as an individual, business or other organization) has been commonly known by the disputed domain name, even if the Respondent has acquired no trademark or service mark rights; or

(iii) the Respondent is making a legitimate noncommercial or fair use of the disputed domain name, without intent for commercial gain to misleadingly divert customers or to tarnish the trademark or service mark at issue.

The Complainant contends that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the disputed domain name and is not related in any way with the Complainant. The Respondent is not identified in the WHOIS database as the disputed domain name. The Complainant does not carry out any activity for, nor has any business with the Respondent. Neither licence nor authorization has been granted to the Respondent to make any use of the Complainant's trademark SAINT-GOBAIN, nor to apply for registration of the disputed domain name, which resolves to a blank page.

The Panel notes that the disputed domain name <globalsaintgobainpartner.com> was registered by the Respondent on March 16, 2026, long after the Complainant had shown that its SAINT-GOBAIN mark had become very well-known. Although the disputed domain name is inactive, MX records have been activated, allowing the disputed domain name to be used to send emails. These circumstances, together with the Complainant's assertions, are sufficient to constitute a prima facie showing of absence of rights or legitimate interests in respect of the disputed domain name on the part of the Respondent. The evidentiary burden therefore, shifts to the Respondent to show that it does have rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name. See JUUL Labs, Inc. v. Dryx Emerson / KMF Events LTD, FA1906001849706 (Forum July 17, 2019). The Respondent has made no attempt to do so.

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

The Complainant has established this element.

As to the third element, the circumstances set out above in relation to the second element satisfy the Panel that the Respondent was fully aware of the Complainant's very well-known SAINT-GOBAIN mark when the Respondent registered the disputed domain name. As in WIPO Case No. D2000-0003, Telstra Corporation Limited v. Nuclear Marshmallows, 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, such as by being a passing off, an infringement of consumer protection legislation, or an infringement of the Complainant's rights under trademark law. The Respondent's ability to use the disputed domain name for email messages, which would appear to emanate from the Complainant, is further evidence of the Respondent's bad faith.

The Complainant has established this element.

FOR ALL THE REASONS STATED ABOVE, THE COMPLAINT IS

Accepted

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

1. **globalsaintgobainpartner.com**: Transferred

PANELLISTS

Name	**Alan Limbury**

DATE OF PANEL DECISION 2026-04-16

Publish the Decision