Decision for dispute CAC-UDRP-108458

Case number	CAC-UDRP-108458
Time of filing	2026-03-03 10:25:58
Domain names	sint-gobain.com

Case administrator

Name	Olga Slanařová (Case admin)

Complainant

Organization	COMPAGNIE DE SAINT-GOBAIN

Complainant representative

Organization	NAMESHIELD S.A.S.

Respondent

Name	Meekeeyah Lee

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 registered owner of several trademark registrations for <SAINT-GOBAIN>, in particular the following mark:

- International trademark registration <SAINT-GOBAIN> n° 740183 registered on July 26, 2000 for goods and services in classes 01, 02, 03, 06, 07, 08, 09, 10, 11, 12, 17, 19, 20, 21, 22, 23, 24, 37, 38, 40, 42 and designating many countries, including the United States of America, where the Respondent is residing

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

1. The Complainant is a French company specialized in the production, processing and distribution of materials for the construction and industrial markets with around 46.5 billion euros in turnover in 2025 and more than 161,000 employees.

2. It results from the registrar verification response that the Respondent registered the disputed domain name on February 25, 2026. The disputed domain name resolves to a Registar parking page and has been set up with MX records.

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

1.

The Panel finds that the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to the Complainant’s trademark.

As a matter of fact, it reflects the Complainant’s trademark <SAINT-GOBAIN> almost identically, merely omitting the letter “A” in the element “SAINT.” The Panel considers this obvious misspelling insufficient to render the disputed domain name dissimilar to the Complainant’s registered trademark, which, in the Panel’s view, remains clearly recognizable within the disputed domain name.

2.

In the absence of any Response, or any other information from the Respondent indicating the contrary, the Panel further holds that the Complainant successfully presented a prima facie case that the Respondent lacks rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name.

In particular, it results from the Complainant's undisputed allegations and evidence that the Respondent is not affiliated with nor authorized by the Complainant in any way, and he is not related in any way to the Complainant’s business. Moreover, the Respondent has not demonstrated any preparations to use the disputed domain name - which currently resolves to a Registrar parking page - in connection with any bona fide offering of goods or services. Finally, the Panel has not been presented with any evidence that could lead the Panel to the conclusion that the Respondent is commonly known by the disputed domain name or that he has acquired trademark rights. In particular, the Respondent is not identified in the Whois database under the disputed domain name.

3.

The Panel finds that the disputed domain name has been registered and is being used in bad faith.

While looking at the totality of the circumstances of the case, the Panel particularly considers the following documented factors - which have not been contested by the Respondent - to be relevant in reaching this conclusion in the present case:

- the disputed domain name contains the Complainant's trademark <SAINT-GOBAIN> almost identically, with a mere typo. The Panel holds that the use of such misspelling is intended to confuse the users and therefore indicates bad faith. This result is

confirmed by previous panels (see CAC Case no. 100740 <ARCELORNNITTAL.COM>).;
- the Panel recognizes that for the purposes of these UDRP proceedings, the Complainant's trademark <SAINT-GOBAIN> enjoys an enhanced degree of distinctiveness and even reputation, generating around 46.5 billion euros in turnover in 2025 and having more than 161,000 employees. Therefore, it is the Panel's view that Respondent knew or should have known that the disputed domain name contains the Complainant's trademark almost identically. Registration of a confusingly similar domain name in awareness of a reputed trademark and in the absence of rights or legitimate interests amounts to registration in bad faith;
- the Respondent's failure to submit a response or to provide any evidence of actual or contemplated good-faith use or rights/legitimate interests;
- the implausibility of any good faith use to which the disputed domain name, containing the Complainant's trademark almost identically, may be put; and
- the disputed domain name has been set up with MX records so that the Respondent could be engaged in a phishing scheme.

In light of the above, the Panel finds that the Complainant has established 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. **sint-gobain.com**: Transferred

PANELLISTS

Name	**Tobias Malte Müller**

DATE OF PANEL DECISION 2026-04-16

Publish the Decision