Decision for dispute CAC-UDRP-108486

Case number	CAC-UDRP-108486
Time of filing	2026-03-12 09:42:36
Domain names	cibomat.com

Case administrator

Name	Olga Slanařová (Case admin)

Complainant

Organization	CIBOMAT

Complainant representative

Organization	NAMESHIELD S.A.S.

Respondent

Organization	JEM AUTO

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, inter alia, a registered owner of the following **trademark** containing the word element "CIBOMAT”:

(i) CIBOMAT (word), French national trademark, application date 19 January 2024, registration date 3 May 2024, trademark registration no. 5022643, registered for services in the international class 35,

(referred to as "Complainant's trademark").

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

The **Complainant** in this administrative proceeding is CIBOMAT, a French company. The Complainant is a subsidiary of COMPAGNIE DE SAINT-GOBAIN, a French multinational corporation specializing in the production, processing, and distribution of materials for the construction and industrial markets. COMPAGNIE DE SAINT-GOBAIN is a global leader in sustainable construction, reporting a turnover of approximately 46.5 billion euros in 2025 and employing more than 162,000 individuals.

The Complainant is specialized in the trade of building materials and equipment, particularly wood-related products for home improvement.

The **disputed domain name** <cibomat.com> was registered on 26 February 2026 and is held by the Respondent.

The **disputed domain name website** (i.e. website available under internet address containing the disputed domain name) is currently inactive and does not resolve to any active website. However, as proven by the Complainant, the disputed domain name website at least for some time resolved to an imitative website offering wood pellets for home equipment, directly competing with those sold by Complainant.

This disputed domain name website also displayed the Complainant's actual physical address and legal mentions.

The Complainant seeks the transfer of the disputed domain name to the Complainant.

PARTIES CONTENTIONS

COMPLAINANT:

A) CONFUSING SIMILARITY

The Complainant states that:

The disputed domain name <cibomat.com> is identical to the Complainant's trademark, as the mark is contained within the domain name without any additions or deletions.

TLDs (including ".com") are disregarded when assessing identity or confusing similarity, as they are standard registration elements.

B) NO RIGHTS OR LEGITIMATE INTERESTS

The Complainant states that:

Respondent has no authorization from Complainant to use Complainant's Trademark in any way, including in any domain name.

The disputed domain name does not correspond to the Respondent's name and offers no basis for a legitimate interest.

The disputed domain name resolves to an imitative website offering wood pellets (i.e. competing products, trading on Complainant's goodwill to mislead users. Such use is not a bona fide offering of goods or services, nor legitimate non-commercial or fair use.

The disputed domain name website uses the Complainant's actual physical address and legal mentions to create a likelihood of confusion. The Complainant contends that resolving a confusingly similar domain to a competing webpage does not constitute a bona fide offering of goods or services.

Once Complainant makes a prima facie showing of no rights or legitimate interests, the burden shifts to Respondent; Respondent has provided no evidence to the contrary.

The Respondent therefore has no rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name

C) BAD FAITH REGISTRATION AND USE

The Complainant states that:

The disputed domain resolves to a competing, imitative website using Complainant's Trademark without authorization.

There is no evidence of any bona fide, legitimate, or fair use of the disputed domain name by Respondent.

The Respondent registered the domain name with full knowledge of the Complainant's CIBOMAT Trademark, given the mark's distinctiveness

Respondent is using the domain name to intentionally divert Internet users searching for the Complainant's official website to a competing website.

By displaying the Complainant's legal information and offering competing products (wood pellets), the Respondent is attempting to create a likelihood of confusion for commercial gain.

Accordingly, the Complainant concludes that the domain name was registered and is being used in bad faith.

RESPONDENT:

The Respondent has not provided any response to the Complaint.

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

A) RIGHTS

The first UDRP element functions primarily as a standing requirement. The standing (or threshold) test for confusing similarity involves a reasoned but relatively straightforward comparison between the Complainant's Trademark and the disputed domain name(s).

This test typically involves a side-by-side comparison of the disputed domain name and the textual components of the relevant trademark to assess whether the trademark is recognizable within the disputed domain name.

In cases where a disputed domain name incorporates the entirety of a trademark, or where at least a dominant feature of the relevant mark is recognizable in such domain name, the disputed domain name will normally be considered confusingly similar to that trademark for purposes of UDRP standing.

In such case, the addition of other terms (whether descriptive, geographical, pejorative, meaningless, or otherwise) would not prevent a finding of confusing similarity under the first element.

Applying the principles described above, The Panel finds that the disputed domain name is idemtical to Complainant's Trademark.

The domain incorporates Complainant's Trademark in its entirety. The addition of a descriptive term or TLD does not prevent a finding of confusing similarity

For the sake of completeness, the Panel asserts that the top-level suffix in the disputed domain name (i.e. the ".COM") must be disregarded under the identity and confusing similarity tests as it is a necessary technical requirement of registration.

Consequently, the disputed domain name is identical to a trademark or service mark in which the Complainant has rights (within the meaning of paragraph 4(a)(i) of the Policy).

B) NO RIGHTS OR LEGITIMATE INTERESTS

According to established UDRP precedent, once the Complainant makes a prima facie case that the Respondent lacks such rights or legitimate interests, the burden shifts to the Respondent to show otherwise.

In this case, the Complainant has established a prima facie case that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name. The Respondent is not identified in the WHOIS record by the disputed domain name and there is no

evidence that the Respondent is commonly known by it. The Complainant has further stated that it has no relationship with the Respondent and has not licensed, authorized, or otherwise permitted the Respondent to use Complainant's Trademarks or to register any domain name incorporating it.

The disputed domain name resolved to an imitation website offering competing products, trading on the goodwill of Complainant's Trademark to mislead Internet users. Currently it is inactive. Such use cannot be considered a bona fide offering of goods or services or a legitimate non-commercial or fair use under paragraph 4(c) of the Policy.

The Respondent has not come forward with any evidence to rebut the Complainant's prima facie case or to demonstrate any rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name.

Accordingly, the Panel finds that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name within the meaning of paragraph 4(a)(ii) of the Policy.

C) BAD FAITH

The Complainant's Trademark has been registered and widely used for many years prior to the registration of the disputed domain name.

The Panel notes that the term "CIBOMAT" is distinctive and closely associated with the Complainant. In these circumstances, it is not likely that the Respondent registered the disputed domain name without knowledge of the Complainant's Trademark and reputation.

The disputed domain name resolved to an imitation website offering competing pet-related products. Such use demonstrates an intent to attract Internet users to the Respondent's website for commercial gain by creating a likelihood of confusion with the Complainant's mark as to the source, sponsorship, affiliation, or endorsement of the website.

The Panel notes the following specific bad faith behaviour of the Respondent:

- **Impersonation:** The Respondent has populated the website at the disputed domain name with the Complainant's own corporate identity, including its address.
- **Direct Competition:** The website is used to offer wood pellets and building-related products that compete directly with the Complainant's business.
- **Confusion for Profit:** By masquerading as the Complainant, the Respondent is leveraging the reputation of the Complainant's Trademark to divert consumers for its own commercial gain

This constitutes evidence of bad faith registration and use within the meaning of paragraph 4(b)(iv) of the Policy.

Thus, the Panel has taken a view that 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.

FOR ALL THE REASONS STATED ABOVE, THE COMPLAINT IS

Accepted

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

1. **cibomat.com**: Transferred

PANELLISTS

Name	**Jiří Čermák**

DATE OF PANEL DECISION 2026-04-18

Publish the Decision