Decision for dispute CAC-UDRP-108514

Case number	CAC-UDRP-108514
Time of filing	2026-03-23 11:25:49
Domain names	contactlagardere.com, grouplagardere.com, lagarderegestion.com, conseillerlagardere.com

Case administrator

Name	Olga Slanařová (Case admin)

Complainant

Organization	LAGARDERE SA

Complainant representative

Organization	NAMESHIELD S.A.S.

Respondents

Name	Arnaud Crouzet
Name	gerard dupuis
Name	Anne Boiteux
Name	Manon Fornier

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 names.

IDENTIFICATION OF RIGHTS

The Complainant is the owner of a number of trademark registrations for LAGARDERE (the “LAGARDERE trademark”), including the following representative registrations:

– the International trademark **LAGARDERE** (word) with registration No. 751186, registered on 18 October 2000 for goods and services in International Classes 9, 16, 35, 38, 41 and 42;

– the International trademark **LAGARDERE** (combined) with registration No. 954315, registered on 31 August 2007 for goods and services in International Classes 3, 6, 9, 14, 16, 18, 20, 21, 22, 24, 25, 28, 34, 35, 36, 38, 39, 41, 42, 43, 44 and 45;

– the International trademark **LAGARDÈRE** (word) with registration No. 989729, registered on 29 February 2008 for goods and services in International Classes 5, 7, 10, 12, 27, 30, 32 and 37; and

– the European Union trademark **LAGARDÈRE** (word) with registration No. 006529747, registered on 21 November 2008 for goods and services in International Classes 5, 7, 10, 12, 27, 30, 32 and 37.

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

The Complainant is an international group, created in 1992. It operates in more than 50 countries and employs more than 33,000 people. In 2025, the Complainant generated revenue of more than EUR 9,3 billion. The Complainant's group includes Lagardere Publishing - the world's third-largest book publisher for the general public and educational markets, and leader in France, and Lagardere Travel Retail - the world's third-largest travel retail merchant and number two in airports. The Complainant operates its official website at the domain names <lagardere.com>, registered since 2 August 1995, and <lagardere-groupe.com>, registered since 7 July 2003.

The disputed domain name <contactlagardere.com> was registered on 25 February 2026, and its registrant is Arnaud Crouzet.

The disputed domain name <grouplagardere.com> was registered on 18 March 2026, and its registrant is gerard dupuis.

The disputed domain name <lagarderegestion.com> was registered on 25 February 2026, and its registrant is Anne Boiteux.

The disputed domain name <conseillerlagardere.com> was registered on 26 February 2026, and its registrant is Manon Fournier.

The disputed domain names are inactive. The disputed domain names <contactlagardere.com> and <grouplagardere.com> have mail exchanger ("MX") servers configured.

PARTIES CONTENTIONS

COMPLAINANT

The Complainant states that the disputed domain names are confusingly similar to the LAGARDERE trademark, as they incorporate the trademark in its entirety. The Complainant asserts that the addition of the French language terms "conseiller" (in English, "advise" or "advisor"), "contact", "group" or "gestion" (in English, "management") does not change the overall impression that the disputed domain names are connected to the LAGARDERE trademark and does not preclude a finding of confusingly similar to it.

The Complainant asserts that the Respondents have no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the disputed domain names, because they are not related to the Complainant and do not carry out any activities for it. The Complainant adds that it has not authorised the Respondents to use the LAGARDERE trademark or to apply for registration of the disputed domain names.

The Complainant points out that the disputed domain names are not used for websites, and submits that the Respondents have not used the disputed domain names since their registration, except for fraudulent purposes as part of a phishing scheme, passing themselves off as employees of the Complainant.

The Complainant contends that the disputed domain names were registered and are being used in bad faith. It notes that the disputed domain names were registered many years after the Complainant had established a strong reputation and goodwill in its LAGARDERE trademark, and that a Google search with the keywords "lagardere gestion", "contact lagardere", "conseiller lagardere" and "group lagardere" returns only results related to the Complainant. According to the Complainant, the Respondents have registered the disputed domain names with full knowledge of the Complainant's LAGARDERE trademark.

The Complainant notes that the disputed domain names <contactlagardere.com> and <grouplagardere.com> have MX servers configured, which suggests that they may be used for email purposes.

RESPONDENTS:

The Respondents did not submit any Response in this proceeding.

RIGHTS

The Complainant has, to the satisfaction of the Panel, shown the disputed domain names are confusingly similar to the LAGARDERE trademark 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 names (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 names have been registered and are being used in bad faith (within the meaning of paragraph 4(a)(iii) of the Policy).

PROCEDURAL FACTORS

Consolidation of the Respondents

The amended Complaint was filed in relation to nominally different domain name registrants. The Complainant alleges that the disputed domain names are under the control of the same person. It requests the consolidation of the Complaint against the multiple disputed domain name registrants pursuant to paragraph 10(e) of the Rules.

In support of its consolidation request, the Complainant points out that the registrants of all disputed domain names have participated in the same phishing scheme using the same email address, and all of them have indicated Proton.me email addresses to the Registrars. According to the Complainant, the combination of these factors supports a conclusion that the four disputed domain names are under common control.

The registrants of the disputed domain names have not made any comments on the Complainant's consolidation request and have not disputed any of its supporting arguments or evidence.

Paragraph 3(c) of the Rules states that a complaint may relate to more than one domain name, provided that the domain names are registered by the same domain name holder.

In addressing the Complainant's request, the Panel will consider whether (i) the disputed domain names or corresponding websites are subject to common control; and (ii) the consolidation would be fair and equitable to all Parties. See WIPO Overview of WIPO Panel Views on Select UDRP Questions ("WIPO Overview 3.1"), section 4.11.2.

The Panel notes that the four disputed domain names were registered within a short period of time and share a similar naming pattern combining the LAGARDERE trademark with dictionary words, and the evidence submitted by the Complainant supports its arguments that the disputed domain names have been used for a phishing scheme impersonating the Complainant. In the absence of any contrary evidence, this leads the Panel to the conclusion that it is more likely than not that the disputed domain names are under common control.

As regards fairness and equity, the Panel is not aware of any reason why the consolidation of the disputes in respect of the four disputed domain names would be unfair or inequitable to any Party.

Therefore, the Panel decides to consolidate the disputes regarding the nominally different disputed domain name registrants in a single proceeding. Accordingly, the two Respondents will hereinafter be collectively referred to as "the Respondent".

Having resolved the above issue, the Panel is satisfied that all procedural requirements under UDRP have been met and there is no reason why it would be inappropriate to issue a decision.

PRINCIPAL REASONS FOR THE DECISION

Pursuant to the Policy, paragraph 4(a), a complainant must prove each of the following to justify the transfer of a domain name:

(i) the domain name is identical or confusingly similar to a trademark or service mark in which the complainant has rights;

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

(iii) the domain name was registered and is being used in bad faith.

Identical or confusingly similar

It is well accepted that the first 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 names. WIPO Overview 3.1, section 1.7.

The Complainant has established that it has rights in respect of the LAGARDERE trademark for the purposes of the Policy. WIPO Overview 3.1, section 1.2.1.

The LAGARDERE trademark is easily recognisable within the disputed domain names. Accordingly, the disputed domain names are confusingly similar to the LAGARDERE trademark for the purposes of the Policy. WIPO Overview 3.1, section 1.7.

Although the addition of other terms (here, the dictionary words “conseiller”, “contact”, “group” or “gestion”) may bear on assessment of the second and third elements, the Panel finds the addition of such terms does not prevent a finding of confusing similarity between the disputed domain names and the LAGARDERE trademark for the purposes of the Policy. WIPO Overview 3.1, section 1.8.

The Panel therefore finds that the disputed domain names are confusingly similar to the Complainant’s LAGARDERE trademark, and that the Complainant has established the first element of the Policy.

Rights and legitimate interests

Although the overall burden of proof in UDRP proceedings is on the complainant, panels have recognised that proving that 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 (although the burden of proof always remains on the complainant). If the respondent fails to come forward with such relevant evidence, the complainant is deemed to have satisfied the second element. WIPO Overview 3.1, section 2.1.

Having reviewed the available record, the Panel finds the Complainant has established a prima facie case that the Respondent lacks rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain names. The Respondent has not rebutted the Complainant’s prima facie showing and has not come forward with any relevant evidence demonstrating rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain names such as those enumerated in the Policy or otherwise.

The disputed domain names are confusingly similar to the Complainant’s LAGARDERE trademark, which was first registered 26 years earlier, and has been extensively used in many countries. The disputed domain names are combinations of the LAGARDERE trademark with terms related to business activities or services, and imply an affiliation with the Complainant. WIPO Overview 3.1, section 2.5.1.

The evidence submitted by the Complainant shows that email addresses set up with three of the disputed domain names have been used for a phishing scheme impersonating the Complainant through the use of its contact details, trademark and logo, which also involves the fourth disputed domain name. As discussed in section 2.13.1 of the WIPO Overview 3.1, UDRP panels have held that the use of a domain name for an illegitimate activity such as phishing or identity theft can never confer rights or legitimate interests on a respondent.

In view of the above, the Panel finds that the Respondent does not have rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain names, so the Complainant has established the second element of the Policy.

Bad faith

The Panel notes that, for the purposes of paragraph 4(a)(iii) of the Policy, paragraph 4(b) of the Policy establishes circumstances, in particular, but without limitation, that, if found by the Panel to be present, shall be evidence of the registration and use of a domain name in bad faith.

Paragraph 4(b) of the Policy sets out a list of non-exhaustive circumstances that may indicate that a domain name was registered and used in bad faith, but other circumstances may be relevant in assessing whether a respondent’s registration and use of a domain name is in bad faith. WIPO Overview 3.1, section 3.2.1.

Panels have held that the use of a domain name for an illegitimate activity such as phishing or identity theft constitutes bad faith. WIPO Overview 3.1, section 3.4. As discussed in the previous section, the Complainant has submitted evidence that the disputed domain names have been used for a phishing scheme impersonating the Complainant in an attempt to collect personal data of Internet users. The Respondent has not disputed the allegations of the Complainant or the supporting evidence submitted by it.

Considering the above, the Panel concludes that the Respondent has registered and used the disputed domain names in bad faith under the Policy, and 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. **contactlagardere.com**: Transferred
2. **grouplagardere.com**: Transferred
3. **lagarderegestion.com**: Transferred
4. **conseillerlagardere.com**: Transferred

PANELLISTS

Name	Assen Alexiev

DATE OF PANEL DECISION 2026-04-24

Publish the Decision