Decision for dispute CAC-UDRP-108548

Case number	CAC-UDRP-108548
Time of filing	2026-04-02 09:59:33
Domain names	info-lagardere.com

Case administrator

Name	Olga Slanařová (Case admin)

Complainant

Organization	LAGARDERE SA

Complainant representative

Organization	NAMESHIELD S.A.S.

Respondent

Name	Richard Honore

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

According to the submitted evidence, the Complainant owns, among many others, the following trademark registrations:

-International trademark for LAGARDERE (word mark), Reg. No. 751186, registered on October 18, 2000, in force until October 18, 2030, in International Classes ("ICs") 9, 16, 35, 38, 41, and 42;

-International trademark for LAGARDERE (and design mark), Reg. No. 954315, registered on August 31, 2007, in force until August 31, 2027, in ICs 3, 6, 9, 14, 16, 18, 20, 21, 22, 24, 25, 28, 34, 35, 36, 38, 39, 41, 42, 43, 44, and 45;

-International trademark for LAGARDÈRE (word mark), Reg. No. 989729, registered on February 29, 2008, in force until February 28, 2028, in ICs 5, 7, 10, 12, 27, 30, 32, and 37.

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

The Complainant is a French company founded in 1992, with operations and a group of companies in more than 50 countries worldwide, employing more than 33,000 people, and generating revenue of EUR9,353 million in 2025. The Complainant's LAGARDERE trademark has been extensively used for more than 20 years, and its reputation has been recognized in many countries, including by previous UDRP panelists[1].

The Complainant is focused on two main lines of business: Lagardère Publishing (book publishing) and Lagardère Travel Retail (travel retail).

The Complainant´s business scope also comprises Lagardère Live, which includes Lagardère News (Le Joumal du Dimanche, LeJDNews, Le JDMagand the Elle brand licence), Lagardère Radio (Europe 1, Europe 2, et al.), Lagardère Live Entertainment (venue management, production of concerts and shows, hosting and local promotional services), and Lagardère Paris Racing (sports club).

The Complainant also owns the domain names <lagardere.com> registered on August 2, 1995, and <lagardere-groupe.com> registered on July 7, 2003.

The disputed domain name **<info-lagardere.com>** was registered on **March 30, 2026**.

According to the Complainant's submitted evidence, the disputed domain name resolves to an inactive website, as of the time of this Decision, with Mail Exchange ("MX") servers configured.

[1] LAGARDERE SA v. Arnaud Crouzet et al. CAC-UDRP-108514; LAGARDERE SA v. Oxana Gavrilov, CAC-UDRP-107439; LAGARDERE SA v. Unlimited Cohen, Stella Kennion, Laurence CASTELNAU, Affing Aff, WIPO Case No. D2025-4895.

PARTIES CONTENTIONS

The Respondent did not reply to any of the Complainant's contentions.

Complainant Contentions (summary):

- The Complainant contends that the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to its trademark LAGARDERE; that the addition of the term "INFO" is not sufficient to escape the finding that the domain name is confusingly similar to the trademark and branded goods LAGARDERE. It does not change the overall impression of the designation as being connected to the Complainant's trademark LAGARDERE.

- The Complainant contends that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the disputed domain name since the Respondent is not commonly known by the disputed domain name, in particular given the results of the WhoIs; that the Respondent is not related in any way with the Complainant; that the Complainant does not carry out any activity for, nor has any business with the Respondent; neither license nor authorization has been granted to the Respondent to make any use of the Complainant's trademark LAGARDERE or apply for registration of the disputed domain name by the Complainant. Furthermore, the Respondent did not use the disputed domain name, and it confirms that the Respondent has no demonstrable plan to use the disputed domain name.

- Regarding the bad faith registration, the Complainant contends that, given the distinctiveness of the Complainant's trademark and reputation, it is reasonable to infer that the Respondent has registered the disputed domain name with full knowledge of the Complainant's trademark. Concerning the bad faith use, the Complainant contends that the Respondent has not demonstrated any activity in respect of the disputed domain name, and it is not possible to conceive of any plausible actual or contemplated active use of the domain name by the Respondent that would not be illegitimate, citing the Telstra Case. Finally, the Complainant contends that the disputed domain name has been set up with MX records, which suggests that it may be actively used for email purposes.

RIGHTS

The Complainant has, to the satisfaction of the Panel, shown the disputed domain name is 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

In accordance with Paragraph 4(a) of the Policy, the onus is on the Complainant to prove:

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

The Panel will consider each of these requirements in turn.

Identical or Confusingly Similar

Concerning the first element of the Policy, the Complainant has sufficiently proved before the Panel that owns trademark Rights over the term LAGARDERE. See WIPO Overview of WIPO Panel Views on Select UDRP Questions ("WIPO Overview 3.1"), section 1.2.1.

The disputed domain name is composed of the term "info", a hyphen, and the trademark LAGARDERE; such additions do not avoid a finding of confusing similarity to the Complainant´s trademark LAGARDERE. See WIPO Overview 3.1, section 1.8.

Regarding the generic Top-Level Domain (gTLD) ".com", it may be disregarded. See WIPO Overview 3.1, section 1.11.1.

The Panel finds that the first element of the Policy has been satisfied.

Rights or Legitimate Interests

Concerning the Second Element of the Policy, to this Panel it is clear that:

(1) The Respondent is not associated with or affiliated with or hasn't been authorized or licensed by the Complainant to register the disputed domain name.

(2) There is no evidence that the Respondent corresponds or has become commonly known by the term "info-lagardere.com".

(3) Nothing in the record suggests or infers any fair or non-commercial use of the disputed domain name, in particular given its lack of activity and/or potential use for illegal activities, i.e., malicious emails, or other types of fraud.

According to the evidence submitted by the Complainant and the absence of Response, the Panel finds that the Complainant has made out its prima facie case. 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 name, such as those enumerated in the Policy or otherwise. See WIPO Overview 3.1, section 2.1.

Furthermore, the Panel finds that there is no favorable evidence towards the Respondent concerning the composition of the disputed domain name, which suggests sponsorship or endorsement by the trademark owner. See WIPO Overview 3.1, section 2.5.1.

The Panel finds that the second element of the Policy has been satisfied.

Registered and Used in Bad Faith

Registration in Bad Faith:

In this case, according to the evidence provided, by the time the Respondent registered the disputed domain name, the Complainant had already established its trademark Rights, especially in France, at least since 2000.

The composition of the disputed domain name is not coincidental, in particular given the nature and extensive use and reputation

associated with the Complainant's business activities and its trademark. Therefore, to this Panel, it is clear that the Respondent registered the disputed domain name, with the Complainant's LAGARDERE trademark in mind. See WIPO Overview 3.1, section 3.2.2.

Use 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. See WIPO Overview 3.1, section 3.2.1.

In this case, the disputed domain name has remained inactive since its registration. The absence of an active website with configured MX records does not mitigate the damages; on the contrary, it exacerbates them, as it constitutes an imminent harm that, under no circumstances, can remain unnoticed. See WIPO Overview 3.1, section 3.4.

To this Panel, such inactive use—in particular given (i) the extended and worldwide presence of the Complainant's business activities and its LAGARDERE trademark, (ii) the failure of the Respondent to submit a response or to provide any evidence of actual or contemplated good-faith use, and (iii) the implausibility of any good-faith use to which the disputed domain name may be put—applies under the passive holding doctrine. See WIPO Overview 3.1, section 3.3.

The Panel finds that the third element of the Policy has been satisfied.

FOR ALL THE REASONS STATED ABOVE, THE COMPLAINT IS

Accepted

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

1. **info-lagardere.com**: Transferred

PANELLISTS

Name	**María Alejandra López García**

DATE OF PANEL DECISION 2026-04-29

Publish the Decision