Decision for dispute CAC-UDRP-108511

Case number	CAC-UDRP-108511
Time of filing	2026-03-23 09:40:07
Domain names	saints-goblain.com

Case administrator

Organization	Iveta Špiclová (Czech Arbitration Court) (Case admin)

Complainant

Organization	COMPAGNIE DE SAINT-GOBAIN

Complainant representative

Organization	NAMESHIELD S.A.S.

Respondent

Name	vijayapal Reddy

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 invokes various trademarks including the following:

- International trademark SAINT-GOBAIN No. 551682 registered on July 21, 1989, covering goods and services in classes 1, 6, 7, 9, 11, 12, 16, 17, 19, 20, 21, 22, 23, 24, 37, 39 and 41;
- International trademark SAINT-GOBAIN No. 740183 registered on July 26, 2000, covering goods and services in classes 1, 2, 3, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 17, 19, 20, 21, 22, 23, 24, 37, 38, 40 and 42, and covering the USA.

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

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

The Complainant is the owner of various registered trademarks including an international mark SAINT-GOBAIN in numerous classes since 2000 and covering the USA. The Complainant also owns and operates domain names such as <saint-gobain.com>.

The disputed domain name <saints-goblain.com> has been registered on March 16, 2026. The disputed domain name currently

does not resolve to an active website but, according to the Complainant's evidence, MX records have been configured.

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

Paragraph 15 of the Rules provides that the Panel is to decide the complaint on the basis of the statements and documents submitted in accordance with the Policy, the Rules and any rules and principles of law that it deems applicable.

The onus is on the Complainant to make out its case and it is apparent, both from the terms of the Policy and the decisions of past UDRP panels, that the Complainant must show that all three elements set out in Paragraph 4 (a) of the Policy have been established before any order can be made to transfer a domain name. As the proceedings are administrative, the standard of proof is the balance of probabilities.

Thus, for the Complainant to succeed it must prove, within the meaning of Paragraph 4(a) of the Policy and on the balance of probabilities that:

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

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.

The Panel has therefore dealt with each of these requirements in turn.

1. Identity of confusing similarity

The Complainant must first establish that there is a trademark or service mark in which it has rights. Since the Complainant shows to be the holder of the registered SAINT-GOBAIN trademark, which is used in connection with the Complainant's manufacturing business, it is established that there is a trademark in which the Complainant has rights.

The disputed domain name <saints-goblain.com> appears to be a misspelling of the Complainant's SAINT-GOBAIN trademark: a letter "s" and a letter "l" have been added. The Panel finds that these small changes do not prevent the disputed domain name from being confusingly similar to the Complainant's mark and may qualify as "typosquatting" (see section 1.9 of the WIPO Overview 3.1).

It is well established that the Top-Level Domains ("TLDs") such as ".com" may be disregarded when considering whether the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to the trademark in which the Complainant has rights (see section 1.11 WIPO Overview 3.1).

For these reasons, the Panel finds that the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to the Complainant's trademark. Accordingly, the Complainant has made out the first of the three elements that it must establish.

2. No rights or legitimate interests

Under paragraph 4(a)(ii) of the Policy, the Complainant has the burden of establishing that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the disputed domain name.

It is established case law that it is sufficient for the Complainant to make a prima facie showing that the Respondent has no right or legitimate interest in the disputed domain name in order to shift the burden of proof to the Respondent (see section 2.1 WIPO Overview 3.1 and Champion Innovations, Ltd. V. Udo Dussling (45FHH), WIPO case No. D2005-1094; Croatia Airlines d.d. v. Modern Empire Internet Ltd., WIPO case No. D2003-0455; Belupo d.d. v. WACHEM d.o.o., WIPO case No. 2004-0110).

The Panel notes that the Respondent does not seem to be commonly known by the disputed domain name and that the Respondent has not acquired trademark or service mark rights. According to the information provided by the Registrar, the Respondent is known as "vijayapal Reddy". The Respondent's use and registration of the disputed domain name was not authorized by the Complainant. There are no indications that a connection between the Complainant and the Respondent existed.

Fundamentally, a respondent's use of a domain name will not be considered "fair" if it falsely suggests affiliation with the trademark owner. The correlation between a domain name and the complainant's mark is often central to this inquiry. In this case, given the distinctive character of the Complainant's mark, the Panel finds that the disputed domain name can be considered as a typosquatted version of the mark as it simply adds two letters, one in each word of the mark. The disputed domain name is also almost identical to the Complainant's domain name <saint-gobain.com> linked to the Complainant's official website, which further increases the risk of implied affiliation.

Beyond looking at the domain name and the nature of any additional terms appended to it, UDRP panels assess whether the overall facts and circumstances of the case, such as the absence of a response, support a fair use or not (see sections 2.5.2 and 2.5.3 of the WIPO Overview 3.1).

The disputed domain name does not appear to resolve to an active web page. In the Panel's view, this does not amount to any legitimate noncommercial or fair use or use in connection with a bona fide offering of goods and services.

The Respondent had the opportunity to demonstrate its rights or legitimate interests but did not do so. In the absence of a Response from the Respondent, the prima facie case established by the Complainant has not been rebutted.

Therefore, the Panel finds that the Complainant has established that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name. In light of the above, the Complainant succeeds on the second element of the Policy.

3. Bad faith

The Complainant must prove on the balance of probabilities that the disputed domain name was registered in bad faith and that it is being used in bad faith (see section 4.2 WIPO Overview 3.1 and e.g. Telstra Corporation Limited v. Nuclear Marshmallow, WIPO Case No. D2000-0003; Control Techniques Limited v. Lektronix Ltd, WIPO Case No. D2006-1052).

According to the Panel, the awareness of a respondent of the complainant and/or the complainant's trademark rights at the time of registration can evidence bad faith (see Red Bull GmbH v. Credit du Léman SA, Jean-Denis Deletraz, WIPO Case No. D2011-2209; Nintendo of America Inc v. Marco Beijen, Beijen Consulting, Pokemon Fan Clubs Org., and Pokemon Fans Unite, WIPO Case No. D2001-1070).

In the instant case, the Panel finds that the Respondent must have had knowledge of the Complainant's rights in the SAINT-GOBAIN trademark at the moment it registered the disputed domain name, since the disputed domain name corresponds to the Complainant's distinctive SAINT-GOBAIN trademark except for the addition of two letters. The Complainant invokes a trademark which predates the disputed domain name by more than 25 years, also covering the USA where the Respondent appears to reside. Moreover, the reputation of the Complainant's SAINT-GOBAIN trademark has been confirmed by at least one previous UDRP Panel (see Compagnie de Saint-Gobain v. On behalf of saintgobain-recherche.net owner, Whois Privacy Service / Grigore PODAC, WIPO Case No. D2020-3549).

The Panel further holds that the misspelling of the Complainant's mark in the disputed domain name is a form of typosquatting which is further evidence of bad faith (ESPN, Inc. v. XC2, WIPO Case No. D2005-0444; WestJet Airlines Ltd. v. Taranga Services Pty

Ltd, WIPO Case No. D2010-1814; and Compagnie Générale des Etablissements Michelin v. Terramonte Corp, Domain Manager, WIPO Case No. D2011-1951).

In the Panel's view, the fact that the disputed domain name does not resolve to an active website does not prevent a finding of bad faith under the doctrine of passive holding (see section 3.3 WIPO Overview 3.1).

Moreover, according to the Complainant's evidence, the disputed domain name has been set up with MX records which suggests that it may be actively used for e-mail purposes. In the above circumstances, the Panel finds that this is also indicative of bad faith.

Finally, the Respondent did not formally take part in the administrative proceedings. According to the Panel, this serves as an additional indication of the Respondent's bad faith.

Therefore, the Panel finds that, on the balance of probabilities, it is sufficiently shown that the disputed domain name was registered and is being used in bad faith. In light of the above, the Complainant also succeeds on the third and last 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. **saints-goblain.com**: Transferred

PANELLISTS

Name	**Flip Petillion**

DATE OF PANEL DECISION 2026-04-29

Publish the Decision