Decision for dispute CAC-UDRP-108543

Case number	CAC-UDRP-108543
Time of filing	2026-04-01 10:04:20
Domain names	clientlagardere.com, espacelagardere.com

Case administrator

Name	Olga Slanařová (Case admin)

Complainant

Organization	LAGARDERE SA

Complainant representative

Organization	NAMESHIELD S.A.S.

Respondents

Name	Gilbert Allot
Name	Arthur Leclair

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 multiple trademark registrations incorporating LAGARDERE, including, inter alia:

- LAGARDERE, international word mark registered with the World Intellectual Property Organization (“WIPO”) under No. 751186, on October 18, 2000 in classes 9, 16 35, 38, 41 and 42; and

- LAGARDERE, international word mark registered with the WIPO under No. 954315 on August 31, 2007 in classes 3, 6, 9, 14, 16, 18, 20, 21, 22, 24, 25, 28, 34, 35, 36, 38, 39, 41, 42, 43, 44 and 45; and

- LAGARDERE, international word mark registered with the WIPO under No. 989729 on February 29, 2008 in classes 5, 7, 10, 12, 27, 30, 32 and 37.

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

The Complainant is an international group founded in 1992, operating in over 50 countries worldwide. It employs more than 33,000

people and generated revenue of €9,353 million in 2025. The Group is structured around two main business lines: Lagardère Publishing and Lagardère Travel Retail, which hold leading positions in global and national markets. The Complainant has also operated domain names <lagardere.com> since August 2, 1995; and <lagardere-groupe.com> registered since July 7, 2003.

The disputed domain names were registered on March 24, 2026. The disputed domain names do not resolve to active websites.

PARTIES CONTENTIONS

The Complainant

The Complainant asserts that each of the elements enumerated in paragraph 4(a) of the Policy and the corresponding provisions in the Rules have been satisfied. In particular, the Complainant asserts that:

(1) the disputed domain names are confusingly similar to the Complainant's trademark, since they incorporate the LAGARDERE mark and the addition of the terms "client" and "espace" does not prevent a finding of confusing similarity with the Complainant's LAGARDERE trademark, which remains clearly recognizable. The addition of the ".com" extension does not prevent confusion;

(2) the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the disputed domain names. The Respondent is not affiliated with the Complainant, has no license or authorization to use the LAGARDERE mark, and is not commonly known by the disputed domain names. The Complainant contends that the Respondent did not make any use of the disputed domain names since the registration, and it confirms that the Respondent has no demonstrable plan to use them. Such conduct negates any claim of legitimate interests.

(3) The disputed domain names were registered and are being used in bad faith. Registering the disputed domain names so obviously connected to a well-known mark without authorization is itself evidence of bad faith. The disputed names were registered on March 24, 2026, many years after the Complainant had established a strong reputation and significant goodwill worldwide. Since the disputed domain names incorporate the Complainant's the LAGARDERE mark, there is reason to believe that the Respondent registered the disputed domain names with full knowledge of the Complainant's trademark. Passive holding of the disputed domain names does not prevent a finding of bad faith.

The Complainant requests transfer of the disputed domain names.

The Respondent

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

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

Preliminary Issue: Consolidation

The amended Complaint was filed in relation to nominally different domain name registrants. The Complainant alleges that the domain name registrants are the same entity or mere alter egos of each other, or under common control. The Complainant requests the consolidation of the Complaint against the multiple disputed domain name registrants pursuant to paragraph 10(e) of the Rules.

The disputed domain name registrants did not comment on the Complainant's request.

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 Selected UDRP Questions, Edition 3.1 ("WIPO Overview 3.1"), section 4.11.2.

As regards common control, the Panel notes that the disputed domain names were registered on the same date through the same registrar and that the corresponding registrant contact details indicate the use of Proton.me email services and a common geographic location in France. The disputed domain names follow a naming pattern consisting of the trademark LAGARDERE, the words "client" and "espace" and the generic Top-Level Domain ".com" and both redirect to inactive websites. This gives the Panel reason to find that these two disputed domain names are under common control.

As regards fairness and equity, the Panel sees no reason why consolidation of the disputes would be unfair or inequitable to any Party.

Accordingly, the Panel decides to consolidate the disputes regarding the nominally different disputed domain names registrants (referred to below as "the Respondent") in a single proceeding.

Substantive issues

To succeed, in a UDRP complaint, complainant must demonstrate that all the elements listed in paragraph 4(a) of the Policy have been satisfied, as following:

1) that the disputed domain name registered by the Respondent are identical or confusingly similar to a trademark in which the Complainant has rights;

2) that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the disputed domain name; and

3) that the disputed domain names have been registered or are being used in bad faith.

The Respondent had 20 days to submit a response in accordance with paragraph 5(a) of the Rules and failed to do so. Paragraph 5(f) of the Rules establishes that if a respondent does not respond to the Complaint, the Panel's decision shall be based upon the Complaint. The Complainant bears the burden of proving that all these requirements are fulfilled, even if the Respondent has not replied to the Complainant's contentions.

However, concerning the uncontested information provided by the Complainant, the Panel may, where relevant, accept the provided reasonable factual allegations in the Complaint as true. See WIPO Overview 3.1, section 4.3.

The Panel will further analyze the potential concurrence of the above circumstances.

Moreover, the Panel has taken note of the WIPO Overview 3.1 and, where appropriate, will decide consistent with the consensus views captured therein.

Identical or Confusingly Similar

According to paragraph 4(a)(i) of the Policy, it should be established that the disputed domain names are identical or confusingly similar to a mark in which the Complainant has rights.

The Complainant has demonstrated ownership of its LAGARDERE trademark in various jurisdictions. The Panel is therefore satisfied that the Complainant has valid registered trademark rights. See WIPO Overview 3.1, section 1.2.1.

With the Complainant's trademark rights established, the remaining question under the first element of the Policy is whether the disputed domain names are identical or confusingly similar to the Complainant's mark. As clarified in WIPO Overview 3.1, section 1.7, this element primarily serves as a standing requirement, and the test for confusing similarity involves a reasoned but relatively straightforward comparison between the Complainant's mark and the disputed domain name, focusing on whether the Complainant's mark is recognizable within the domain name.

The Panel finds that the disputed domain names are confusingly similar to the Complainant's LAGARDERE trademark, as it directly and entirely incorporate the Complainant's registered trademark LAGARDERE, together with the addition of the terms "client" and "espace". The addition of a descriptive term does not prevent a finding of confusing similarity, as the Complainant's LAGARDERE mark remains clearly recognizable and constitutes the dominant element of the disputed domain names. See WIPO Overview 3.1, section 1.8.

In line with established UDRP practice, the generic Top-Level Domain ".com" is disregarded when assessing confusing similarity. See WIPO Overview 3.1, section 1.11.

The Panel therefore concludes that the disputed domain names are confusingly similar to a trademark in which the Complainant has rights, and the requirement under paragraph 4(a)(i) of the Policy is satisfied.

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.

While the overall burden of proof remains with the Complainant, UDRP panels have consistently recognized that requiring a complainant to prove a negative would often be impracticable, as the relevant evidence concerning a respondent's rights or legitimate interests is typically within the respondent's knowledge. Accordingly, once the Complainant establishes a prima facie case that the Respondent lacks rights or legitimate interests, the burden of production shifts to the Respondent to demonstrate such rights or legitimate interests under paragraph 4(c) of the Policy.

In the present case, the Complainant has not authorized the Respondent to use its LAGARDERE trademark in any manner. The record further shows that the Respondent is not, and has never been, a licensee of the Complainant, nor has it been permitted to register or use the Complainant's trademark or any domain name incorporating it. There is no evidence that the Respondent is affiliated with the Complainant, nor that the Respondent is commonly known by the disputed domain names or any corresponding name within the meaning of paragraph 4(c)(ii) of the Policy.

The Respondent's use of the disputed domain names does not constitute a bona fide offering of goods or services within the meaning of the Policy. The evidence shows that the disputed domain names are not used for any active website or genuine business purpose. Such passive holding of the disputed domain names and non-operational content does not constitute a bona fide offering of goods or services under paragraph 4(c)(i) of the Policy and WIPO Overview 3.1 sections 2.2. There is no evidence that, before notice of the dispute, the Respondent made any demonstrable preparations to use the disputed domain names in connection with a legitimate offering of goods or services. Nor does the Respondent's conduct qualify as a legitimate noncommercial or fair use of the disputed domain names under paragraph 4(c)(iii) of the Policy. In the absence of any legitimate use, the Respondent has failed to demonstrate rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name.

Accordingly, the Complainant has established a strong prima facie case that the Respondent lacks rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain names. The Respondent has failed to rebut this case or to provide any evidence demonstrating rights or legitimate interests under paragraph 4(c) of the Policy.

Accordingly, the Complainant has satisfied paragraph 4(a)(ii) of the Policy.

Registered and Used in Bad Faith

According to paragraph 4(a)(iii) of the Policy, the Complainant must prove on the balance of probabilities both that the disputed domain name was registered in bad faith and that it is being used in bad faith.

The Complainant's LAGARDERE trademark registrations significantly predate the registration of the disputed domain names. The evidence shows that the Complainant's trademarks were registered and had already gained substantial recognition well before the Respondent registered the disputed domain names in 2026. The Complainant's marks are distinctive and well known in the field of publishing and travel retail, with operations in more than 50 countries worldwide.

The Respondent's incorporation of the Complainant's LAGARDERE trademark in its entirety, combined with the descriptive terms "client" and "espace" and the gTLD ".com" strongly indicates that the Respondent was fully aware of the Complainant and its reputation at the time of registration. Given the distinctiveness of the mark and the Complainant's extensive public presence, it is inconceivable that the Respondent independently selected the disputed domain names without prior knowledge of the Complainant.

This inference of knowledge is further reinforced by the Respondent's creation of two websites that incorporate the LAGARDERE mark without authorization in the disputed domain names. The disputed domain names were registered on the same date, through the same registrar, using Proton.me email services, and indicating a common geographic location in France. Taken together with the redirects and the coordinated use of the Complainant's LAGARDERE mark, these circumstances support the inference that the domain names form part of a deliberate scheme to exploit the Complainant's reputation.

On the balance of the evidence, the Panel finds that the Respondent's registration of the disputed domain names was motivated by the notoriety and goodwill of the Complainant's LAGARDERE trademark. The Respondent's use of the disputed domain names to host a deceptive, imitation website constitutes a classic example of bad faith under paragraph 4(b)(iv) of the Policy, which applies where a respondent intentionally attempts to attract Internet users for commercial gain by creating a likelihood of confusion with the complainant's mark as to source, sponsorship, affiliation, or endorsement.

Although the disputed domain names do not resolve to active websites, Panels have consistently held that passive holding does not preclude a finding of bad faith. Considering the reputation of the Complainant's mark, the composition of the disputed domain name, and the Respondent's failure to submit any Response, the Panel finds that the passive holding of the disputed domain names in this case supports, rather than negates, a finding of bad faith. WIPO Overview 3.1, section 3.3.

Taken together, these circumstances demonstrate a deliberate and sustained effort by the Respondent to exploit the Complainant's

reputation and to mislead consumers for commercial gain.

Accordingly, the disputed domain names were both registered and 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. **clientlagardere.com**: Transferred
2. **espacelagardere.com**: Transferred

PANELLISTS

Name	**Ganna Prokhorova**

DATE OF PANEL DECISION 2026-05-08

Publish the Decision