Decision for dispute CAC-UDRP-108591

Case number	CAC-UDRP-108591
Time of filing	2026-04-17 16:04:45
Domain names	saints-gobain.cam

Case administrator

Name	Olga Slanařová (Case admin)

Complainant

Organization	COMPAGNIE DE SAINT-GOBAIN

Complainant representative

Organization	NAMESHIELD S.A.S.

Respondent

Name	Investor Goldrich

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 (the "Domain Name").

IDENTIFICATION OF RIGHTS

The Complainant is the owner of various trade mark registrations around the world that comprise or incorporate the term “Saint-Gobain”. These include international trade mark registration n° 740183 for "SAINT-GOBAIN" as a word mark with a registration date of 26 July 2000 in classes 1, 2, 3, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 17, 19, 20, 21, 22, 23, 24, 37, 38, 40 and 42. This international mark is based on an earlier French trade mark and has proceeded to registration, and remains registered, to at least some degree in approximately 70 other jurisdictions.

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

FACTS ASSERTED BY THE COMPLAINANT AND NOT CONTESTED BY THE RESPONDENT

The Complainant is a French company specialised in the production, processing and distribution of materials for the construction and industrial markets.

It has operated for more than 360 years, and is now one of the top industrial groups in the world with around 46.5 billion euros in turnover in 2025 and 162,000 employees.

The Complainant also owns many domain names including its trade mark SAINT-GOBAIN, These include the domain name <saint-gobain.com> registered on December 29, 1995, which has been used for a longstanding website to promote the Complainant's business.

SAINT-GOBAIN is also commonly used to designate the company name of the Complainant.

The Domain Name was registered on April 14, 2026 and resolves to an index page .MX servers are also configured for the Domain Name.

PARTIES CONTENTIONS

The Complainant contends that the requirements of the Policy have been met and that the 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 Domain Name is identical or confusingly similar to a trade mark 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 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 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

The Panel accepts (as the Complainant alleges) that this is a case of deliberate typosquatting. The most sensible reading of the Domain Name is as a misspelling of the Complainant's name and trade mark, with an additional letter “s” after the word “Saint”, combined with the ".cam" Top Level Domain (“TLD”). The additional letter "s" and the use of the “.cam” instead of the “.com” TLD, are also the only differences between the Domain Name and the domain name used by Complainant for its business.

It follows from this that the Complainant's mark is clearly recognisable in the Domain Name and that the Complainant thereby holds a mark that is "confusingly similar" to the Domain Name as that term is understood under the Policy. In this respect see section 1.7 and 1.9 the WIPO Overview of WIPO Panel Views on Selected UDRP Questions, Third Edition (the “WIPO Overview 3.1”). The Complainant has, therefore, made out the requirements of paragraph 4(a)(i) of the Policy.

Further, typosquatting usually signals an intention on the part of the respondent to confuse users seeking or expecting the complainant (see section 1.9 of the WIPO Overview 3.1). There is no right or legitimate interest in holding a domain name for that purpose and this also usually constitutes evidence that no such right or legitimate interest exists. Also, the registration and holding of a domain name to take advantage of such actual or potential confusion will usually involve bad faith registration and use (see sections 3.1.4 and 3.2.1 of WIPO Overview 3.1) and the Panel holds that this is so in this case.

The Complainant has, therefore, made out the requirements of paragraph 4(a)(ii) and 4(a)(iii) of the Policy.

The Panel also notes the Complainant’s contentions about the Domain Name being set up with MX records, but there is no evidence

before it that the Domain Name has been used for email. Further, the Panel understands that many registrars configure those records as a matter of course and that this is not necessarily a reliable indicator of a complainant's intentions. However, the Panel does not need to make any findings in this respect for it to come to its decision in this case.

FOR ALL THE REASONS STATED ABOVE, THE COMPLAINT IS

Accepted

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

1. **saints-gobain.cam**: Transferred

PANELLISTS

Name	**Matthew Harris**

DATE OF PANEL DECISION 2026-05-13

Publish the Decision