Decision for dispute CAC-UDRP-108601

Case number	CAC-UDRP-108601
Time of filing	2026-04-22 08:57:30
Domain names	saint-qobains.com

Case administrator

Name	Olga Slanařová (Case admin)

Complainant

Organization	COMPAGNIE DE SAINT-GOBAIN

Complainant representative

Organization	NAMESHIELD S.A.S.

Respondent

Name	Guillermo Fenoglio

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 is the owner of several trademarks SAINT-GOBAIN, registered worldwide, including but are not limited to the following:

- International trademark SAINT-GOBAIN No.740184 registered on 26 July 2000;
- International trademark SAINT-GOBAIN No.740183 registered on 26 July 2000;
- International trademark SAINT-GOBAIN No.596735 registered on 2 November 1992;
- International trademark SAINT-GOBAIN No.551682 registered on 21 July 1989.

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

The Complainant is a French company engaged in the production, processing, and distribution of materials for the construction and industrial markets. The Complainant is a recognized participant in the sustainable habitat and construction sectors, developing products and services intended to support sustainable construction and improve everyday living conditions.

Founded more than 360 years ago, the Complainant has established an international presence and operates worldwide. According to the information provided by the Complainant, it achieved a turnover of approximately EUR 46.5 billion in 2025 and employs more than 161,000 people globally.

The Complainant owns numerous trademark registrations for SAINT-GOBAIN, as well as domain names incorporating the mark, including <saint-gobain.com>, registered on 29 December 1995. SAINT-GOBAIN is also used as the Complainant's company name.

The Respondent appears to be an individual based in Cyprus.

The disputed domain name was registered on 19 April 2026.

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).

The Complainant submits that the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to its well-known and distinctive SAINT-GOBAIN trademark. According to the Complainant, the addition of the letter “s” and the substitution of the letter “g” with the letter “q” are insufficient to avoid a finding of confusing similarity. The Complainant contends that this constitutes a clear case of typosquatting, as the disputed domain name contains an obvious misspelling of the Complainant’s trademark. It is well established that minor spelling variations do not prevent a finding of confusing similarity between a disputed domain name and a complainant’s trademark.

The Complainant further submits that the addition of the “.com” generic Top-Level Domain (gTLD) does not alter the overall impression of the disputed domain name or prevent a likelihood of confusion with the Complainant’s trademark and associated domain name.

- Complainant's trademark: SAINT-GOBAIN
- Complainant's primary domain name: <saint-gobain.com> (SAINT-GOBAIN.COM)
- The disputed domain name: <saint-qobains .com> (SAINT-QOBAINS.COM)

By way of a side-by-side comparison, the Panel finds that the disputed domain name constitutes a typosquatted version of the Complainant’s trademark and is confusingly similar to it. See paragraph 1.9 of the WIPO Overview 3.1.

For the foregoing reasons, the Panel finds that the Complainant has satisfied 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). More specifically, the Complainant must first make a prima facie case that the Respondent lacks rights and legitimate interests in the disputed domain name, and the burden of proof then shifts to the Respondent to show it does have rights or legitimate interests. See PepsiCo, Inc. v Smith power production, 102378, (CAC 2019-03-08) ("The Panel finds that the Complainant has made out a prima facie case that arises from the considerations above. All of these matters go to make out the prima facie case against the Respondent. As the Respondent has not filed a Response or attempted by any other means to rebut the prima facie case against it, the Panel finds that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name.").

The Complainant submits that the Respondent is not commonly known by the disputed domain name, as reflected by the Whois information, and has not been authorized or licensed by the Complainant to use the SAINT-GOBAIN trademark.

The Complainant further contends that the disputed domain name constitutes a typosquatted version of its trademark and that it resolves to an inactive page, with no evidence of a bona fide offering of goods or services or legitimate noncommercial or fair use by the Respondent.

The Panel finds that the Complainant has established a prima facie case that the Respondent lacks rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name. As a result, the burden shifts to the Respondent to demonstrate such rights or legitimate interests. However, the Respondent has failed to submit any response within the prescribed time limit to rebut the Complainant’s assertions.

For the foregoing reasons, the Panel finds that the Complainant has satisfied paragraph 4(a)(ii) of the Policy.

BAD FAITH

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).

The Complainant submits that the disputed domain name was registered long after the Complainant had established rights in the well-known SAINT-GOBAIN trademark and after it had commenced use of its primary domain name <saint-gobain.com>. According to the Complainant, the Respondent was necessarily aware of the Complainant and its trademark at the time of registration.

The Complainant further contends that the disputed domain name constitutes an intentional misspelling of the SAINT-GOBAIN trademark, which supports a finding of typosquatting and bad faith.

In addition, the disputed domain name is inactive. The Complainant argues that there is no conceivable good faith use of the disputed domain name by the Respondent, particularly given the reputation of the Complainant's trademark. The Complainant also notes that MX records have been configured for the disputed domain name, indicating potential use for email purposes, which further supports an inference of bad faith.

Having considered the totality of the circumstances and in the absence of a timely Response, the Panel finds that it is more likely than not that the Respondent is targeting the Complainant and its SAINT-GOBAIN trademark. By registering a domain name comprising a typographical variation of the Complainant's well-known mark, the Respondent has demonstrated an intentional attempt to attract Internet users, for commercial gain, to the associated website or online location. The passive holding of the disputed domain name does not preclude a finding of bad faith registration and use. See JCDECAUX SE v. Buch Man, 108544 (CAC 2026-05-04). See also paragraph 3.1.4 of the WIPO Overview 3.1.

For the foregoing reasons, the Panel finds the Complainant has satisfied paragraph 4(a)(iii) of the Policy.

PROCEDURAL FACTORS

The Panel is satisfied that all procedural requirements under the UDRP were met and there is no other reason why it would be inappropriate to provide a decision.

PRINCIPAL REASONS FOR THE DECISION

Having established all three elements required under the UDRP Policy, the Panel concludes that the disputed domain name should be transferred to the Complainant.

FOR ALL THE REASONS STATED ABOVE, THE COMPLAINT IS

Accepted

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

1. **saint-qobains.com**: Transferred

PANELLISTS

Name	**Mr Paddy TAM**

DATE OF PANEL DECISION 2026-05-14

Publish the Decision