Decision for dispute CAC-UDRP-108563

Case number	CAC-UDRP-108563
Time of filing	2026-04-08 16:54:33
Domain names	saintgobaincarcare.com

Case administrator

Name	Olga Slanařová (Case admin)

Complainant

Organization	COMPAGNIE DE SAINT-GOBAIN

Complainant representative

Organization	NAMESHIELD S.A.S.

Respondent

Name	Jaijeeth J

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 proprietor of the following (among other) international marks:

- no. 740183 for the mark SAINT-GOBAIN registered on 26 July 2000 in classes 1-3, 6-12, 17, 19-24, 37, 38, 40 and 42;
- no. 740184 for a logo consisting primarily of the words SAINT-GOBAIN also registered on 26 July 2000 in classes 1-3, 6-12, 17, 19-24, 37, 38, 40 and 42;
- no. 551682 for the same logo, registered on 21 July 1989 in classes 1, 6, 7, 9, 11, 12, 16, 17, 19-24, 37, 39 and 41.

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

The Complainant is a major French company specialising in the production, processing and distribution of materials for the construction and industrial markets. It had a turnover of around 46.5 billion Euros in 2025 and around 161,000 employees.

It has registered trademarks consisting wholly or primarily of the words "SAINT-GOBAIN" as stated above. It is also the registrant of many domain names containing these words, including <saint-gobain.com> which was registered on 29 December 1995.

The disputed domain name, <saint-gobaincarcare.com> was registered on 26 March 2026 and locates a website offering the Complainant's goods and other competing goods.

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 Panel finds that the Complainant has registered rights in the mark SAINT-GOBAIN. The Panel further considers that the disputed domain name is confusingly similar with this mark, from which it differs only in the addition of the descriptive words "carcare" and the generic top level domain suffix, ".com". These differences are insufficient to avert confusion.

Accordingly, 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 Panel notes that the Respondent has used the disputed domain name to locate a website offering the Complainant's and other products. The Complainant does not dispute that the products and the offer to supply them are genuine.

However, in line with the decision in Oki Data Americas, Inc. v ASD, Inc., WIPO Case No. D2001-0903, the Panel considers that the use of a domain name by a respondent to locate a website offering a complainant's products cannot constitute fair use giving rise to a right or legitimate interest in the domain name in accordance with paragraph 4(a)(ii) of the Policy unless certain conditions are satisfied.

These conditions include that the respondent is using the site to sell only the complainant's products placed on the market under the relevant mark and that the site must accurately and prominently disclose the respondent's relationship (or lack of relationship) with the complainant. Neither of these conditions is satisfied in this case.

On the material in the case file, there is no other basis on which the Respondent could claim any right or legitimate interests in respect of the disputed domain name.

In these circumstances, 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 Panel finds on the balance of probabilities that the Respondent has used the disputed domain name with the intention of attracting Internet users to its website for commercial gain by creating a likelihood of confusion with the Complainant's marks as to the source, sponsorship, affiliation or endorsement of that website.

In accordance with paragraph 4(b)(iv) of the Policy, this constituted evidence of registration and use of the disputed domain name in bad faith. This presumption is not controverted by any contrary evidence in the file.

Accordingly, 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.

FOR ALL THE REASONS STATED ABOVE, THE COMPLAINT IS

Accepted

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

1. **saintgobaincarcare.com**: Transferred

PANELLISTS

Name	**Jonathan Turner**

DATE OF PANEL DECISION 2026-05-21

Publish the Decision