Decision for dispute CAC-UDRP-108647

Case number	CAC-UDRP-108647
Time of filing	2026-05-13 09:46:44
Domain names	lactaliscanadacorp.com

Case administrator

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

Complainant

Organization	Groupe Lactalis

Complainant representative

Organization	NAMESHIELD S.A.S.

Respondent

Organization	KINGPING

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 owns the LACTALIS mark, which enjoys thorough protection through many registrations worldwide.

The Complainant is, inter alia, the owner of:

European trademark LACTALIS (word) registration No. 1529833 registered on November 7, 2002;

International trademark LACTALIS (device) registration No. 900154 registered on July 27, 2006;

International trademark LACTALIS (device) registration No. 1135514 registered on September 20, 2012;

European trademark LACTALIS (device) registration No. 017959526 registered on May 22, 2019;

Canadian trademark LACTALIS (device) registration No. TMA92057 registered on November 16, 2015.

The Complainant is also the owner of the domain name <lactalis.com> registered on January 9, 1999.

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

FACTS ASSERTED BY THE COMPLAINANT AND NOT CONTESTED BY THE RESPONDENT:

Founded in 1933, the Complainant is a French multinational company engaged in the food industry, in particular the dairy sector.
The Complainant has been operating under the name “Lactalis” since 1999.
LACTALIS is the largest dairy products group in the world, with over 85,500 employees, 266 production sites, and a presence in 49 different countries.
Past panels have confirmed the notoriety of the LACTALIS trademark.

The disputed domain name <lactaliscanadacorp.com> was registered on April 27, 2026.

At the time of this decision the disputed domain resolves to a page where the message “Account suspended” is displayed. However, based on the evidence submitted by the Complainant, it appears that previously (at least on May 11, 2026) the disputed domain name resolved to a blog template (i.e. My WordPress Blog) without any substantial content.

PARTIES CONTENTIONS

COMPLAINANT:

The Complainant contends that:

1. The disputed domain name is confusingly similar to the Complainant's trademarks

The Complainant asserts that the addition of the terms “CANADA” and “CORP” is not sufficient to escape the finding that the domain name is confusingly similar to the trademark LACTALIS. On the contrary, according to the Complainant, it increases the likelihood of confusion, as these terms refer to the Complainant’s activities in Canada via its subsidiary LACTALIS CANADA.

The addition of a gTLD in a domain name is a technical requirement and thus such element may be disregarded when assessing whether a domain name is identical or confusingly similar to a trademark.

The Complainant concludes that the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to its LACTALIS trademark.

2. The Respondent does not have any rights or legitimate interest in the disputed domain name

The Complainant contends that the Respondent is not commonly known by the disputed domain name and that the Respondent is not affiliated with or authorized by the Complainant in any way. The Complainant contends that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the disputed domain name, and is not related to the Complainant’s business in any way. The Complainant does not carry out any activity for, nor does it have any business dealings with, the Respondent.

Therefore, the Complainant contends that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the disputed domain name.

3. The disputed domain name has been registered and is being used in bad faith

The Complainant contends that the Respondent could not be unaware of the existence of the LACTALIS trademark at the time of registration of the disputed domain name, not only because LACTALIS is a well-known trademark, but also in consideration of the nature of the domain name.

The Complainant further states that the Respondent has not demonstrated any activity in respect of the disputed domain name, and it is not possible to conceive of any plausible actual or contemplated active use of the disputed domain name by the Respondent that would not be illegitimate, such as passing-off, infringement of consumer protection legislation, or infringement of the Complainant’s rights under trademark law.

Finally, the Complainant states that a further indicator of bad faith may be inferred from the fact that the disputed domain name has been set up with MX records, which suggests that it may be actively used for e-mail purposes.

RESPONDENT:

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

1. A) Confusing similarity

The Panel finds the entirety of the Complainant’s trademark is reproduced and recognizable within the disputed domain name. Accordingly, the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to the mark for the purposes of the Policy.

Although the addition of other terms here, “Canada” and “corp”, may bear on assessment of the second and third elements, the Panel finds the addition of such terms does not prevent a finding of confusing similarity between the disputed domain name and the Complainant’s LACTALIS trademark for the purposes of the Policy.

Consequently, the disputed domain name appears to be confusingly similar with the Complainant's trademark.

1. B) Lack of legitimate rights or interests

The disputed domain name is a distinctive, non-descriptive name. It is unlikely that the Respondent registered the disputed domain name without having the Complainant firmly in mind. The Complainant’s assertions that the Respondent is not commonly known by the disputed domain name and is not affiliated with nor authorized by the Complainant are sufficient to constitute a prima facie demonstration of the absence of rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name on the part of the Respondent. The burden of evidence therefore shifts to the Respondent to show, using tangible evidence, that it does have rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name. The Respondent has made no attempt to do so.

Accordingly, the Panel finds that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name.

1. C) Registered or Used in Bad Faith

The Complainant gives sound bases for its contention that the disputed domain name was registered and has been used in bad faith.

Firstly, owing to the distinctiveness of the Complainant's trademark and reputation, it is reasonable to infer that the Respondent registered the disputed domain name with full knowledge of the Complainant's trademarks, and so the Panel finds on the balance of probabilities that the Respondent was aware of the Complainant's trademark when registering the disputed domain name.

Secondly, the Panel accepts the Complainant's unchallenged assertion that the Respondent registered the disputed domain name with the aim of creating a likelihood of confusion with the Complainant's trademark.

Thirdly, as underlined by prior UDRP panels, the incorporation of a well-known trademark into a domain name, coupled with an inactive website, may be evidence of bad faith registration and use.

Fourthly, owing to the circumstances of the present case, the Respondent's use of a privacy shield registration constitutes further inference of bad faith registration.

Fifthly, a further indicator of bad faith may be inferred from the fact that the disputed domain name has been set up with MX records, which suggests that it may be actively used for e-mail purposes.

Finally, the Respondent has not responded to nor denied any of the assertions made by the Complainant in this proceeding.

FOR ALL THE REASONS STATED ABOVE, THE COMPLAINT IS

Accepted

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

1. **lactaliscanadacorp.com**: Transferred

PANELLISTS

Name	**Fabrizio Bedarida**

DATE OF PANEL DECISION 2026-06-15

Publish the Decision