Decision for dispute CAC-UDRP-108632

Case number	CAC-UDRP-108632
Time of filing	2026-05-06 10:22:33
Domain names	saintgobainnorton.com

Case administrator

Name	Olga Slanařová (Case admin)

Complainant

Organization	COMPAGNIE DE SAINT-GOBAIN

Complainant representative

Organization	NAMESHIELD S.A.S.

Respondent

Organization	A. S. ENTERPR ISE

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 inter alia the owner of the international trademark registration no. 740183 "SAINT-GOBAIN", registered on July 26, 2000 (hereinafter referred to as the "Trademark").

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

The Complainant is a French company specialising in the production, processing, and distribution of materials for the construction and industrial markets. The Complainant was founded in 1665 and is today a leading industrial group worldwide, with approximately €46.5 billion in turnover in 2025 and 162,000 employees. Information regarding the Complainant's products and services is available online at www.saint-gobain.com.

The disputed domain name was registered on 25 April 2026 and redirects to a blog template devoid of any substantive content. Furthermore, MX servers are configured.

PARTIES CONTENTIONS

COMPLAINANT:

The Complainant contends that the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to the Trademark. The addition of the term "NORTON", which refers to the Complainant's subsidiary NORTON, is insufficient to distinguish the disputed domain name from the Trademark; rather, it exacerbates the likelihood of confusion.

The Complainant further submits that the Respondent lacks rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name. The Complainant observes that the Respondent is not identified in the WhoIs record as the registrant of the disputed domain name, that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the disputed domain name and is not related in any way to the Complainant, that neither a licence nor authorisation has been granted to the Respondent to make any use of the Trademark or to apply for registration of the disputed domain name with the Complainant, and that the use of the domain name in connection with a blog template devoid of any substantive content demonstrates the absence of a bona fide offering of goods or services, or of a legitimate non-commercial or fair use.

Finally, the Complainant alleges that the disputed domain name was registered and is being used in bad faith. The Complainant argues that the Trademark is well established, as has already been confirmed by previous panels under the UDRP, and that the addition of the term "NORTON", which refers to the Complainant's division, cannot be coincidental but rather proves that the Respondent evidently knew of the prior rights and extensive use of the Trademark by the Complainant. With respect to bad faith use, the Complainant states that the disputed domain name points to a blog template devoid of any substantive content and contends that the Respondent has not demonstrated any activity in respect of the disputed domain name, and that it is not possible to conceive of any plausible actual or contemplated active use of the domain name by the Respondent that would not be illegitimate, such as by amounting to passing off, an infringement of consumer protection legislation, or an infringement of the Complainant's rights under trade mark law. Finally, the Complainant argues that the domain name has been configured 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

Under paragraph 4(a) of the Policy, the Complainant must prove that each of the following three elements is present:

(i) the disputed domain name is identical or confusingly similar to the Complainant's trade mark; and

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

(iii) the disputed domain name has been registered and is being used in bad faith.

1. The Panel acknowledges that the disputed domain name is indeed confusingly similar to the Trademark, as it fully incorporates the well-known Trademark. It is well established that a domain name that entirely incorporates a trade mark may still be considered confusingly similar to that trade mark under the Policy. Moreover, given that the additional term refers to one of the Complainant's divisions, its inclusion in fact increases the likelihood of confusion.

2. The Complainant has substantiated that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name. The Panel finds that the Complainant has fulfilled its obligations under paragraph 4(a)(ii) of the Policy. The Respondent has not contested these assertions in any manner and, accordingly, has failed to demonstrate any rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name. On the basis of the evidence before the Panel, the Panel is likewise unable to discern any rights or legitimate interests on the part of the Respondent, as the disputed domain name is not generic and the Respondent's use of the disputed domain name does not indicate the existence of any rights or legitimate interests of its own.

3. The Panel is further satisfied that the Respondent registered the disputed domain name with full knowledge of the Complainant and its rights in the Trademark, given that the Trademark is distinctive to a very high degree and has been used by a multinational corporation for centuries. Furthermore, the disputed domain name clearly targets the Complainant's business.

With respect to bad faith use, the Panel finds that this is not a classic case of passive holding, in which the registrant has simply registered a domain name without using it in any other manner. The fact that MX records are configured at the disputed domain name demonstrates that the Respondent has in fact actively used the disputed domain name, at least for e-mail purposes. Given that the disputed domain name clearly targets the Complainant and that the Trademark is very well established, the Panel considers it more likely than not that the Respondent has actually used or intended to use the disputed domain name in connection with fraudulent e-mails, which constitutes evidence of bad faith under paragraph 4(a)(IV) of the Policy. Even if the MX records were not configured by the Respondent and the Respondent has not used the disputed domain name in connection with fraudulent e-mails, the facts of this case do not admit of any plausible actual or contemplated active use of the disputed domain name by the Respondent in good faith, as the domain name includes both the name of the Complainant and the name of its division. The Panel is therefore convinced that, even if the disputed domain name had not yet been actively used, the Respondent's non-use of the disputed domain name is tantamount to use in bad faith.

FOR ALL THE REASONS STATED ABOVE, THE COMPLAINT IS

Accepted

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

1. **saintgobainnorton.com**: Transferred

PANELLISTS

Name	**Peter Müller**

DATE OF PANEL DECISION 2026-06-16

Publish the Decision