Decision for dispute CAC-UDRP-108659

Case number	CAC-UDRP-108659
Time of filing	2026-05-19 09:35:38
Domain names	boursorama-service.org

Case administrator

Name	Olga Slanařová (Case admin)

Complainant

Organization	BOURSORAMA

Complainant representative

Organization	NAMESHIELD S.A.S.

Respondent

Name	Keisha Smith

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 an EU trademark "BOURSORAMA" – Reg. No 1758614 – registered since October 19, 2001, in classes 9, 16, 35, 36, 38, 41, and 42.

The Complainant also owns a domain names portfolio including the wording "BOURSORAMA", such as <BOURSORAMA.COM>, registered since March 1, 1998.

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

The Complainant is a company active in Europe, particularly in France. The Complainant provides online brokerage, internet banking services, and digital financial information. Pioneer and leader in its three core businesses, online brokerage, financial information on the Internet and online banking, BOURSORAMA based its growth on innovation, commitment and transparency. In France, BOURSORAMA is the online banking reference with over 4.7 million customers. The portal www.boursorama.com is the first national financial and economic information site and first French online banking platform. The Complainant uses its trademark BOURSORAMA for its services.

The disputed domain name <boursorama-service.org> was registered on May 13, 2026. It does not point to any active web site. Besides, MX servers are configured.

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).

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

As the Respondent did not file an administratively compliant Response, pursuant to paragraph 14(b) of the Rules, the Panel may draw such inferences therefrom as it considers appropriate. Thus, the Panel accepts the contentions of the Complainant as admitted by the Respondent.

A. Identical or Confusingly Similar

The Complainant has, to the satisfaction of the Panel, shown the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to a trademark in which the Complainant has rights (within the meaning of paragraph 4(a)(i) of the Policy).

The Complainant is the registered owner of the EU trademark "BOURSORAMA" – Reg. No 1758614 – registered since October 19, 2001. The disputed domain name incorporates the trademark BOURSORAMA in its entirety. The addition of the generic term "service" combined with a hyphen does not prevent a finding of confusing similarity. Likewise, the addition of the generic Top-Level Domain ".org" does not change the overall impression of the designation as being connected to the trademark BOURSORAMA. These findings are consistent with established UDRP jurisprudence, including WIPO Case No. D2003-0888, Dr. Ing. h.c. F. Porsche AG v. Vasiliy Terkin, and WIPO Case No. D2006-0451, F. Hoffmann-La Roche AG v. Macalve e-dominios S.A. Furthermore, several prior CAC decisions have confirmed the Complainant's rights in the BOURSORAMA trademark in similar disputes, such as CAC Case No. 104433, CAC Case No. 102278, and CAC Case No. 101844.

The Panel therefore finds that the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to the Complainant's trademark BOURSORAMA.

B. 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).

The Complainant has made a prima facie case that the Respondent lacks rights or legitimate interests. The Respondent is not identified in the WHOIS database by the disputed domain name. The Respondent is not known by the Complainant. The Complainant contends that the Respondent is not affiliated with nor authorized by the Complainant in any way. Neither license nor

authorization has been granted to the Respondent to make any use of the Complainant's trademark BOURSORAMA, or to apply for registration of the disputed domain name. Finally, the disputed domain name resolves to an inactive page. The Respondent did not use the disputed domain name in connection with a bona fide offering of goods or services, nor does it appear that the Respondent has any demonstrable plan to do so.

The Respondent has not filed any Response and thus has not rebutted the Complainant's prima facie case.

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

C. Registered and Used in 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 disputed domain name incorporates the well-known and distinctive trademark BOURSORAMA in its entirety. Given the longstanding use and distinctive nature of the mark BOURSORAMA, it is inconceivable that the Respondent registered the disputed domain name without prior knowledge of the Complainant and the Complainant's mark. See CAC Case No. 101131, BOURSORAMA v. PD Host Inc – Ken Thomas, and WIPO Case No. D2017-1463, Boursorama SA v. Estrade Nicolas.

Furthermore, the disputed domain name points to an inactive page. 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 domain name by the Respondent that would not be illegitimate. As prior WIPO UDRP panels have held, the incorporation of a famous mark into a domain name, coupled with an inactive website, may be evidence of bad faith registration and use. See WIPO Case No. D2000-0003, Telstra Corporation Limited v. Nuclear Marshmallows, and WIPO Case No. D2000-0400, CBS Broadcasting, Inc. v. Dennis Toeppen.

Finally, the disputed domain name has been set up with MX records, which suggests that it may be actively used for e-mail purposes, potentially to engage in phishing or other fraudulent activities targeting the Complainant's customers. See CAC Case No. 102827, JCDECAUX SA v. Handi Hariyono.

The Panel therefore finds that the disputed domain name has been registered and is being used in bad faith.

FOR ALL THE REASONS STATED ABOVE, THE COMPLAINT IS

Accepted

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

1. **boursorama-service.org**: Transferred

PANELLISTS

Name	**Dominik Eickemeier**

DATE OF PANEL DECISION 2026-06-18

Publish the Decision