

Decision for dispute CAC-UDRP-108670

Case number CAC-UDRP-108670

Time of filing 2026-05-22 09:24:47

Domain names hachetteboardgames.shop, thehachette.shop, gethachetteboardgames.shop

Case administrator

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

Complainant

Organization LAGARDERE SA

Complainant representative

Organization NAMESHIELD S.A.S.

Respondents

Name George White

Name Edward Harris

Name Anika Stokes

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 names.

IDENTIFICATION OF RIGHTS

The Complainant owns the following trademark registrations:

- French trademark HACHETTE n°1356085 registered since April 25, 1985;
- European trademark HACHETTE n°003608551 registered since June 30, 2005;
- International trademark HACHETTE n°948251 registered since November 6, 2007;
- International trademark H HACHETTE n°1038697 registered since December 11, 2009; and
- United States trademark H HACHETTE n° 4058068 registered since November 22, 2011.

The Complainant also owns an important domain names portfolio including, but not restrictively:

- <hachetteboardgames.fr> registered since at least September 10, 2020;
- <hachetteboardgames.com> registered since at least September 10, 2020.

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

The Complainant is an international group with operations in 45 countries worldwide. It employs more than 33,000 people and generated revenue of 9,353 million in 2025. The Group is structured around two main business lines: Lagardère Publishing and Lagardère Travel Retail.

Lagardère Publishing, operating mainly under the Hachette Livre imprint, is the world's third largest consumer publishing group in the Trade and Education markets.

Hachette Boardgames is a branch of Hachette Livres devoted to boardgames publishing. It comprises several games publishers, such as Gigamic and Studio H. It also includes distributors Gigamic and Blackrock games in France, Randolph in Canada, Hachette Boardgames USA, Hachette boardgames UK and Hachette Boardgames Benelux.

The disputed domain names

- <hachetteboardgames.shop>
- <thehachette.shop>

were registered on April 17, 2026 and

- <gethachetteboardgames.shop>

was registered on May 17, 2026.

All three domains were active or are still active.

PARTIES CONTENTIONS

COMPLAINANT

The Complainant states that the disputed domain names are confusingly similar to the Complainant's trademark as it includes the trademark in its entirety and adds only the term "boardgames" or "get" and "boardgames" or the sole article "the" as well as the ".shop" TLD.

According to the Complainant, the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain names as it is not commonly known by the domain names and all of them resolved to websites copying the Complainant's official website.

The Complainant contends that the disputed domain names were registered and used in bad faith based on the above-mentioned activity by the Respondent.

RESPONDENT

No administratively compliant Response has been filed by either Respondents. It ought to be indicated that the Centre sent of the complaint but nor the advice of delivery thereof was returned to the Czech Arbitration Court. The notice of the Commencement of the administrative proceeding was therefore only sent by e-mail. Yet, the e-mail notice sent to postmaster@hachetteboardgames.shop, postmaster@gethachetteboardgames.shop and postmaster@thehachette.shop were returned back undelivered as the e-mail addresses had permanent fatal errors. The e-mail notices were also sent to kleinhausx56@outlook.com, clarkx911@outlook.com and to alondrax257@outlook.com, but the Czech Arbitration Court never received any proof of delivery or notification of undelivery. No further e-mail addresses could be found on the disputed sites.

The Respondents never accessed the online platform.

RIGHTS

The Complainant has, to the satisfaction of the Panel, shown the disputed domain names are 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 Respondents to have no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the disputed domain names (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 names have been registered and are 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

CONSOLIDATION

The Complainant has requested that the proceedings concerning both disputed domain names are consolidated into single proceedings in accordance with paragraph 4(f) of the UDRP and paragraphs 3(c) and 10(e) of the UDRP Rules. The Complainant asserts that all disputed domain names are owned or under the effective control of a single person or entity, or a group of individuals acting in concert. In support of this assertion, the Complainant contends that the disputed domain names:

- the disputed domain names use a privacy protect service to mask the Registrants;
- the disputed domain names use Dynadot Inc. as Registrar;
- the disputed domain names were all registered on the exact same day or extremely closely;
- the disputed domain names redirect to an identical way so as to pass off as the Complainant's subsidiary Hachette Boardgames;
- the similarity of disputed domain names anatomy to one another; and
- Once the privacy was waived, the Complainant indicates that the Registrants use the same email structure, namely "name"x"number"@outlook.com.

Section 4.11.1 of the WIPO Overview of WIPO Panel Views on Selected UDRP Questions, Third Edition ("WIPO Overview 3.1") provides as follows:

"Paragraph 10(e) of the UDRP Rules grants a panel the power to consolidate multiple domain name disputes. At the same time, paragraph 3(c) of the UDRP Rules provides that a complaint may relate to more than one domain name, provided that the domain names are registered by the same domain-name holder."

For the above reasons put forward by the Complainant, the Panel concludes that there are sufficient grounds to support the conclusion that the disputed domain names are subject to common control and that consolidation would be fair and equitable to all Parties.

DECISION

Notwithstanding the fact that no Response has been filed, the Panel shall consider the issues present in the case based on the statements and documents submitted by the Complainant.

Paragraph 4(a) of the Policy directs that the Complainant must prove each of the following elements:

- that the disputed domain names are identical or confusingly similar to a trademark or service mark in which the Complainant has rights; and
- that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the disputed domain names; and
- that the disputed domain names were registered and are being used in bad faith.

Identical or confusingly similar

The Complainant has provided evidence and has thus established its rights in the HACHETTE trademark.

The disputed domain names <hachetteboardgames.shop>, <thehachette.shop> and <gethachetteboardgames.shop> are found to be confusingly similar to the Complainant's Trademark. This finding is based on the settled practice in evaluating the existence of a likelihood of confusion of:

- disregarding the top-level suffix in the domain names (i.e. ".shop");

The Panel notes that a common practice has emerged under the Policy to disregard in appropriate circumstances the general Top-Level Domain ("gTLD") section of domain names for the purposes of the comparison under the Policy, paragraph 4(a)(i). The Panel sees no reason not to follow the same approach here, so it will disregard the ".shop" gTLD section of the disputed domain name.

- finding that the identical reproduction of the trademark right or same with the adding of generic words i.e. "GET" and "BOARDGAMES, sole generic word "BOARDGAMES" or the article "THE" would not be considered sufficient to distinguish the domain names from the concerned trademark being reproduced strictly identically which is intentionally designed to be confusingly similar with the trademark, i.e. a case of typosquatting. Moreover, the term "boardgames" covers the activity of the Complainant's subsidiary and are identical or almost identical to the Complainant's domain names hachetteboardgames;

The disputed domain names are therefore confusingly similar to the earlier right "HACHETTE", and the Panel concludes that the Complainant has satisfied the requirement under paragraph 4(a)(i) of the Policy.

No Rights Or Legitimate Interests

The Complainant's assertions that the Respondents are not commonly known by either disputed domain names and are not affiliated with or authorised by the Complainant are sufficient to constitute prima facie showing of absence of rights or legitimate interest in the disputed domain names on the part of the Respondents.

Therefore, in the absence of the Respondents' response, the Panel concludes that there is no indication that the disputed domain names were intended to be used in connection with a bona fide offering of goods or services as required by Policy.

Consequently, the evidentiary burden shifts to the Respondents to show by concrete evidence that they do have rights or legitimate interests in that respective disputed domain name. However, the Respondents failed to provide any information and evidence that it has relevant rights or legitimate interests in respect of the disputed domain names (within the meaning of paragraph 4(a) (ii) of Policy).

Bad Faith

The Panel finds that the Complainant has established that the disputed domain names were registered by the Respondents and are being used by the Respondents in bad faith.

For this purpose, the Complainant has successfully put forward prima facie evidence that the Respondent has not made use, or demonstrable preparations to use, of either the disputed domain names in connection with a bona fide offering of goods or services, or of making a legitimate non-commercial or fair use of the disputed domain names. This prima facie evidence was not challenged by the Respondents.

Not only there was no bona fide offering of goods or services, but the disputed domain names resolve to a website copying the Complainant's official website.

Such making use of the disputed domain names, obviously in a potential fraudulent manner, neither qualifies as a bona fide nor as a legitimate noncommercial or fair use under the UDRP and may not of itself confer rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain names. The potential collection of personal data or passwords via phishing process being one possible fraudulent act.

The Respondents have failed to demonstrate any activity in respect of the disputed domain names, and it is not possible to conceive of any plausible actual or contemplated active use of the domain names by the Respondents that would not be illegitimate, by passing off, infringement of consumer protection legislation, or infringement of the Complainant's rights under trademark law.

In the absence of a Response and given the reputation of the Complainant and its trademark, company names and domain names as supported by the Complainant's evidence, the Panel must conclude that the Respondents were fully aware of the Complainant's trademark "HACHETTE" and domains <hachetteboardgames.fr> and <hachetteboardgames.com> at the time of registering the disputed domain names

The Panel concludes that the Respondents have registered and are using the disputed domain names in bad faith (within the meaning of paragraph 4(a)(iii) of the Policy). The Complainant has therefore also satisfied the requirement under paragraph 4(a)(iii) of the Policy.

FOR ALL THE REASONS STATED ABOVE, THE COMPLAINT IS

Accepted

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

1. **hachetteboardgames.shop**: Transferred
2. **thehachette.shop**: Transferred
3. **gethachetteboardgames.shop**: Transferred

PANELLISTS

Name **David-Irving Tayer**

DATE OF PANEL DECISION **2026-06-28**

Publish the Decision
