

Decision for dispute CAC-UDRP-108669

Case number CAC-UDRP-108669

Time of filing 2026-05-25 09:49:05

Domain names bicsportsoldes.com

Case administrator

Name Olga Dvořáková (Case admin)

Complainant

Organization SOCIETE BIC

Complainant representative

Organization IN CONCRETO

Respondent

Name Christopher K Kilkenny

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 various trade marks for BIC and BIC SPORT, including:

- International Trademark Registration No. 152381E for BIC, registered on 10 March 1951;
- International Trademark Registration No. 380478A for BIC (figurative), registered on 18 June 1971;
- European Union Trade Mark Registration No. 000414904 for BIC, registered on 16 October 1998;
- European Union Trade Mark Registration No. 000415067 for BIC (figurative), registered on 2 October 1998; and
- International Trademark Registration No. 560997 for BIC Sport, registered on 8 August 1990.

The Complainant also owns and operates domain names incorporating the BIC mark, including <bic.com>, created on 20 June 1994.

The disputed domain name <bicsportsoldes.com> was registered on 15 November 2024 with Gname.com Pte. Ltd. The disputed domain name previously resolved to a website purporting to be a BIC Sport discount online shop, with the header "BIC Sport Shop: Unbeatable Discounts on Surfboards and Accessories". The website reproduced the BIC Sport logo and offered water-sports products and accessories, including surf, windsurf, foil, bodyboard, and related accessories, at discounted prices. The website is currently inactive.

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

The Complainant, SOCIETE BIC, is a French company and is internationally known for, among other things, stationery products, lighters, razors, and, historically, sporting and water sports goods. In 2025, BIC reported EUR 2,090 million in net sales, sold approximately 26 million BIC products every day, and was voted France's favourite brand in an OpinionWay survey.

From 1979 to 2019, the Complainant developed and marketed water sports equipment under or by reference to BIC SPORT. The evidence shows that the BIC SPORT sign has been used in connection with water sports products and that the Complainant continues to own registered rights in BIC SPORT.

PARTIES CONTENTIONS

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

A. Identical or Confusingly Similar

Paragraph 4(a)(i) of the Policy requires a complainant to show that a domain name is identical or confusingly similar to a trademark or service mark in which the complainant has rights.

The Complainant has provided evidence that it owns registered trademark rights in the BIC and BIC SPORT marks.

In this case, the disputed domain name <bicsportsoldes.com> incorporates the Complainant's BIC mark and the Complainant's BIC SPORT mark in their entirety, followed by the term "soldes". The addition of the descriptive term "soldes", meaning sales or discounts in French, does not prevent a finding of confusing similarity.

As for the generic Top-Level Domain ("gTLD") ".com", it is well established that the gTLD is not relevant to the issue of identity or confusing similarity between the Complainant's trademark and the domain name in dispute.

Consequently, the Panel finds that the Complainant has shown that the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to a trademark in which the Complainant has rights.

B. Rights or Legitimate Interests

Once the complainant establishes a prima facie case that the respondent lacks rights or legitimate interests in the domain name, the burden of production shifts to the respondent to show that it has rights or legitimate interests in respect to the domain name.

In the present case, the Complainant has demonstrated a prima facie case that the Respondent lacks rights or legitimate interests in respect of the disputed domain name and the Respondent has failed to assert any such rights or legitimate interests.

The Complainant has provided evidence that it has been the registered owner of the BIC and BIC SPORT marks long before the date that the disputed domain name was registered and that it has not authorised the Respondent to use the Complainant's trademark. There is no evidence that the Respondent is commonly known by the disputed domain name.

Further, the disputed domain name website reproduced the BIC Sport logo and presented itself as a "Bic Sport Shop" offering water sports products at "unbeatable" discounted prices. Such use does not constitute a bona fide offering of goods or services or a legitimate non-commercial or fair use of the disputed domain name.

The Respondent did not submit a Response and did not provide any explanation for its choice of the disputed domain name nor evidence to show rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name which would be sufficient to rebut the Complainant's prima facie case.

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

C. Registered and Used in Bad Faith

The Complainant must also show that the respondent registered and is using the disputed domain name in bad faith (see Policy, paragraph 4(a)(iii)). Paragraph 4(b) of the Policy provides circumstances that may evidence bad faith under paragraph 4(a)(iii) of the Policy.

The Complainant's BIC and BIC SPORT trademarks were registered many years before the registration of the disputed domain name. The disputed domain name consists of the Complainant's BIC and BIC SPORT marks, together with the French term "soldes", and was used for a website reproducing the BIC Sport logo and purporting to offer water sports products and accessories.

On the evidence, the Panel is persuaded that the Respondent was aware of the Complainant and its BIC and BIC SPORT trademarks at the time of registering the disputed domain name, and that the disputed domain name was registered with the Complainant's mark in mind.

The Respondent's use of the disputed domain name falls squarely within paragraph 4(b)(iv) of the Policy. By using the disputed domain name to operate a website impersonating an official or authorized BIC SPORT discount shop, the Respondent intentionally attempted to attract, for commercial gain, Internet users to its website by creating a likelihood of confusion with the Complainant's marks as to source, sponsorship, affiliation, or endorsement.

Additionally, the Complainant provided evidence of a consumer complaint alleging suspected fraudulent payment redirection, non-delivery of ordered goods, and lack of order confirmation by the Respondent, which is further indication of bad faith.

Further, the Panel cannot conceive any plausible good faith use to which the disputed domain name may be put. The Respondent failed to submit a response and provided no evidence to rebut the Complainant's case. The Respondent also registered the disputed domain name under a fictitious name. This is also an indication of bad faith.

Accordingly, having regard to the circumstances of this case, the Panel finds that the Complainant has met its burden 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. **bicsportsoldes.com**: Transferred

PANELLISTS

Name	Jonathan Agmon
------	-----------------------

DATE OF PANEL DECISION 2026-06-30

Publish the Decision
