

Decision for dispute CAC-UDRP-108668

Case number CAC-UDRP-108668

Time of filing 2026-05-21 09:05:17

Domain names colas-us.com

Case administrator

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

Complainant

Organization COLAS

Complainant representative

Organization NAMESHIELD S.A.S.

Respondent

Name frederick jonas

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 several trademarks consisting in the wording COLAS in several countries, among them the European Union trademark 010799559 COLAS in classes 01, 19 and 37 registered since January 15, 2013, and in effect.

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

The Complainant is a French company, a major player in transport infrastructure activities. It designs, builds, and maintains mobility infrastructure and sustainable development projects around the world. It employs around 62,000 people globally and undertakes about 60,000 projects completed via a network of 2,000 construction units and 3,500 material production and recycling sites in some fifty countries on five different continents. Complainant's US division is called Colas USA. In 2025, the Complainant's consolidated revenue was in total EUR 16 billion.

The disputed domain name has been registered on May 4, 2026 and resolves to an inactive website. Also, MX servers are configured.

PARTIES CONTENTIONS

The Complainant states, inter alia, that the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to its trademark. The Complainant contends that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the domain name <colas-us.com> and he is not related in any way to the Complainant and is not known as „colas-us.com“. The Complainant does not carry out any activity for, nor has any business with, the Respondent. The Complainant contends that the Respondent did not use the disputed domain name or has no demonstrable plan to use the disputed domain name.

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

In order to succeed in its claim, the Complainant must demonstrate that all of the elements enumerated in paragraph 4(a) of the Policy have been satisfied:

- (i) The disputed domain name is identical or confusingly similar to a trademark or service mark in which the Complainant has rights; and
- (ii) The Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests with respect to the disputed domain name; and
- (iii) The disputed domain name has been registered and is being used in bad faith.

The Complainant has established the fact that it has valid trademark rights for „COLAS“.

The disputed domain name is confusingly similar to the Complainant’s trademark since the modifications in the disputed domain name, the addition of the geographical identifier „US does not influence the overall character of the disputed domain name compared to the trademark of the Complainant. Also, the trademark is fully incorporated in the disputed domain name.

The Panel therefore considers the disputed domain name to be confusingly similar to the trademark in which the Complainant has rights in accordance with paragraph 4(a)(i) of the Policy.

B. Rights or Legitimate Interests

The Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name, since the Respondent is not a licensee of the Complainant nor has the Complainant granted any permission or consent to the Respondent to use its trademarks or designations confusingly similar to its trademarks. Furthermore, the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name, since there is no indication that the Respondent is commonly known by the name “colas-us.com” or that the Respondent is using the disputed domain name in connection with a bona fide offering of goods or services.

The Panel therefore finds that the Respondent does not have rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name.

C. Registered and Used in Bad Faith

In view of the size of the Complainant, its business success, the full incorporation of the trademark of the Complainant as well as the addition of the geographical term US similarly used by the Complainant for its US division, the Respondent must have been aware of the Complainant.

The Complainant has not authorized the Respondent to make use of a designation that is highly similar to its marks. This Panel does not see any conceivable legitimate use that could be made by the Respondent of this particular domain name without the Complainant's authorization.

It is the consensus view of panels (following the decision *Telstra Corporation Limited v. Nuclear Marshmallows*, WIPO Case No. D2000-0003, <telstra.org>) that the apparent lack of active use of the domain name without any active attempt to sell or to contact the trademark holder (passive holding), does not as such prevent a finding of bad faith. Examples of what may be cumulative circumstances found to be indicative of bad faith include that no response to the complaint has been filed and the implausibility of any good faith use to which the disputed domain name may be put. Such circumstances are given in the present case.

The Panel therefore considers the disputed domain name to have been registered and used in bad faith in accordance with 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. **colas-us.com**: Transferred

PANELLISTS

Name	Dietrich Beier
------	----------------

DATE OF PANEL DECISION 2026-06-30

Publish the Decision
