

Decision for dispute CAC-UDRP-108695

Case number CAC-UDRP-108695

Time of filing 2026-06-04 09:43:49

Domain names saints-goban.com

Case administrator

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

Complainant

Organization COMPAGNIE DE SAINT-GOBAIN

Complainant representative

Organization NAMESHIELD S.A.S.

Respondent

Organization saints-goban

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 states that it is the owner of the following international trademark registrations:

- 740184 "SAINT-GOBAIN", registered on 26 July 2000, for goods and services in classes 1, 2, 3, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 17, 19, 20, 21, 22, 23, 24, 37, 38, 40, 42;
- 740183 "SAINT-GOBAIN", registered on 26 July 2000, for goods and services in classes 1, 2, 3, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 17, 19, 20, 21, 22, 23, 24, 37, 38, 40, 42;
- 596735 "SAINT-GOBAIN", registered on 2 November 1992, for goods and services in classes 1, 6, 9, 11, 12, 16, 17, 19, 20, 21, 22, 23, 24;
- 551682 "SAINT-GOBAIN", registered on 21 July 1989, for goods and services in classes 1, 6, 7, 9, 11, 12, 16, 17, 19, 20, 21, 22, 23, 24, 37, 39, 41.

The Complainant proved its ownership of the aforementioned trademark registrations by the submitted extract from the WIPO database.

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

Saint-Gobain (hereinafter “Complainant”) is a French company specialized in the production, processing and distribution of materials for the construction and industrial markets. The Complainant is a worldwide reference in sustainable habitat and construction markets. It takes a long-term view in order to develop products and services for its customers that facilitate sustainable construction. In this way, it designs innovative, high-performance solutions that improve habitat and everyday life. For more than 360 years, the Complainant has consistently demonstrated its ability to invent products that improve quality of life. It is now one of the top industrial groups in the world with around 46.5 billion euros in turnover in 2025 and 162 000 employees.

The Complainant also owns many domain names including its trademark “SAINT-GOBAIN”, such as the domain name < saint-gobain.com > registered on 29 December 1995.

The disputed domain name < saints-goban.com > (hereinafter “disputed domain name”) was registered on 26 May 2026. According to the Registrar, the Respondent is ‘saints-goban’. The Respondent’s provided address as being in the US.

PARTIES CONTENTIONS

COMPLAINANT:

The Complainant contends that the requirements of the Policy have been met and that the disputed domain name should be transferred to it.

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 UDRP).

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 UDRP).

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 UDRP).

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 the present case, the Respondent has not submitted any Response and consequently has not contested any of the contentions made by the Complainant. Therefore, the Panel proceeds to decide only on the basis of the Complainant’s factual statements and the documentary evidence provided in support of them [Paragraph 5(f) of The Rules].

1. CONFUSING SIMILARITY

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

The WIPO Overview 3.1 in Paragraph 1.2.1 states: “Where the complainant holds a nationally or regionally registered trademark or service mark, this prima facie satisfies the threshold requirement of having trademark rights for purposes of standing to file a UDRP

case.”

The WIPO Overview 3.1 in Paragraph 1.7 states: “[...] in cases where a domain name incorporates the entirety of a trademark [...] the domain name will normally be considered confusingly similar to that mark for purposes of UDRP standing.”

The WIPO Overview 3.1 in Paragraph 1.9 states: “A domain name which consists of a variation of a trademark (typically a common, obvious, or intentional misspelling, referred to as typosquatting) is considered by panels to be confusingly similar to the relevant mark for purposes of the first element. [...]”

Examples of such variations include (i) adjacent keyboard letters, (ii) substitution of similar-appearing characters (e.g., upper vs lower-case letters or numbers used to look like letters), (iii) the use of different letters that appear similar in different fonts, (iv) the use of non-Latin internationalized or accented characters, (v) the inversion of letters and numbers, (vi) the addition or interspersion of other terms or numbers, or (vii) plays on the mark (e.g., abbreviations or combinations of select elements of the mark).”

The WIPO Overview 3.1 in Paragraph 1.11.1 states: “The applicable Top Level Domain (“TLD”) in a domain name (e.g., “.com”, “.club”, “.nyc”) is viewed as a standard registration requirement and as such is disregarded under the first element confusing similarity test.”

In the present case, the Complainant has established that it owns numerous international trademark registrations for the “SAINT-GOBAIN” verbal element.

In the disputed domain name, the “SAINT-GOBAIN” trademark is clearly recognizable and used mostly in its entirety. The addition of the letter “S” and the omission of the letter “I” in the disputed domain name are not sufficient to escape the finding of the confusing similarity with the Complainant’s trademarks. The disputed domain name clearly represents an example of typosquatting, since it contains intentional and obvious misspellings.

This Panel is of the view that the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to the Complainant’s trademarks.

The addition of the <.com> TLD is not sufficient to prevent the finding of confusing similarity since it is regarded as a necessary technical requirement of registration.

As a result, the Panel finds that the Complainant has satisfied Paragraph 4(a)(i) of the UDRP.

2. THE RESPONDENT’S LACK OF RIGHTS OR LEGITIMATE INTEREST IN THE DISPUTED DOMAIN NAME

The Panel finds that the Respondent lacks rights or legitimate interest in the disputed domain name.

According to Paragraph 4(a)(ii) of the UDRP, the Complainant shall make a case that the Respondent lacks rights and legitimate interests in the disputed domain name. If the Complainant fulfils this demand the burden of proof shifts to the Respondent and so the Respondent shall demonstrate rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name. If the Respondent fails to prove its rights or legitimate interests, it is assumed that the Complainant satisfied the element of Paragraph 4(a)(ii) of the UDRP (see CAC Case No. 102430, Lesaffre et Compagnie v. Tims Dozman). Moreover, past panels were of the view that it is difficult or sometimes impossible to prove negative facts, i.e., absence of rights or legitimate interest on the part of the Respondent. In this respect, past panels referred to the WIPO Case No. D2000-1769, Neusiedler Aktiengesellschaft v. Vinayak Kulkarni. Within the meaning of Paragraph 4(a)(ii) of the UDRP, once the complainant has made something credible (prima facie evidence), the burden of proof shifts to the Respondent to show that he has rights or legitimate interests in the domain name at issue by providing concrete evidence.

The WIPO Overview 3.1 in Paragraph 2.5.1 states: “Generally speaking, UDRP panels have found that domain names identical to a complainant’s trademark carry a high risk of implied affiliation.”

In the Forum Case No. 1597465, The Hackett Group, Inc. v. Brian HERN / The Hackett Group, the Panel stated that: “typosquatting is occurring, and finds this is additional evidence that Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests under Policy ¶ 4(a)(ii).”

In the Forum Case No. FA 1773444, Ashley Furniture Industries, Inc. v. Joannet Macket / JM Consultants, the Panel stated that: “The Panel finds that Respondent’s lack of content at the disputed domain shows the lack of a bona fide offering of goods or services or a legitimate noncommercial or fair use per Policy ¶¶ 4(c)(i) and (iii).”

The Complainant contends that the Respondent is not related in any way to the Complainant. The Complainant does not carry out any activity for, nor has any business with, the Respondent.

Neither license nor authorization has been granted to the Respondent to make any use of the Complainant’s trademark “SAINT-GOBAIN” or apply for registration of the disputed domain name by the Complainant.

Moreover, the Complainant also claims that the disputed domain name is a typosquatted version of the trademark “SAINT-GOBAIN”.

Finally, the Complainant submitted a screenshot showing that the disputed domain name resolves to a parking page. The Complainant contends that the Respondent did not use the disputed domain name, and it confirms that the Respondent has no demonstrable plan to use the disputed domain name.

The Respondent did not file any Response to the Complaint. Thus, the Respondent failed to demonstrate rights or legitimate interest in the disputed domain name.

To the satisfaction of the Panel, the Complainant made a prima facie case that there is no connection between the Complainant and the Respondent, and that the Respondent does not have authorization in the disputed domain name or in the "SAINT-GOBAIN" trademark from the Complainant.

Above, the Panel found that the Complainant owns numerous international trademark registrations for the term "SAINT-GOBAIN" and that the disputed domain name represents a typosquatted version of the Complainant's trademark. Past panels have declared that typosquatting is additional evidence that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name.

Moreover, the Respondent is using the disputed domain name in a way that it resolves to a parking page. This use of the disputed domain name cannot be qualified as a bona fide use, and no legitimate interest of fair use can be found in the given circumstances.

In conclusion, the Panel is of the view that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interest in the disputed domain name.

Therefore, the Panel finds that the Complainant has satisfied the requirement under Paragraph 4(a)(ii) of the UDRP.

3. THE REGISTRATION AND USE OF THE DISPUTED DOMAIN NAME IN BAD FAITH

The Panel finds that the Respondent registered and uses the disputed domain name in bad faith.

The WIPO Overview 3.1 in Paragraph 3.1.4 states: "Panels have consistently found that the mere registration of a domain name that is identical or confusingly similar (particularly domain names comprising typos or incorporating the mark plus a descriptive term) to a famous or widely-known trademark by an unaffiliated entity can by itself create a presumption of bad faith [...]."

The WIPO Overview 3.1 in Paragraph 3.3 states: "While panelists will look at the totality of the circumstances in each case, factors that have been considered relevant in applying the passive holding doctrine include: (i) the degree of distinctiveness or reputation of the complainant's mark, (ii) the failure of the respondent to submit a response or to provide any evidence of actual or contemplated good-faith use, (iii) the respondent's concealing its identity or use of false contact details (noted to be in breach of its registration agreement), and (iv) the implausibility of any good faith use to which the domain name may be put."

In the WIPO Case No. D2020-2116, VFS Global Services Private Limited v. WhoisGuard, Inc., Quijano & Associates / Narendra Singhmanushi, the Panel stated: "The Panel also determines that the Respondent's use of the privacy protection service, WhoisGuard in the circumstances of the present case constitutes additional evidence of bad faith. Absent any explanation from the Respondent, the Panel cannot conceive of any plausible good faith use of the disputed Domain Name that could be made by the Respondent. The Respondent's conduct in registering the disputed Domain Name therefore constitutes opportunistic bad faith."

In the Forum Case No. FA 877979, Microsoft Corporation v. Domain Registration Philippines, the Panel stated that: "In addition, Respondent's misspelling of Complainant's MICROSOFT mark in the <microsoft.com> domain name indicates that Respondent is typosquatting, which is a further indication of bad faith registration and use pursuant to Policy ¶ 4(a)(iii)."

In the CAC Case No. 102827, JCDECAUX SA v. Handi Hariyono, the Panel stated that: "There is no present use of the disputed domain name but there are several active MX records connected to the disputed domain name. It is concluded that it is inconceivable that the Respondent will be able to make any good faith use of the disputed domain name as part of an e-mail address."

In the present case, the Complainant has established that it owns numerous international trademark registrations for the "SAINT-GOBAIN" term.

From the submitted material "about the Complainant" and the Complainant's worldwide business activities, it can be established that the Complainant has a certain reputation regarding the production, processing and distribution of materials for the construction and industrial markets. Moreover, past panels have declared that the Complainant is a well-established company and its "SAINT-GOBAIN" trademark is recognised worldwide (see, e.g., the WIPO Case No. D2020-3549, Compagnie de Saint-Gobain v. On behalf of saint-gobain-recherche.net owner, Whois Privacy Service / Grigore PODAC).

Therefore, the Panel is of the opinion that the Respondent must have been aware of the Complainant, its trademark and business activities at the moment of registering the disputed domain name on 26 May 2026.

The Panel cannot find any indicators of the Respondent's good faith in registering or using the disputed domain name.

Firstly, the Panel found the disputed domain name to be confusingly similar (see part 1 above). This finding itself is one of the bad faith indicators.

Secondly, from the WHOIS information, it is clear that the identification of the Respondent is hidden (privacy protected).

Thirdly, as demonstrated by the Complainant, the disputed domain name leads Internet users to the parking page. The Panel finds that the Respondent is passively holding the disputed domain name and has no demonstrable plan to use it. This finding is based on the following circumstances:

- The "SAINT-GOBAIN" trademark is highly distinctive and reputed worldwide;
- The Respondent did not file any Response to the Complaint;
- The Respondent's identity is hidden in the WHOIS information;
- The disputed domain name incorporates the Complainant's trademark mostly in its entirety;

- The disputed domain name is obviously a typosquatted version of the Complainant’s trademark.

Finally, the Complainant submitted the screenshot of the DNS Query, according to which the disputed domain name has been set up with MX records, and so the disputed domain name may be actively used for e-mail purposes. Based on the above findings, the Panel cannot see any possibility of legitimate e-mail activities in connection with the disputed domain name from the Respondent.

Following all the above-mentioned, the Panel is of the view that the Respondent did not register and is not using the disputed domain name in good faith.

Following the above-mentioned, the Panel finds that the Complainant has satisfied the conditions pursuant to Paragraph 4(a)(iii) of the UDRP.

FOR ALL THE REASONS STATED ABOVE, THE COMPLAINT IS

Accepted

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

1. **saints-goban.com**: Transferred

PANELLISTS

Name	Radim Charvát
------	----------------------

DATE OF PANEL DECISION **2026-07-02**

Publish the Decision
