Decision for dispute CAC-UDRP-108750

Case number	CAC-UDRP-108750
Time of filing	2026-06-18 16:07:14
Domain names	altagroupe.com

Case administrator

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

Complainant

Organization	ALTAREA

Complainant representative

Organization	NAMESHIELD S.A.S.

Respondent

Name	Matthieu Taravella

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 the French trademark ALTA No. 3786529 registered since 1 April 2011 ("**Complainant's Trademark**").

The disputed domain name <altagroupe.com> was registered on 17 October 2025.

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

As the Respondent did not file any response to the complaint, the Panel took into account the following facts asserted by the Complainant (and supported by the documentary evidence submitted by the Complainant) and unchallenged by the Respondent:

(a) found in 1994, the Complainant is the leading property developer in France. The Complainant has developed a unique real estate skills and development platform covering all classes of real estate assets (residential, retail, offices, logistics, hotels, serviced residences, etc.);

(b) the Complainant is the owner of the Complainant's Trademark;

(c) the Complainant also owns several domain names including the trademark ALTA, such as the domain name <altarea.com>

registered and used for its official website since 31 March 1999; and

(d) the disputed domain name was registered on 17 October 2025 and redirects to a parking page. Besides, it has been used in a phishing scheme.

PARTIES CONTENTIONS

COMPLAINANT:

In addition to the above factual assertions, the Complainant also contends the following:

(a) the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to the Complainant's Trademark as the addition of the term “GROUPE” is not sufficient to escape the finding of such confusing similarity. It does not change the overall impression of the designation as being connected to the Complainant’s Trademark. It does not prevent the likelihood of confusion between the disputed domain name and the Complainant and its trademarks. On the contrary, the addition of the term “GROUPE” to the term “ALTA” worsens the likelihood of confusion and cannot be coincidental, as it directly refers to the Complainant’s holding company ALTAGROUPE;

(b) the Respondent identifies itself as Matthieu Taravella, who is one of the executives of ALTAGROUPE. Besides, the Respondent uses the Complainant's and its related company's ALTAGROUPE postal address "87 rue de Richelieu Paris". Consequently, the Respondent asserts that the Respondent has registered the domain name with this information in order to legitimize the registration and worsen the likelihood of confusion. The Respondent is not identified by the disputed domain name. The Complainant does not carry out any activity for, nor has any business with the Respondent. The Respondent is not known by the Complainant. The Complainant contends that 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 or apply for registration of the disputed domain name by the Complainant. As a result, the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the disputed domain name; and

(c) given the above circumstances and distinctiveness of the Complainant's Trademark and reputation, it is reasonable to infer that the Respondent has registered the domain name with full knowledge of the Complainant's Trademark. The disputed domain name points to a parking page and has been used in a phishing scheme as the Respondent uses an e-mail address associated with the domain name to attempt to pass itself off as an employee of the Complainant’s holding company ALTAGROUPE for financial gain. Such use of the disputed domain name demonstrates bad faith of the Respondent.

RESPONDENT:

The Respondent did not provide any response to the complaint.

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 Uniform Domain Name Dispute Resolution Policy ("**UDRP**" or "**Policy**").

For details, please see "Principal Reasons for the Decision".

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).

For details, please see "Principal Reasons for the Decision".

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).

For details, please see "Principal Reasons for the Decision".

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

Paragraph 4(a) of the Policy requires that the Complainant proves each of the following three elements to obtain an order that the disputed domain name should be transferred or revoked:

(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 in respect of the disputed domain name; and

(iii) the disputed domain name has been registered and is being used in bad faith.

The Panel will proceed to analyze whether the three elements of paragraph 4(a) of the Policy are satisfied in these proceedings.

RIGHTS

The disputed domain name is confusingly similar to Complainant’s Trademark. It reproduces the word element of Complainant's Trademark (ALTA) and mere addition of a non-distinctive term "GROUPE" cannot diminish confusing similarity of the disputed domain name to Complainant`s Trademark.

For sake of completeness, the Panel asserts that the top-level suffix in the domain name (i.e. the ".com") must be disregarded under the identity / confusing similarity test as it is a necessary technical requirement of registration.

Therefore, the Panel concludes that the Complainant satisfied the requirement under paragraph 4(a)(i) of the Policy.

NO RIGHTS OR LEGITIMATE INTERESTS

The Complainant is required to make out a prima facie case that the Respondent lacks rights or legitimate interests. Once such prima facie case is made, the Respondent carries the burden of demonstrating rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name. If the Respondent fails to do so, the Complainant is deemed to have satisfied paragraph 4(a)(ii) of the Policy (for example, WIPO case no. D2003-0455, Croatia Airlines d.d. v. Modern Empire Internet Ltd.).

As asserted by the Complainant (and unchallenged by the Respondent), the Respondent is not commonly known by the disputed domain name. Neither is the Respondent in any way related to the Complainant. The Respondent failed to provide any information and evidence that it has relevant rights or legitimate interests in respect of the disputed domain name (within the meaning of paragraph 4(a) (ii) of the Policy). Moreover, the Respondent clearly uses the disputed domain name for fraudulent purposes (phishing), which certainly cannot establish rights or legitimate interest of the Respondent in respect of the disputed domain name.

Therefore, the Panel concludes that the Respondent has no right or legitimate interest in respect of the disputed domain name (within the meaning of paragraph 4(a)(ii) of the Policy).

BAD FAITH

Given the reputation of the Complainant and well-known nature of its trademark the Panel cannot find any conceivable good faith registration and use of the disputed domain name by the Respondent. Moreover, the disputed domain name has been used for phishing activities. The Respondent registered the disputed domain name using fake registration details (name of the executive of the Complainant's holding company and its address). Therefore, in the opinion of the Panel, the Respondent deliberately registered the disputed domain name which is confusingly similar to Complainant's Trademark in order to mislead internet users and fraudulently collect and misuse their data.

As a result, the Panel found that the disputed domain name has been registered and used by the Respondent in bad faith (within the meaning of 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. **altagroupe.com**: Transferred

PANELLISTS

Name	**Michal Matějka**

DATE OF PANEL DECISION 2026-07-23

Publish the Decision