Decision for dispute CAC-UDRP-108779

Case number	CAC-UDRP-108779
Time of filing	2026-06-25 12:03:17
Domain names	brasilit-saintgobain.com

Case administrator

Name	Olga Slanařová (Case admin)

Complainant

Organization	COMPAGNIE DE SAINT-GOBAIN

Complainant representative

Organization	NAMESHIELD S.A.S.

Respondent

Name	Paulo Ricardo portela nascimento

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 several trademarks SAINT-GOBAIN, registered worldwide, one of them - international trademark SAINT-GOBAIN (Reg. No. 740183), registered on July 26, 2000.

The Complainant also owns multiple domain names consisting of the wording “SAINT-GOBAIN”, such as the domain name <saint-gobain.com> registered on December 29, 1995.

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

The Complainant, COMPAGNIE DE SAINT-GOBAIN, is a French company specialized in the production, processing and distribution of materials for the construction and industrial markets. Saint-Gobain has been operating more than 350 years and is globally known for important inventions of products that improve quality of life. It is one of the top industrial groups in the world with around 46.5 billion euros in turnover in 2025 and 162,000 employees.

The disputed domain name <brasilit-saintgobain.com> was registered on June 22, 2026, and redirects to a parking page. MX servers are configured as well, which shows the Respondent's intent to use this domain name in e-mail communication. The Respondent is

Paulo Ricardo from Brasil.

PARTIES CONTENTIONS

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

The Panel agrees with the Complainant that the disputed domain name <brasilit-saintgobain.com> is confusingly similar to the Complainant's trademark SAINT-GOBAIN. Considering the renown of the Complainant and its trademark, the Panel agrees with the Complainant that the addition of the word “BRASILIT” does not set aside the confusing similarity between the disputed domain name and the Complainant's trademark. On the contrary, the addition of the word “BRASILIT” refers directly to the Complainant because Brasilit is a Brazilian building materials manufacturer and brand that is part of the Saint-Gobain Group (i.e. it is the Complainant’s subsidiary).

The Panel acknowledges that the Complainant presented prima facie evidence that the Respondent is not sponsored by or affiliated with Complainant in any way. Furthermore, Complainant has not licensed, authorized, or permitted Respondent to use Complainant’s trademark in any manner, including in domain names. The disputed domain name is not used for website purposes (resolves only to a parking page), however, it has been set up with MX records which suggests that it may be actively used for email purposes. The panels in previous CAC UDRP cases underlined that such activity would be far from any good faith use (see the decision of CAC Case No. 102827, JCDECAUX SA v. Handi Hariyono: “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 conclusion, Respondent’s use of the disputed domain name does not constitute a bona fide offering of goods or services or a legitimate non-commercial or fair use (Policy Para. 4(a)(ii) and 4(c).

As no administratively compliant response has been provided to the Panel and the prima facie evidence was not challenged by the Respondent, the Panel concludes that the Respondent, when he registered the disputed domain name, meant nothing else except the Complainant's trademark SAINT-GOBAIN (see WIPO Overview 3.0, para. 3.1.1). Previous UDRP panels have consistently found that the mere registration of a domain name that is identical or confusingly similar to a famous or widely-known trademark by an unaffiliated entity can by itself create a presumption of bad faith. Accordingly, the Panel finds that the disputed domain name was registered in bad faith.

The Respondent has made no active or bona fide use of the disputed domain name. Rather than using the disputed domain name for any legitimate purpose, the Respondent has passively held it and directed it to a GoDaddy landing page advertising the domain name as potentially available for purchase through GoDaddy's Domain Broker Service. In these circumstances, the Panel concludes that the Respondent registered the disputed domain name primarily for the purpose of selling it for valuable consideration in excess of its documented out-of-pocket costs directly related to the disputed domain name, thereby constituting evidence of registration and use in bad faith under paragraph 4(b)(i) of the Policy.

Moreover, MX servers are configured which suggests that the disputed domain name may be actively used for email purposes (see WIPO Overview 3.0, para. 3.4). This is indicative of bad faith use because any email emanating from the disputed domain name could not be used for any good faith purpose (CAC Case No. 102827, JCDECAUX SA v. Handi Hariyono).

On these bases, the Panel concludes that the Respondent has both registered and used the disputed domain name in bad faith.

FOR ALL THE REASONS STATED ABOVE, THE COMPLAINT IS

Accepted

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

1. **brasilit-saintgobain.com**: Transferred

PANELLISTS

Name	**Darius Sauliūnas**

DATE OF PANEL DECISION 2026-07-24

Publish the Decision