# Decision for dispute CAC-UDRP-108789

| | |
|---|---|
| Case number | CAC-UDRP-108789 |
| Time of filing | 2026-06-29 08:52:29 |
| Domain names | biospringerlesaffre.com |

## Case administrator

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

## Complainant

| | |
|---|---|
| Organization | LESAFFRE ET COMPAGNIE |

## Complainant representative

| | |
|---|---|
| Organization | NAMESHIELD S.A.S. |

## Respondent

| | |
|---|---|
| Name | Dario Conti |

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 relies on several trademark registrations for the name “LESAFFRE”, including the following:

(i) French trademark registration No. 3202372, “LESAFFRE”, registered on January 2, 2003 and duly renewed; and

(ii) International trademark registration No. 1775809, “LESAFFRE”, registered on October 12, 2023.

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

The Complainant, LESAFFRE ET COMPAGNIE, is a French family group established in 1853 and active internationally in the fields of yeasts and fermentation. The Complainant designs, manufactures and markets solutions for baking, food taste, health care and biotechnology.

According to the information submitted with the Complaint, the Complainant employs approximately 11,700 people in more than 62 countries, distributes its products in 180 countries and achieves an annual turnover of approximately EUR 3.2 billion.

For its activities, the Complainant has also established BIOSPRINGER, a business unit dedicated to the production of yeast extracts designed to enhance the flavour and organoleptic properties of food.

The Complainant owns several domain names related to its business, including <lesaffre.com>, registered on December 19, 1996, and <biospringer.com>, registered on May 19, 1995.

The disputed domain name <biospringerlesaffre.com> was registered on September 9, 2025. It currently resolves to a parking page. Furthermore, MX records have been configured for the disputed domain name.

No administratively compliant Response has been filed.

## PARTIES CONTENTIONS

### COMPLAINANT'S CONTENTIONS

**Identical or confusingly similar**

The Complainant asserts that the disputed domain name <biospringerlesaffre.com> is confusingly similar to its registered trademark LESAFFRE, which is entirely incorporated in the disputed domain name.

The Complainant further contends that the addition of the term “biospringer” does not prevent a finding of confusing similarity. On the contrary, BIOSPRINGER is the name of the Complainant’s business unit and therefore reinforces the association between the disputed domain name and the Complainant.

The Complainant further submits that the addition of the gTLD “.com” does not affect the assessment of confusing similarity.

**No rights or legitimate interests**

The Complainant asserts that the Respondent is not commonly known by the disputed domain name and is neither affiliated with nor authorized by the Complainant.

No licence or other authorization has been granted to the Respondent to use the LESAFFRE trademark or to register any domain name incorporating it.

Furthermore, the disputed domain name merely resolves to a parking page and there is no evidence of any bona fide offering of goods or services or legitimate non-commercial or fair use of the disputed domain name.

**Registered and used in bad faith**

The Complainant asserts that the disputed domain name was registered many years after the registration and use of the LESAFFRE trademark.

According to the Complainant, the combination of the LESAFFRE trademark with the term “biospringer”, corresponding to the Complainant’s business unit, demonstrates that the Respondent was aware of the Complainant and deliberately targeted its business when registering the disputed domain name.

Although the disputed domain name currently resolves only to a parking page, the Complainant submits that passive holding does not prevent a finding of bad faith where the circumstances of the case indicate that no plausible good faith use of the disputed domain name can be conceived.

The Complainant also points out that MX records have been configured for the disputed domain name, allowing its potential use for e-mail communications and increasing the risk of fraudulent or misleading use.

### RESPONDENT'S CONTENTIONS

The Respondent has not responded to the Complaint.

## RIGHTS

The Complainant has, to the satisfaction of the Panel, shown the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to a trademark 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

Paragraph 15 of the Rules states that the Panel shall decide a Complaint on the basis of the statements and documents submitted and in accordance with the Policy, the Rules and any rules and principles of law deemed applicable.

In the case of default by a Party, Rule 14 provides that if a Party, in the absence of exceptional circumstances, does not comply with a provision of, or requirement under, the Rules, the Panel shall draw such inferences therefrom as it considers appropriate.

In the present case, the Respondent has not submitted any response and consequently has not contested any of the contentions made by the Complainant.

The Panel therefore proceeds to decide the case on the basis of the Complainant's factual statements and the documentary evidence submitted in support thereof.

**(I) Similarity test**

The Panel finds that the disputed domain name <biospringerlesaffre.com> is confusingly similar to the Complainant's registered trademark LESAFFRE, since the trademark is entirely incorporated and clearly recognizable within the disputed domain name.

The addition of the term "biospringer" does not prevent a finding of confusing similarity. Moreover, BIOSPRINGER corresponds to the name of the Complainant's business unit and therefore further strengthens the apparent connection between the disputed domain name and the Complainant.

The addition of the gTLD ".com" does not alter this conclusion, as it constitutes a technical requirement for domain name registration and is generally disregarded for the purpose of assessing confusing similarity.

Accordingly, the Panel finds that the requirements of paragraph 4(a)(i) of the Policy are satisfied.

**(II) Lack of legitimate interest**

According to the Complainant's contentions and evidence submitted in these proceedings, which have not been disputed, the Respondent is neither affiliated with nor otherwise related to the Complainant and has not been authorized to use the LESAFFRE trademark or to register a domain name incorporating it.

There is no evidence that the Respondent is commonly known by the disputed domain name or has acquired any trademark or other rights corresponding to it.

Furthermore, the disputed domain name resolves merely to a parking page. There is therefore no evidence that the Respondent has used, or made demonstrable preparations to use, the disputed domain name in connection with a bona fide offering of goods or services or for any legitimate non-commercial or fair purpose.

Consequently, and in the absence of any response or evidence to the contrary, the Panel finds that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name.

The requirements of paragraph 4(a)(ii) of the Policy are therefore satisfied.

**(III) Bad Faith**

As regards registration in bad faith, the Panel considers that the composition of the disputed domain name makes it highly unlikely that it was registered without knowledge of the Complainant and its activities.

The disputed domain name combines the Complainant's distinctive LESAFFRE trademark in its entirety with the term "biospringer", which corresponds precisely to the name of the Complainant's business unit. Such a specific combination cannot reasonably be considered coincidental and indicates that the Respondent deliberately targeted the Complainant when registering the disputed domain name.

As regards use in bad faith, the disputed domain name currently resolves only to a parking page. However, the absence of active use

does not, as such, prevent a finding of bad faith under the Policy. As established in prior cases, passive holding of a domain name may constitute bad faith use depending on the totality of the circumstances of the case.

In the present case, the Panel considers particularly relevant that:

(i) the LESAFFRE trademark predates the registration of the disputed domain name by many years and is distinctive;

(ii) the disputed domain name reproduces the LESAFFRE trademark in its entirety;

(iii) the disputed domain name additionally incorporates the name BIOSPRINGER, which specifically identifies a business unit of the Complainant, demonstrating deliberate targeting of the Complainant;

(iv) the Respondent has failed to submit any Response or provide any explanation of an actual or contemplated good faith use of the disputed domain name;

(v) the disputed domain name does not currently appear to be used for any bona fide offering of goods or services; and

(vi) MX records have been configured for the disputed domain name, creating the technical possibility of its use for e-mail communications which, given the composition of the disputed domain name, could misleadingly appear to originate from or be associated with the Complainant.

Taking all these circumstances into account, the Panel finds it difficult to conceive of any plausible active use of the disputed domain name by the Respondent that would not improperly create an association with the Complainant or otherwise interfere with the Complainant's trademark rights.

The Panel therefore concludes that the Respondent's passive holding of the disputed domain name, considered together with the deliberate combination of the Complainant's trademark and the name of its business unit and the configuration of MX records, constitutes use in bad faith for the purposes of the Policy.

Accordingly, the Panel finds that the Complainant has satisfied 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. **biospringerlesaffre.com**: Transferred

## PANELLISTS

| Name | **Hana Číslerová** |
|---|---|

DATE OF PANEL DECISION 2026-07-28

Publish the Decision