

Decision for dispute CAC-UDRP-108821

Case number	CAC-UDRP-108821
Time of filing	2026-07-09 10:47:52
Domain names	boursolink.com

Case administrator

Name	Olga Dvořáková (Case admin)
------	-----------------------------

Complainant

Organization	BOURSORAMA
--------------	------------

Complainant representative

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

Respondent

Name	Severus KEY
------	-------------

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 has provided evidence of its ownership of registered trademark rights in the trademarks BOURSO and BOURSORAMA:

- French trademark BOURSO No. 3009973 registered on February 22, 2000;
- European trademark BOURSORAMA No. 1758614 registered on October 19, 2001.

The trademarks are still valid at present and their registration dates predate the registration date of the disputed domain name, <boursolink.com>, registered on July 3, 2026.

The Complainant also owns a number of domain names, including <bourso.com>, registered on January 11, 2000 and <boursorama.com>, registered on March 1, 1998.

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

A. Complainant's Factual Allegations

The Complainant grows in Europe with the emergence of e-commerce and the continuous expansion of the range of financial

products online. Pioneer and leader in its three core businesses, online brokerage, financial information on the Internet and online banking, it based its growth on innovation, commitment and transparency. In France, it is the online banking reference with over 6 million customers. The portal "www.boursorama.com" is the first national financial and economic information site and first French online banking platform, with over 41.5 million visits each month.

B. Respondent's Factual Allegations

The Respondent has defaulted in this UDRP administrative proceeding and has consequently made no factual allegations. The Respondent is Severus KEY, based at the address of pahou 12, Cotonou, Zou, Postal Code 00000, Benin. The disputed domain name was registered on July 3, 2026 by the Respondent, as confirmed by the Registrar. The disputed domain name redirects to a page in Portuguese featuring the BOURSORAMA trademark, with the aim of offering banking services.

PARTIES CONTENTIONS

A. Complainant

The Complainant's contentions can be summarized as follows:

I. The disputed domain name is identical or confusingly similar to a trade mark in which the Complainant has rights

The disputed domain name reproduces the Complainant's trademark in its entirety. The addition of the generic term "link" is not sufficient to escape the finding that the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to the trademark. It is well-established that "a domain name that wholly incorporates a Complainant's registered trademark may be sufficient to establish confusing similarity for purposes of the UDRP".

II. The Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the disputed domain name

The Complainant contends that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name on the grounds: i) the Respondent is not affiliated with nor authorized by the Complainant; ii) the Complainant does not carry out any activity for, nor has any business with the Respondent; iii) 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; iv) the disputed domain name points to a competitor's website by displaying the Complainant's trademark, which is not a bona fide offering of goods or services or a legitimate noncommercial or fair use.

III. The Respondent registered and is using the disputed domain name in bad faith

The Complainant submits that the Respondent registered and is using the disputed domain name in bad faith on the grounds: i) its trademark BOURSO has a significant reputation in France and abroad in connection with online financial services. Several experts have confirmed the reputation of the BOURSO trademark; ii) the disputed domain name redirects to a website displaying the Complainant's BOURSORAMA trademark. It is reasonable to infer that the Respondent has registered the disputed domain name with full knowledge of the Complainant's trademarks; iii) the use of the disputed domain name to redirect consumers to competing goods or services can be evidence of bad faith disruption of a complainant's business under Policy 4(b)(iii) and an attempt to attract users for commercial gain under Policy 4(b)(iv).

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

B. 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 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 4(a) of the Policy provides that in order to be entitled to a transfer of the domain name; the complainant shall prove the following three elements:

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

Based on the above regulations under the Policy, what the Panel needs to do is to find out whether each and all of the above-mentioned elements are established. If all three elements are established, the Panel will make a decision in favor of the Complainant. If the three elements are not established, the claims by the Complainant shall be rejected.

The Respondent did not submit a Response of any argument against what the Complainant claimed and to show his intention to retain the disputed domain name as required by the Policy and the Rules. If the Respondent does not submit a response, in the absence of exceptional circumstances, the Panel shall decide the dispute based upon the complaint. In view of the situation, the Panel cannot help but make the decision based primarily upon the contentions and the accompanying exhibits by the Complainant, except where there is an exhibit proving to the contrary.

I. Identity or Confusing Similarity

Pursuant to Paragraph 4(a)(i) of the Policy, a complainant must prove that the domain name is identical with or confusingly similar to a trademark or service mark in which the complainant has rights.

A. Complainant has rights in a trademark or service mark

The Complainant has provided evidence of ownership of valid trademark registrations for the trademarks BOURSO and BOURSORAMA, registered in 2000 and 2001 in France and EU countries as mentioned above in the IDENTIFICATION OF RIGHTS. The trademarks are still valid and their registration dates significantly predate the registration date of the disputed domain name, i.e. July 3, 2026. The Complainant therefore has rights in the trademarks BOURSO and BOURSORAMA.

B. The disputed domain name should be identical or confusingly similar to the trademark or service mark

The disputed domain name contains the Complainant's trademark BOURSO in its entirety. Numerous UDRP Panel decisions have established that the addition of words or letters to a trademark used in a domain name does not alter the fact that the domain name is confusingly similar to the trademark. WIPO Overview 3.1, paragraph 1.8 mentions: "Where the relevant trademark is recognizable within the disputed domain name, the addition of other terms (whether descriptive, geographical, pejorative, meaningless, or otherwise) would not prevent a finding of confusing similarity under the first element".

Paragraph 1.7 mentions: "In cases where a domain name incorporates the entirety of a trademark, or where at least a dominant feature of the relevant mark is recognizable in the domain name, the domain name will normally be considered confusingly similar to that mark for purposes of UDRP standing".

As to the generic Top Level Domain ".com", it is viewed as a standard registration requirement and as such can be disregarded for the purpose of assessing identity or confusing similarity.

Therefore, the Panel finds that the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to a trademark in which the Complainant has rights according to paragraph 4(a)(i) of the Policy. Accordingly, the Complainant has proven that the first element required by paragraph 4(a) of the Policy is established.

II. Rights or Legitimate Interests of the Respondent

The Complainant contends that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name on the grounds: i) the Respondent is not affiliated with nor authorized by the Complainant; ii) the Complainant does not carry out any activity for, nor has any business with the Respondent; iii) 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; iv) the disputed domain

name points to a competitor's website by displaying the Complainant's trademark, which is not a bona fide offering of goods or services or a legitimate noncommercial or fair use.

Once the Complainant makes out a prima facie case that the Respondent lacks rights or legitimate interests, the burden of production on this element shifts to the Respondent to come forward with relevant evidence demonstrating rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name. If the Respondent fails to come forward with such relevant evidence, the Complainant is deemed to have satisfied the second element. See WIPO Overview 3.1, paragraph 2.1.

Paragraph 4(c) of the Policy lists a number of circumstances which can be taken to demonstrate a respondent's rights or legitimate interests in a domain name. However, the Respondent has failed to meet that burden. The Respondent did not submit any evidence to demonstrate any of the above circumstances.

Therefore, the Panel finds that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name. Accordingly, the Complainant has proven that the second element required by paragraph 4(a) of the Policy is established.

III. Bad Faith

Under Paragraph 4(a)(iii) of the Policy, the Panel finds that the disputed domain name has been registered and is being used in bad faith on the following grounds:

A. The disputed domain name has been registered in bad faith

The Panel finds that the Respondent had knowledge of the Complainant's trademark at the time of registration of the disputed domain name, considering the following circumstances:

WIPO Overview 3.1, paragraph 3.2.2 mentions: "Noting the near instantaneous and global reach of the Internet and search engines and particularly in circumstances where the complainant's mark is widely known (including in its sector) or highly specific and a respondent cannot credibly claim to have been unaware of the mark (particularly in the case of domainers), panels have been prepared to infer that the respondent knew, or have found that the respondent should have known, that its registration would be identical or confusingly similar to a complainant's mark". The Panel believes that before registration of the disputed domain name, the Respondent had made searches for the wording BOURSO and knew it was the trademark of the Complainant.

The Complainant's trademark BOURSEO is well-known, which was considered by previous UDRP Panel decisions. See WIPO Case No. D2020-0083, Boursorama S.A. v. WhoisGuard, Inc. / Margaret; WIPO Case No. D2022-0720, Boursorama S.A. v. John Sicot, Jonathan Bramille; WIPO Case No. D2017-1463, Boursorama SA v. Estrade Nicolas. Given the distinctive and well-known BOURSO trademark, it is implausible that the Respondent selected the disputed domain name without awareness of the Complainant and its trademark. As the disputed domain name incorporates the Complainant's mark in its entirety together with the term "link", Internet users may reasonably assume that the disputed domain name refers to the Complainant and its business. This further supports the conclusion that the Respondent registered the disputed domain name with the Complainant and its trademark in mind and with the intention of taking unfair advantage of the Complainant's reputation.

In view of the above circumstances, the Panel holds that the Respondent had knowledge of the Complainant's trademark at the time of registration of the disputed domain name. As the domain name would cause confusion to internet users, it should have avoided the registration, which is considered good faith, but it registered the disputed domain name. The Respondent deliberately sought to cause such confusion. Accordingly, the Panel finds that the disputed domain name has been registered in bad faith.

B. The disputed domain name is being used in bad faith

The Complainant contends that the disputed domain name redirects to a website displaying the Complainant's BOURSORAMA trademark, with the aim of offering banking services, which redirects consumers to competing goods or services. One of the annexes of the Complainant shows the Complainant's trademark "BourSorama" and "BOURSORAMA" on the web pages. The Panel finds that the Respondent's using the Complainant's trademark on its web pages is the evidence of use of a domain name in bad faith mentioned by Paragraph 4(b)(iv) of the Policy: by using the domain name, you have intentionally attempted to attract, for commercial gain, Internet users to your web site or other on-line location, by creating a likelihood of confusion with the complainant's mark as to the source, sponsorship, affiliation, or endorsement of your web site or location or of a product or service on your web site or location.

Regarding the Complainant's contention on bad faith, the Respondent should rebut it, but it did not make any response, which strengthened the Panel's findings on its bad faith.

In view of all the above, the Panel finds that the disputed domain name has been registered and is being used in bad faith according to paragraph 4(a)(iii) of the Policy. Therefore, the Complainant has proven that the third element required by paragraph 4(a) of the Policy is established.

Decision

For all the foregoing reasons, in accordance with paragraph 4(a) of the Policy and Rule 15 of the Rules, the Panel orders that the disputed domain name be transferred to the Complainant.

FOR ALL THE REASONS STATED ABOVE, THE COMPLAINANT IS

Accepted

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

1. **boursolink.com**: Transferred

PANELLISTS

Name	Yunze Lian
------	------------

DATE OF PANEL DECISION 2026-08-08

Publish the Decision