

Decision for dispute CAC-UDRP-108831

Case number	CAC-UDRP-108831
Time of filing	2026-07-13 09:43:13
Domain names	saints-gobainn.com

Case administrator

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

Complainant

Organization	COMPAGNIE DE SAINT-GOBAIN
--------------	---------------------------

Complainant representative

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

Respondent

Name	felix derrick
------	---------------

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 consisting of the word element “SAINT-GOBAIN”, such as:
International Trademark Registration for “SAINT-GOBAIN” No. 740184 of July 26, 2000;
International Trademark Registration for “SAINT-GOBAIN” No. 740183 of July 26, 2000;
International Trademark Registration for “SAINT-GOBAIN” No. 596735 of November 2, 1992;
International Trademark Registration for “SAINT-GOBAIN” No. 551682 of July 21, 1989;
US Trademark Registration for “SAINT-GOBAIN” No. 1648605 of June 25, 1991.

Furthermore, the Complainant operates, inter alia, the domain name <saint-gobain.com>, registered on December 29, 1995.

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

FACTS ASSERTED BY THE COMPLAINANT AND NOT CONTESTED BY THE RESPONDENT:

The Complainant is a French company specialized in the production, processing and distribution of materials for the construction and industrial markets. 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 is the owner of several trademarks for SAINT-GOBAIN registered worldwide, including international trademark

registrations dating back to 1989. SAINT-GOBAIN is also commonly used to designate the company name of the Complainant.

The Complainant also owns and operates the domain name <saint-gobain.com>, registered on December 29, 1995. The Complainant operates widely in the United States, where it maintains a significant presence through its subsidiary Saint-Gobain North America.

The Disputed Domain Name was registered on May 29, 2026. The disputed domain name is currently inactive and does not resolve to any active website.

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

As the Respondent did not file an administratively compliant Response, pursuant to paragraph 14(b) of the Rules for Uniform Domain Name Dispute Resolution Policy (the "Rules"), the Panel may draw such inferences therefrom as it considers appropriate. Thus, the Panel accepts the contentions of the Complainant as admitted by the Respondent. Taking the statements and documents submitted by the Complainant under careful consideration, the Panel concludes that the Complainant has established all the elements entitling it to claim the transfer of the disputed domain name.

I. Identical or Confusingly Similar Disputed Domain Name

The Complainant has, to the satisfaction of the Panel, shown the disputed domain name to be 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.

The Complainant has, to the satisfaction of the Panel, shown that it has valid trademark rights in "SAINT-GOBAIN". The Complainant holds several trademark registrations for SAINT-GOBAIN in multiple jurisdictions, including international registrations dating back to 1989 and a US registration from 1991, all of which substantially predate the registration of the disputed domain name.

The disputed domain name is a misspelling of the Complainant's SAINT-GOBAIN trademark. The disputed domain name adds the letter "s" after "saint" and an additional letter "n" at the end of "gobain", resulting in "saints-gobainn". This indicates a case of typosquatting, i.e. the practice of registering a domain name containing an obvious misspelling of a trademark in an attempt to take advantage of Internet users' typographical errors.

It is well established in UDRP practice that slight spelling variations do not prevent a finding of confusing similarity. It is equally well established that the generic Top-Level Domain (“gTLD”) suffix “.com” is a standard registration requirement and does not serve to distinguish the disputed domain name from the Complainant’s trademark. The Complainant’s SAINT-GOBAIN trademark remains clearly recognizable within the disputed domain name despite the minor typographical alterations. Accordingly, the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to the Complainant’s SAINT-GOBAIN trademark, and the requirement of paragraph 4(a)(i) of the Policy is satisfied.

II. Respondent’s Rights or Legitimate Interests in the disputed domain name

The Complainant has established a prima facie case that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name. The Complainant must show, at least prima facie, that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests with respect to the disputed domain name; once such prima facie case is made, the burden of production shifts to the Respondent.

The Complainant has not licensed or otherwise consented to the Respondent’s use of the trademark SAINT-GOBAIN in connection with the disputed domain name. The Respondent is not identified in the Whois records by the disputed domain name but as “felix derrick”. There is no indication that the Respondent is commonly known by the disputed domain name or by any name corresponding to it. Past panels have held that a respondent was not commonly known by a disputed domain name if the Whois information was not similar to the disputed domain name (see *Skechers U.S.A., Inc. v. Chad Moston / Elite Media Group*, Forum Case No. FA 1781783).

Furthermore, the disputed domain name is a typosquatted version of the trademark SAINT-GOBAIN. Typosquatting is the practice of registering a domain name in an attempt to take advantage of Internet users’ typographical errors and itself constitutes evidence that a respondent lacks rights and legitimate interests in the domain name.

The disputed domain name is currently inactive and does not resolve to any active website. This lack of content further demonstrates the absence of a bona fide offering of goods or services or a legitimate noncommercial or fair use. The criteria established in *Oki Data Americas, Inc. v. ASD, Inc.*, WIPO Case No. D2001-0903, under which a reseller may in limited circumstances establish rights or legitimate interests, are plainly inapplicable in the present case. The Respondent is not a reseller, distributor, or authorized representative of the Complainant, does not offer any goods or services related to the Complainant’s business, and has not made any use of the disputed domain name whatsoever.

Although given the opportunity, the Respondent has not rebutted the Complainant’s prima facie case. There is no evidence in the case file indicating that the Respondent has any rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name. The Panel concludes that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name within the meaning of paragraph 4(a)(ii) of the Policy.

III. The disputed domain name has been registered and is being used in Bad Faith

The Respondent has registered and is using the Disputed Domain Name in bad faith within the meaning of paragraph 4(a)(iii) of the Policy.

The Complainant’s SAINT-GOBAIN trademark has been in use for more than 360 years and is a well-known and widely recognized mark worldwide. The Complainant is one of the top industrial groups in the world with a turnover of approximately 46.5 billion euros in 2025 and 162,000 employees.

The disputed domain name was registered on May 29, 2026, i.e. decades after the Complainant first adopted and registered the SAINT-GOBAIN trademark and more than 30 years after the Complainant registered its domain name <saint-gobain.com>. In view of the well-known character and long-standing worldwide use of the SAINT-GOBAIN trademark, it is inconceivable that the Respondent registered the disputed domain name without knowledge of the Complainant’s trademark rights.

The deliberate misspelling of the Complainant’s trademark in the disputed domain name constitutes typosquatting. Previous UDRP panels have consistently held that such actions constitute evidence of bad faith registration and use. The disputed domain name is currently inactive and does not resolve to any active website. The Panel finds that the passive holding of the disputed domain name does not prevent a finding of bad faith. As held by the decision in *Telstra Corporation Limited v. Nuclear Marshmallows*, WIPO Case No. D2000-0003, the incorporation of a famous mark into a domain name, coupled with an inactive website, may constitute evidence of bad faith registration and use where it is not possible to conceive of any plausible actual or contemplated active use of the domain name by the respondent that would not be illegitimate. Given the well-known character of the SAINT-GOBAIN trademark, the fact that the disputed domain name is a clear typosquatting variation of that mark, the absence of any conceivable legitimate use, and the Respondent’s failure to provide any explanation or justification for the registration, the Panel concludes that the disputed domain name was registered and is being used in bad faith.

Moreover, the Panel is of the opinion that the mere registration of a domain name that is confusingly similar to a well-known trademark by an unrelated party is sufficient to give rise to a presumption of bad faith.

The Respondent has not provided any evidence of actual or contemplated good faith registration or use of the disputed domain name that could refute this prima facie assessment.

Decision

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

FOR ALL THE REASONS STATED ABOVE, THE COMPLAINT IS

Accepted

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

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

PANELLISTS

Name	Dominik Eickemeier
------	--------------------

DATE OF PANEL DECISION 2026-08-07

Publish the Decision