

Decision for dispute CAC-UDRP-108851

Case number	CAC-UDRP-108851
-------------	-----------------

Time of filing	2026-07-21 10:30:50
----------------	---------------------

Domain names	saintgobain.store
--------------	-------------------

Case administrator

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

Complainant

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

Complainant representative

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

Respondent

Name	Gina Yu
------	---------

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 various trademark registrations for SAINT-GOBAIN, including the following:-

- International Trademark no. 740184 for SAINT-GOBAIN (figurative), registered on 26 July 2000;
- International Trademark no. 740183 for SAINT-GOBAIN, registered on 26 July 2000;
- International Trademark no. 596735 for SAINT-GOBAIN (figurative), registered on 2 November 1992;
- International Trademark no. 551682 for SAINT-GOBAIN (figurative), registered on 21 July 1989; and
- United States Trademark no. 1648605 for SAINT-GOBAIN and design, registered on 25 June 1991.

The Complainant registered its official domain name <saint-gobain.com> on 29 December 1995. The disputed domain name was registered on 19 July 2026.

At the time of the Complaint, the disputed domain name resolved to a parking page where it was offered for sale for USD 1,450.

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

The Complainant is a French company active in the production, processing and distribution of materials for the construction and industrial markets. It has operated for more than 360 years and is present in 81 countries, with approximately 162,000 employees and turnover of EUR 46.5 billion in 2025.

PARTIES CONTENTIONS

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

A. Identical or Confusingly Similar

Paragraph 4(a)(i) of the Policy requires a complainant to show that a domain name is identical or confusingly similar to a trademark or service mark in which the complainant has rights.

The Complainant has provided evidence that it owns trademark registrations for the SAINT-GOBAIN mark.

In this case, the disputed domain name reproduces the Complainant's SAINT-GOBAIN trademark in its entirety save for the hyphen, which does not prevent the mark from being clearly recognizable in the disputed domain name.

As for the generic Top-Level Domain (".store"), it is a standard registration requirement and is disregarded in assessing confusing similarity.

Consequently, the Panel finds that the Complainant has shown that the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to a trademark in which the Complainant has rights.

B. Rights or Legitimate Interests

Once the complainant establishes a prima facie case that the respondent lacks rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name, the burden of production shifts to the respondent to show that it has rights or legitimate interests in respect of the disputed domain name.

In the present case, the Complainant has demonstrated prima facie that the Respondent lacks rights or legitimate interests in respect of the disputed domain name.

The Complainant has provided evidence that it owns trademark registrations for the SAINT-GOBAIN mark long before the date that

the disputed domain name was registered and that the Complainant has not licensed or otherwise authorised the Respondent to use the Complainant's trademark. There is also no evidence that the Respondent is commonly known by the disputed domain name.

Further, the disputed domain name has been used to resolve to a page offering the disputed domain name for sale for USD 1,450. In the circumstances of this case, such use does not constitute a bona fide offering of goods or services or a legitimate noncommercial or fair use of the disputed domain name.

The Respondent did not submit a Response and did not provide any explanation for its choice of the disputed domain name nor evidence to show rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name which would be sufficient to rebut the Complainant's prima facie case.

Accordingly, the Panel finds that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the disputed domain name.

C. Registered and Used in Bad Faith

The Complainant must also show that the Respondent registered and is using the disputed domain name in bad faith (see Policy, paragraph 4(a)(iii)). Paragraph 4(b) of the Policy provides circumstances that may evidence bad faith under paragraph 4(a)(iii) of the Policy.

The Complainant's SAINT-GOBAIN trade mark substantially predates the disputed domain name and is well known worldwide in the relevant industry. The disputed domain name is identical to the Complainant's registered trademark (less the hyphen) and, with the top-level domain name .store its evident that the Respondent planned to offer the disputed domain name for sale to either the Complainant or competitors of the Complainant. This is evidenced further by the evidence which shows that, immediately following registration, the disputed domain name resolved to a GoDaddy page on which it was offered for sale for USD 1,450, which is more than the out-of-pocket costs for purchasing such a domain name.

Given the particular circumstances of this case and the long-standing use and distinctive nature of the Complainant's trademark, the Panel is persuaded by the evidence that the Respondent was aware of the Complainant and its SAINT-GOBAIN trademark at the time of registering the disputed domain name and specifically targeted the Complainant.

Accordingly, having regard to the circumstances of this particular case, the Panel finds that the Complainant has met its burden under 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. saintgobain.store: Transferred

PANELLISTS

Name	Jonathan Agmon
------	----------------

DATE OF PANEL DECISION 2026-08-21

Publish the Decision