

Decision for dispute CAC-UDRP-108832

Case number	CAC-UDRP-108832
Time of filing	2026-07-15 15:22:11
Domain names	pointsnordic.com, point-s-nordic.com

Case administrator

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

Complainant

Organization	POINT S FRANCE
--------------	----------------

Complainant representative

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

Respondents

Organization	web master
Organization	Domain Admin

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 names.

IDENTIFICATION OF RIGHTS

- The Complainant is the owner of trademark registrations for POINT S, including, inter alia:
 - International Registration No. 866487 for the figurative mark point.S, registered on October 1, 2004; and
 - International Registration No. 1447904 for the word mark POINT S, registered on August 18, 2018, in Classes 7, 12, 37 and 40.

Both trademark registrations predate the registration of the disputed domain names and designate multiple countries, for instance Switzerland, Ukraine and Australia (IR No. 866487) or China (IR No. 1447904).

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

The Complainant is a French company operating under the POINT S brand in the tyre retail and vehicle maintenance sector. The evidence shows that the Point S network was created in France in 1971 and has developed into an international independent tyre dealer and vehicle maintenance network with more than 7,244 points of sale in 54 countries.

On February 7, 2026, Point S Europe, together with Point S Sweden and Point S Norway, publicly announced the creation of "Point S Nordic", described as a new regional headquarters intended to strengthen synergies across Sweden, Norway, Finland and Denmark.

The record also contains European Union trademark application No. 019367175 for the word mark POINT S NORDIC, filed on May 19, 2026 by POINT S DEVELOPMENT-PSD, at the same 9 Rue Curie, Lyon address as the Complainant.

The disputed domain name <point-s-nordic.com> was registered on May 19, 2026. The disputed domain name <pointsnordic.com> was registered on May 22, 2026. Both disputed domain names are registered with Realtime Register B.V.

The Registrar disclosed "web master", with an address in Hong Kong, as the registrant of <pointsnordic.com>, and Domain Admin / Kevin Yao, with an address in Beijing, China, as the registrant of <point-s-nordic.com>.

The evidence shows that <point-s-nordic.com> does not resolve to an active website. The disputed domain name <pointsnordic.com> resolves to a domain-name marketplace page stating that "PointsNordic.com is for sale" and offering the domain name for USD 1,999.

No Response was filed by either Respondent.

PARTIES CONTENTIONS

The Complainant contends that the requirements of the Policy have been met and that the disputed domain names 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 names are 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 names (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 names have been registered and are 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

Consolidation of the Respondents

The Complaint has been brought against two nominally different Respondents. The Complainant requests consolidation on the basis that the disputed domain names are subject to common control.

Paragraph 10(e) of the Rules grants the Panel authority to decide a request to consolidate multiple domain name disputes. Under section 4.11.2 of the WIPO Overview 3.1, where a complaint is filed against multiple respondents, panels consider whether (i) the disputed domain names or corresponding websites are subject to common control, and (ii) consolidation would be fair and equitable to all parties. Procedural efficiency is also relevant. Common control may be established by a combination of circumstances, including naming patterns, registration timing, registrar or technical information, the nature of the trademark

targeted, and the respondents' conduct.

The Panel acknowledges that the cumulative circumstances are sufficiently distinctive to support consolidation.

First, after disregarding hyphens, the second-level portions of the disputed domain names are identical: both consist of the exact sequence "pointsnordic". The domains are two punctuation variants of the same specific designation.

Second, that designation corresponds exactly to "POINT S NORDIC", the name publicly announced by Point S only a few months earlier for its new Nordic regional headquarters. The registrations therefore target not only the same POINT S trademark, but the same newly adopted and highly specific Point S designation.

Third, the disputed domain names were registered less than three days apart, on May 19 and May 22, 2026, through the same Registrar. The first registration occurred on the same date as the filing of the POINT S NORDIC European Union trademark application, and the second followed only three days later.

Fourth, neither Respondent has objected to consolidation or provided any explanation for this unusually close combination of naming pattern, timing and targeting. While default alone cannot establish common control, the absence of any rebuttal is a relevant circumstance in assessing the evidence as a whole.

The Panel considers that these factors, taken together, make it more likely than not that the disputed domain names are subject to common control or were registered as part of a coordinated course of conduct.

The Panel further finds that consolidation is fair and equitable. The legal and factual issues related to the two disputed domain names overlap.

The Panel therefore grants the Complainant's request for consolidation.

Rights

The Complainant has established registered rights in the POINT S mark. Both disputed domain names reproduce the POINT S mark in a clearly recognizable form. The disputed domain name <point-s-nordic.com> incorporates the mark with a hyphen between "point" and "s", while <pointsnordic.com> incorporates the same verbal elements without spaces or hyphens. Such punctuation differences have no material effect on the comparison under the first element of the Policy.

Both disputed domain names add the term "nordic" to the POINT S mark. Where the relevant trademark remains recognizable within the disputed domain name, the addition of another term, including a geographical term, does not prevent a finding of confusing similarity (see section 1.8 of the WIPO Overview of WIPO Panel Views on Select UDRP Questions, version 3.1 ("WIPO Overview 3.1")).

The generic Top-Level Domain ".com" is a standard registration requirement and is disregarded for the purposes of the confusing similarity assessment (see section 1.11.1 of the WIPO Overview 3.1).

The Panel therefore finds that the requirements of paragraph 4(a)(i) of the Policy have been satisfied in respect of both disputed domain names.

No rights or legitimate interests

A complainant is required to establish a prima facie case that a respondent lacks rights or legitimate interests. Once such a case is made, the burden of production shifts to the respondent to come forward with evidence demonstrating rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name (see section 2.1 of the WIPO Overview 3.1).

Based on the Complainant's contentions, the Panel concludes that the Complainant has successfully established a prima facie case that the Respondents lack rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain names.

The Complainant has not licensed, authorized or otherwise permitted either Respondent to use its POINT S trademarks or to register the disputed domain names. Nothing indicates that either Respondent is commonly known by POINT S, POINT S NORDIC, or either of the disputed domain names.

Nor does the record disclose any bona fide offering of goods or services or any legitimate noncommercial or fair use. The disputed domain name <point-s-nordic.com> is inactive. The disputed domain name <pointsnordic.com> is offered for sale on a domain-name marketplace. In the circumstances of this case, an offer to sell a domain name that combines the Complainant's POINT S trademark with the exact term used for its recently announced Nordic headquarters does not establish rights or legitimate interests.

The composition of the disputed domain names reinforces this conclusion. Both reproduce the POINT S mark together with the identical term "NORDIC", corresponding precisely to the designation publicly adopted by Point S for its newly announced Nordic regional headquarters. Such composition carries a clear risk of implied affiliation with the Complainant.

Neither Respondent has rebutted the Complainant's prima facie case or provided any explanation for the selection or intended legitimate use of the disputed domain names.

The Panel therefore finds that the requirements of paragraph 4(a)(ii) of the Policy have been satisfied.

The Complainant has, to the satisfaction of the Panel, shown that the disputed domain names have been registered and are being used in bad faith within the meaning of paragraph 4(a)(iii) of the Policy.

Bad faith under the UDRP is broadly understood to occur where a respondent takes unfair advantage of or otherwise abuses a complainant's mark. The circumstances listed in paragraph 4(b) of the Policy are non-exhaustive.

Registration in bad faith

The Panel finds the timing and composition of the disputed domain names particularly significant.

The Complainant's POINT S trademarks were registered many years before the disputed domain names. In addition, Point S publicly announced the creation of Point S Nordic as a new regional headquarters on February 7, 2026, several months before the registrations at issue.

More importantly, <point-s-nordic.com> was registered on May 19, 2026, the same date on which European Union trademark application No. 019367175 for POINT S NORDIC was filed. The second disputed domain name, <pointsnordic.com>, was registered less than three days later, on May 22, 2026.

The two disputed domain names do not merely contain the Complainant's POINT S mark together with an arbitrary geographical expression. They reproduce, with only the omission or insertion of hyphens, the exact designation "POINT S NORDIC" that had recently been publicly adopted in connection with the Point S network's Nordic regional headquarters.

Against that factual background, the Panel considers it implausible that either disputed domain name was selected independently of the Complainant and its POINT S brand. The registration dates, the exact composition of the disputed domain names, and their correspondence with the newly announced POINT S NORDIC designation establish that the Respondents were aware of the Complainant and deliberately targeted its rights when registering the disputed domain names.

The Panel therefore finds that both disputed domain names were registered in bad faith.

Use in bad faith

<point-s-nordic.com>

The disputed domain name <point-s-nordic.com> does not resolve to an active website. The non-use of a domain name does not, however, prevent a finding of bad-faith use under the doctrine of passive holding. Under section 3.3 of the WIPO Overview 3.1, the Panel must consider the totality of the circumstances, including the distinctiveness or reputation of the complainant's mark, the respondent's failure to provide evidence of actual or contemplated good-faith use, and the overall plausibility of any good-faith use to which the domain name could be put. See also *Telstra Corporation Limited v. Nuclear Marshmallows*, WIPO Case No. D2000-0003.

In the present case, the POINT S mark has been registered and used for many years in connection with an extensive international vehicle-service network. The disputed domain name reproduces not only that mark but the exact "POINT S NORDIC" designation publicly announced before registration. The Respondent has filed no Response and has provided no evidence of any actual or intended good-faith use.

Given the specific composition and timing of the disputed domain name, the Panel is unable to identify any plausible good-faith use that the Respondent could make of <point-s-nordic.com> without creating a misleading association with the Complainant and the Point S Nordic operation.

Considering the circumstances cumulatively, the Panel finds that the passive holding of <point-s-nordic.com> constitutes use in bad faith for the purposes of paragraph 4(a)(iii) of the Policy.

<pointsnordic.com>

The disputed domain name <pointsnordic.com> is not merely passively held. It resolves to a marketplace page on which "PointsNordic.com" is expressly offered for sale for USD 1,999.

An offer to sell a domain name is not, standing alone, sufficient to establish bad faith. The surrounding circumstances are decisive (see section 3.1.1 of the WIPO Overview 3.1). Here, the domain name reproduces the Complainant's POINT S mark together with the exact term used for its recently announced Nordic headquarters, was registered only three days after the POINT S NORDIC EU trademark application and less than three days after the registration of the other disputed domain name, and is offered for a four-figure sum substantially exceeding ordinary domain-name registration costs.

These circumstances considered in their entirety constitute evidence of bad faith.

The requirements of paragraph 4(a)(iii) of the Policy have therefore been satisfied in respect of both disputed domain names.

FOR ALL THE REASONS STATED ABOVE, THE COMPLAINT IS

Accepted

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

- 1. **pointsnordic.com**: Transferred
- 2. **point-s-nordic.com**: Transferred

PANELLISTS

Name	Karel Šindelka
------	----------------

DATE OF PANEL DECISION	2026-08-24
------------------------	------------

Publish the Decision