Decision for dispute CAC-UDRP-108886

Case number	**CAC-UDRP-108886**
Time of filing	**2026-08-03 10:27:39**
Domain names	**lci-groupe.com**

Case administrator

Name	**Olga Slanařová (Case admin)**

Complainant

Organization	**LA CHAINE INFO**

Complainant representative

Organization	**IN CONCRETO**

Respondent

Name	**David Czinczenheim**

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 established that it is the owner of numerous trademark registrations for the LCI marks in France and internationally, including but not limited to the following:

- French Trademark No. 94523091, LCI (figurative), filed on 3 June 1994, duly renewed, covering Classes 9, 26, 35, 38 and 41;
- French Trademark No. 94523092, LCI LA CHAINE INFO, filed on 3 June 1994, duly renewed, covering Classes 9, 26, 35, 38 and 41;
- French Trademark No. 94523093, LCI (figurative), filed on 3 June 1994, duly renewed, covering Classes 9, 26, 35, 38 and 41;
- International Trademark No. 635607, LCI LA CHAINE INFO (figurative), filed on 2 December 1994, designating, inter alia, Benelux, Germany, Italy, Monaco, Spain, Switzerland and Portugal, duly renewed, covering Classes 9, 26, 35, 38 and 41; and
- French Trademark No. 4239026, LCI VOUS ETES AU COEUR DE L'INFO (figurative), filed on 8 January 2016, duly renewed, covering Classes 9, 16, 35, 38 and 41.

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

The Complainant is a French company belonging to the TF1 Group, a media group active in television broadcasting, streaming and audiovisual production. Established in 1994, the Complainant operates LCI, a 24-hour news channel broadcasting in France.

According to the evidence submitted, the TF1 Group generated revenues of approximately EUR 2.3 billion in 2025 and employs more than 3,000 people across 12 countries. The Complainant further submits that its television, online and social media services reach a substantial audience, including more than 12 million monthly visitors to the tf1info.fr website and mobile application and millions of followers across major social media platforms.

The Respondent appears to be an individual located in Alpes Maritimes, France.

The disputed domain name was registered on 9 August 2026.

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).

The Complainant relies upon its trademark registrations for LCI. The registration of a trademark is sufficient to establish rights in a mark for the purposes of paragraph 4(a)(i) of the Policy. See Avast Software s.r.o. v. Milen Radumilo, 102384 (CAC 2019-03-12). The Panel therefore finds that the Complainant has established rights in the LCI trademark.

The disputed domain name incorporates the LCI trademark in its entirety, together with the term “groupe”, the French equivalent of “group”. The addition of such a descriptive or generic term does not prevent a finding of confusing similarity where the complainant’s trademark remains clearly recognizable within the disputed domain name. See LyondellBasell Industries Holdings B.V. v. Zara Narang, 108230 (CAC 2026-01-26) (“The disputed domain name is confusingly similar to the Complainant's mark since the addition of the descriptive element ‘group’ does not have a relevant influence on the similarity of signs, which remain phonetically highly similar.”).

Accordingly, the Panel finds that the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to the Complainant’s LCI trademark. The applicable generic Top-Level Domain (“gTLD”) is disregarded for the purposes of the comparison under paragraph 4(a)(i) of the Policy.

For the foregoing reasons, the Panel finds that the Complainant has satisfied 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). More specifically, the Complainant must first make a prima facie case that the Respondent lacks rights and legitimate interests in the disputed domain name, and the burden of proof then shifts to the Respondent to show it does have rights or legitimate interests. See PepsiCo, Inc. v Smith power production, 102378, (CAC 2019-03-08) ("The Panel finds that the Complainant has made out a prima facie case that arises from the considerations above. All of these matters go to make out the prima facie case against the Respondent. As the Respondent has not filed a Response or attempted by any other means to rebut the prima facie case against it, the Panel finds that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name.").

The Complainant submits that the Respondent is not authorized to use the LCI trademark, is not commonly known by the disputed domain name, and has not used, or made demonstrable preparations to use, the disputed domain name in connection with a bona fide offering of goods or services or for a legitimate noncommercial or fair use purpose.

The Complainant further submits that the disputed domain name was offered for sale shortly after registration and that, in view of the reputation of the LCI trademark and the Respondent’s location in France, the Respondent was aware of the Complainant and its trademark rights when registering the disputed domain name.

The Panel finds that these submissions are sufficient to establish a prima facie case that the Respondent lacks rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name. The burden of production therefore shifts to the Respondent to rebut that prima facie case by demonstrating rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name.

The Respondent has not filed a Response and has not otherwise participated in these proceedings. There is no evidence before the Panel of any circumstances that would establish rights or legitimate interests on the part of the Respondent within the meaning of paragraph 4(c) of the Policy.

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

For the foregoing reasons, the Panel finds that the Complainant has satisfied 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).

The Complainant submits that the Respondent was aware, or should have been aware, of the Complainant and its LCI trademark when registering the disputed domain name, particularly in view of the parties' connection to France, the reputation of the LCI trademark, and the incorporation of that trademark in its entirety in the disputed domain name together with the French term "groupe".

The Complainant further submits that the disputed domain name was offered for sale for USD 995 shortly after its registration, an amount substantially exceeding the Respondent's likely out-of-pocket registration costs. The Complainant argues that this circumstance demonstrates that the disputed domain name was registered primarily for the purpose of selling it to the Complainant or to a competitor for valuable consideration in excess of the Respondent's documented out-of-pocket costs directly related to the domain name. The Complainant also submits that the Respondent is a web marketing professional and contends that this further supports an inference that the registration was made with knowledge of, and with the intention of taking advantage of, the Complainant's trademark rights.

Having considered the Complaint and the supporting evidence, including the screenshots showing that the disputed domain name was offered for sale shortly after registration, and in the absence of any Response or contrary evidence, the Panel finds it more likely than not that the disputed domain name was registered primarily for the purpose described in paragraph 4(b)(i) of the Policy.

In particular, the LCI trademark substantially predates the registration of the disputed domain name; the disputed domain name incorporates that trademark in its entirety; the Respondent is located in France, where the Complainant operates its LCI news service; and the disputed domain name was offered for sale shortly after registration for USD 995. Taken together, these circumstances support a finding that the Respondent targeted the Complainant's trademark and registered the disputed domain name primarily for the purpose of obtaining consideration in excess of the Respondent's documented out-of-pocket costs.

Accordingly, the Panel finds that the Respondent's conduct falls within paragraph 4(b)(i) of the Policy. See COMPAGNIE DE SAINT-GOBAIN vs Gina Yu, 108851 (CAC 2026-08-21) ("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, it is 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.").

Accordingly, the Panel finds that the circumstances fall within paragraph 4(b)(i) of the Policy and that the disputed domain name has been registered and is being used in bad faith.

For the foregoing reasons, the Panel finds the Complainant has satisfied 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

Having established all three elements required under the Policy, the Panel concludes that the disputed domain name should 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. **lci-groupe.com**: Transferred

PANELLISTS

Name	**Mr Paddy TAM**

DATE OF PANEL DECISION 2026-09-18

Publish the Decision