# Decision for dispute CAC-UDRP-108955

| | |
|---|---|
| Case number | **CAC-UDRP-108955** |
| Time of filing | **2026-08-27 10:10:03** |
| Domain names | **leroymerlin.click, leroymerlin.lol** |

## Case administrator

| | |
|---|---|
| Name | **Olga Slanařová (Case admin)** |

## Complainant

| | |
|---|---|
| Organization | **GROUPE ADEO** |

Complainant representative

| | |
|---|---|
| Organization | **NAMESHIELD S.A.S.** |

## Respondent

| | |
|---|---|
| Name | **Ahmed Poganini** |

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

EU TM Registration No. 010843597 LEROY MERLIN for various goods and services in classes 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 11, 12, 14, 16, 17, 18, 19, 20, 21, 22, 24, 25, 26, 27, 28, 31, 35, 36, 37, 40, 41, 42 and 44.

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

The Complainant operates a homewares retail business that has traded as LEROY MERLIN since 1923. It employs 28,000 people in France.

The Complainant is the owner of numerous trademarks containing or consisting of the words LEROY MERLIN, including the above mentioned EU Trademark registration. Further, it owns numerous domain names that include the words LEROY MERLIN. This includes the domain name <leroymerlin.com>, which the Complainant registered in 1996 and which it uses for its official websites. On its official websites and store signage, the Complainant prominently displays the LEROY MERLIN trademark, including as part of a stylised triangular logo.

The Respondent registered both the disputed domain names in July 2026 in the name of Ahmed Poganini. Both domain names have been used to redirect web users to webpages that appear to offer homewares for sale and which prominently display the Complainant's aforementioned stylised triangular logo.

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

Paragraph (4)(a) of the Policy lists three elements that the Complainant must prove to merit a finding that the disputed domain names registered by the Respondent should be transferred to the Complainant:

1) the disputed domain names are identical or confusingly similar to a trademark or service mark ("mark") in which the Complainant has rights; and
2) the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the disputed domain names; and
3) the disputed domain names have been registered and are being used in bad faith.

The Panel is satisfied that the Complainant has established all three elements in relation to both the disputed domain names for the principal reasons set out below.

RIGHTS IN AN IDENTICAL OR CONFUSINGLY SIMILAR TRADEMARK

The Complainant has claimed registered rights over trade marks containing or consisting of the words LEROY MERLIN. This includes the above-mentioned registration in relation to numerous goods and services.

To satisfy paragraph 4(a)(i) of the Policy it is enough that the Panel is satisfied that the Complainant has registered rights in a single trademark in a single jurisdiction that predates the registration of the disputed domain name (even if that single jurisdiction is not one in which the Respondent resides or operates) (Koninklijike KPN N.V. v. Telepathy, Inc D2001-0217 (WIPO 7 May 2001); see also WIPO Case Nos. D2012-0141 and D2011-1436).

Hence, here registered rights in LEROY MERLIN are established.

The next question is whether the disputed domain names are confusingly similar to this trademark.

The disputed domain names are identical for LEROY MERLIN save for the fact they appear without a space between these two

distinctive words and they contain the ".click" and ".lol" gTLDs. Hence the similarities are striking. The most significant brand indicator in both the disputed domain names is the words "LEROYMERLIN", which are a complete reproduction of the Complainant's trademark.

Both the disputed domain names are confusingly similar to the Complainant's registered LEROY MERLIN trademark referred to above.

NO RIGHTS OR LEGITIMATE INTERESTS

The Respondent's name bears no resemblance to the disputed domain names. Further, neither of the disputed domain names appear to resolve to webpages indicating rights or legitimate interests in the Respondent. In fact, the use of the disputed domain names to publish webpages which reproduce the Complainant's stylised triangular logo and appear to offer goods for sale indicates the very opposite of a legitimate interest. It indicates an intention to use that disputed domain names to fraudulently impersonate the Complainant.

There is no basis to conclude that the Respondent has any rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain names.

BAD FAITH

Given that;

(a). The Complainant has a significant reputation in the LEROY MERLIN trademark; and

(b). The Respondent has completely reproduced the Complainant's stylised triangular logo on the aforementioned webpages;

It is beyond all doubt that the Respondent knew of the Complainant's reputation and rights in the LEROY MERLIN trademark at the time of registering the disputed domain names.

As the Panel has found the Respondent had such prior knowledge of the LEROY MERLIN trademark at the time of registering the disputed domain names, it can only follow that its purpose in registering the disputed domain names was to opportunistically profit from such confusing similarity. The Respondent targeted the Complainant's well-known name for this purpose. Such opportunism has been recognised as bad faith by numerous panels. The Panel refers to the commentary of the learned Gerald M Levine, Domain Name Arbitration, Legal Corner Press, 2nd ed. 2019, pp.432 to 434.

Both disputed domain names have been registered and are being used in bad faith.

FOR ALL THE REASONS STATED ABOVE, THE COMPLAINT IS

Accepted

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

1. **leroymerlin.click**: Transferred
2. **leroymerlin.lol**: Transferred

## PANELLISTS

| | |
|---|---|
| Name | **Andrew Sykes** |

DATE OF PANEL DECISION 2026-09-21

Publish the Decision