

Decision for dispute CAC-UDRP-108924

Case number	CAC-UDRP-108924
Time of filing	2026-08-18 09:56:46
Domain names	bostlks.com

Case administrator

Organization	Iveta Špiclová (Czech Arbitration Court) (Case admin)
--------------	---

Complainant

Organization	BOSTIK SA
--------------	-----------

Complainant representative

Organization	IN CONCRETO
--------------	-------------

Respondent

Name	Leo FINSK
------	-----------

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 owns several "BOSTIK" trademarks, registered worldwide, such as:

- International combined trademark "BOSTIK" No. 1190940, filed on 22 July 2013, duly registered and renewed since, claiming goods in classes 1, 7, 16, 17 and 19 and designating several countries worldwide and in particular Lithuania and the USA;
- International word trademark "BOSTIK" No. 1592858, filed on 1 March 2021, duly registered in classes 1, 16, 17 and 19;
- International combined trademark "BOSTIK" No. 851632, filed on 3 February 2005 duly registered and renewed since, claiming goods in classes 1, 2, 3 16, 17 and 19 and designating several countries worldwide and in particular Lithuania;
- Lithuanian national trademark "BOSTIK" No 23077 filed on 6 March 1993, duly registered and renewed since, claiming goods in classes 2, 3 and 8;
- Lithuanian national trademark "BOSTIK" No 11287 filed on 6 March 1993, duly registered and renewed since, claiming goods in class 1.

Furthermore, the Complainant indicates that, being part of the ARKEMA Group, it is the duly authorized user of the domain name <bostik.com>, reserved since at least 5 February 1996 in the latter's name, and that the domain name has been duly exploited since.

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

BOSTIK SA is a French company in business activity for over 100 years, using the trademark BOSTIK to designate its products since. It is one of the largest adhesive and sealant companies in the world, employing some 7,000 people in 55 countries across five continents. Therefore, BOSTIK is regarded as a well-known brand in the industry of adhesives and sealants. The Complainant's trademark registrations significantly predate the registration of the disputed domain name (24 July 2026).

The Complainant, being part of the Arkema Group, is duly authorized to use the domain name owned by Arkema <bostik.com> created on 5 February 1996.

The disputed domain name <bostlks.com> was registered on 24 July 2026, by the American resident Leo FINSK. This domain name is the typosquatting of the Complainant's trademark and exchanging the letter "L" with the letter "T" and the adding of the final "S" (plural) does not make any significant difference from the well-known, distinctive trademark BOSTIK.

The disputed domain name <bosstlks.com> was registered on 24 July 2026 and is actively used in connection with a website impersonating the Complainant and offering its products. Moreover, the Complainant was informed of the existence of fraudulent e-mails.

PARTIES CONTENTIONS

THE COMPLAINANT

The Complainant asserts that the BOSTIK brand is being used and products sold under this brand for over 100 years. It is one of the largest adhesive and sealant companies in the world, employing some 7,000 people in 55 countries across five continents. Therefore, BOSTIK is regarded as a famous brand in the industry of adhesives and sealants. The Complainant's trademark registrations significantly predate the registration of the disputed domain name (24 July 2026).

The Complainant contends that the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to its BOSTIK trademark, as it almost identically reproduces; The only difference lays in replacing the letter "i" with the latter 't' (visually highly similar) and adding ta final "s" that is barely perceptible. These slight differences are not likely to alter the overall visual or phonetic impression. The Complainant concludes that the resemblance is not coincidental but rather fits a well-documented of typosquatting.

Furthermore, and in accordance with the well-established caselaw, the generic top-level domain ".com", which should be disregarded, does not affect this comparison.

The Complainant asserts that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name.

Regarding bad faith, the Complainant argues that BOSTIK is a highly distinctive, coined term with no independent meaning, making it impossible that the Respondent selected this domain name by coincidence. The Complainant further contends that the Respondent's use of the domain name to operate sending of fraudulent e-mails using impersonation.

The Complainant contends that the requirements of the Policy have been met and that the disputed domain name should be transferred to it.

THE RESPONDENT

No administratively compliant Response has been filed by Respondent. It ought to be indicated that the Centre sent of the complaint but nor the advice of delivery thereof was returned to the Czech Arbitration Court. The notice of the Commencement of the administrative proceeding was therefore only sent by e-mail. Yet, the e-mail notice sent to preferred252@web-library.net was delivered. The notice sent to postmaster@bostlks.com was returned back undelivered as the e-mail addresses had permanent fatal errors.

The Respondent never accessed the online platform.

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

Notwithstanding the fact that no Response has been filed, the Panel shall consider the issues present in the case based on the statements and documents submitted by the Complainant.

Paragraph 4(a) of the Policy directs that the Complainant must prove each of the following elements:

- that the disputed domain names are identical or confusingly similar to a trademark or service mark in which the Complainant has rights; and
- that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the disputed domain names; and
- that the disputed domain names were registered and are being used in bad faith.

Identical or confusingly similar

The Complainant has provided evidence and has thus established its rights in the BOSTIK trademark.

- disregarding the top-level suffix in the domain names (i.e. ".com");

The Panel notes that a common practice has emerged under the Policy to disregard in appropriate circumstances the general Top-Level Domain ("gTLD") section of domain names for the purposes of the comparison under the Policy, paragraph 4(a)(i). The Panel sees no reason not to follow the same approach here, so it will disregard the ".com" gTLD section of the disputed domain name.

On the question of identity or confusing similarity, what is required is simply a comparison and assessment of the disputed domain name itself to the Complainant's trademark.

The modification of the letters "i" by the letter "t", visually highly similar, and the adding of the final letter "s", does not distinguish the disputed domain name from the Complainant's trademark and more likely demonstrates the typosquatting practice intended to create confusing similarity between the Complainant's trademark and the disputed domain name.

As discussed in section 1.9 of the WIPO Overview 3.1, a domain name which consists of a variation of a trademark (typically a common, obvious, or intentional misspelling, referred to as typosquatting) is considered by panels to be confusingly similar to the relevant mark for purposes of the first element. This stems from the fact that the domain name contains sufficiently recognisable aspects of the relevant mark. Under the second and third elements, panels will normally find that employing a misspelling in this way signals an intention on the part of the respondent (typically corroborated by infringing website content) to confuse users seeking or expecting the complainant.

The addition of the generic top level domain ".COM" does not change the overall impression of the designation as being connected to Complainant's trademark.

The Panel therefore considers the disputed domain name to be confusingly similar to the Complainant's trademark BOSTIK which the Complainant has rights in accordance with paragraph 4(a)(i) of the Policy.

No Rights or Legitimate Interests

The Complainant's assertions that the Respondent is not commonly known by either disputed domain name and are not affiliated with or authorised by the Complainant are sufficient to constitute prima facie showing of absence of rights or legitimate interest in the disputed domain name on the part of the Respondent.

Therefore, in the absence of the Respondents' response, the Panel concludes that there is no indication that the disputed domain names were intended to be used in connection with a bona fide offering of goods or services as required by Policy.

Consequently, the evidentiary burden shifts to the Respondent to show by concrete evidence that they do have rights or legitimate interests in that respective disputed domain name. However, the Respondent failed to provide any information and evidence that it has relevant rights or legitimate interests in respect of the disputed domain names (within the meaning of paragraph 4(a) (ii) of Policy).

Bad Faith

The Panel finds that the Complainant has established that the disputed domain name was registered by the Respondent and is being used by the Respondent in bad faith.

The Respondent is using the disputed domain name for a redirection to the official Complainant's website and has been sending fraudulent e-mail by impersonation of the Complainant.

The Complainant's trademark registrations significantly predate the registration of the disputed domain name. The disputed domain name is confusingly similar to the BOSTIK mark.

In these circumstances, it cannot be envisaged that the Respondent registered the disputed domain name without knowledge of the Complainant and its trademark rights.

The Respondent's conduct demonstrates that the he/she intentionally attempted to fraudulently obtain personal data of internet users or even organise fraudulent activity to the detriment of these internet users.

The Panel further considers that the Respondent's conduct constitutes impersonation.

In light of these circumstances, the Panel finds that the Respondent registered and used the disputed domain name in bad faith.

The Panel concludes that 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 has therefore also satisfied the requirement 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. **bostlks.com**: Transferred

PANELLISTS

Name	David-Irving Tayer
------	--------------------

DATE OF PANEL DECISION 2026-09-23

Publish the Decision