Decision for dispute CAC-UDRP-108933

Case number	CAC-UDRP-108933
Time of filing	2026-08-21 10:00:45
Domain names	lasaffre.com

Case administrator

Name	Olga Slanařová (Case admin)

Complainant

Organization	LESAFFRE ET COMPAGNIE

Complainant representative

Organization	NAMESHIELD S.A.S.

Respondent

Organization	Jie Hsiao

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 the following figurative trademarks:

- LESAFFRE, French registration No. 3202372, registered on 2 January 2003 and duly renewed, covering goods and services in classes 1, 5, 16, 29, 30, 31, 32, 33, 35, 38, 39, 41, 42 and 45;

- LESAFFRE, International registration No. 1775809 registered on 12 October 2023, covering goods and services in classes 1, 5, 29, 30, 31, 32, 33, 35, 37, 38, 39, 41 and 42, designating numerous countries including China and the United States.

Furthermore, the Complainant is the owner of the domain name <lesaffre.com>, which was registered on 19 December 1996.

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

The Complainant is a French multinational company founded in 1853 and a leading global player in the yeast and fermentation industry.

The Complainant designs, manufactures and markets innovative solutions for baking, food flavour and nutrition, healthcare and biotechnology.

Complainant employs approximately 11,700 people from over 100 nationalities, operates in more than 62 countries worldwide and reports an annual turnover of Euro 3.2 billion.

The disputed domain name was registered on 16 June 2025 and resolves to a parking page operated by the Registrar and displaying commercial links. In addition, the Respondent has configured Mail exchanges ("MX records") for the disputed domain name.

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.

According to the Complainant, the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to its LESAFFRE trademark, as it differs from the mark only through the substitution of the letter "e" with the letter "a" and the addition of the letter "s" at the end. The Complainant submits that the disputed domain name constitutes a clear case of typosquatting and that these minor alterations do not prevent a finding of confusing similarity.

The Complainant further contends that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interest in respect of the disputed domain name. The Respondent does not appear to be commonly known by the disputed domain name and is neither affiliated with nor authorized by the Complainant in any way. Furthermore, the Respondent has not carried out any activity for, nor has it had any business with, the Complainant.

The Complainant argues that the disputed domain name constitutes a clear case of typosquatting, having been registered to take advantage of Internet users' typographical errors. In such circumstances, the Respondent cannot claim any rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name.

In addition, the disputed domain name resolves to a parking page displaying commercial links. Such use is neither a bona fide offering of goods or services, nor a legitimate noncommercial or fair use of the disputed domain name.

With regard to bad faith, the Complainant contends that the disputed domain name was registered and is being used in bad faith.

According to the Complainant, the disputed domain name was registered many years after the Complainant had established substantial goodwill and reputation in its LESAFFRE trademark.

The Complainant further notes that an Internet search for the term "lesaffre" returns results exclusively related to the Complainant and its business.

In light of the distinctiveness of the Complainant's mark and its longstanding use, the Complainant submits that it is inconceivable that the Respondent registered the disputed domain name without prior knowledge of the Complainant and its trademark rights.

Furthermore, the Complainant contends that the disputed domain name was deliberately designed as a misspelled version of its LESAFFRE trademark in order to confuse Internet users and divert traffic intended for the Complainant. The Complainant therefore submits that the disputed domain name is a clear example of typosquatting.

The Complainant also points out that the disputed domain name resolves to a parking page displaying commercial links. In the Complainant's view, such use demonstrates an intention to attract Internet users for commercial gain by exploiting the confusing similarity between the disputed domain name and the Complainant's trademark.

The Complainant therefore maintains that the Respondent has sought to profit from the reputation and goodwill associated with the LESAFFRE mark, which constitutes evidence of bad-faith registration and use.

Finally, the Complainant notes that the Respondent has configured MX records for the disputed domain name, indicating that it may be used for email communications. According to the Complainant, this circumstance further supports a finding of bad faith

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

I. Confusing similarity

It is a generally accepted principle that the first requirement under the Policy involves a relatively straightforward comparison between the Complainant’s trademark and the disputed domain name.

The Complainant has successfully proved ownership of registered rights in the trademark LESAFFRE in numerous countries. These registrations predate the registration of the disputed domain name.

The Panel notes that the disputed domain name is a misspelling of the Complainant’s mark, differing from it solely by the replacement of the first letter “e” in LESAFFRE with the letter “a” and the addition of the letter “s” at the end of the disputed domain name. The Panel finds that the mark remains recognizable within the disputed domain name. A domain name that 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. See WIPO Overview 3.1, section 1.9.

Accordingly, the Panel concludes that the first element of the Policy has been established.

II. Rights or legitimate interests

Although the Complainant retains the ultimate burden of proof under the UDRP, panels have long recognized that requiring a complainant to demonstrate that a respondent has no rights or legitimate interests may amount to proving a negative, especially where the relevant facts are primarily within the respondent's knowledge. Therefore, where 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 rebut that case with appropriate evidence. Should the respondent fail to do so, the complainant is generally regarded as having satisfied the second element of the Policy. See WIPO Overview 3.1, section 2.1.

In this case, the Complainant has not authorized the Respondent to use a misspelling of its LESAFFRE mark in any manner whatsoever, including as part of the disputed domain name. Furthermore, the Respondent is neither a licensee of the Complainant nor otherwise affiliated with, or authorized by, the Complainant. Finally, there is no evidence in the record indicating that the Respondent has been commonly known by the disputed domain name.

The disputed domain name resolves to the Registrar's parking page, which contains links to various subjects, such as "communication", "shopping", "voyage", and "music and audio". By clicking on these links, Internet users are redirected to webpages that trigger security threats.

Such use cannot be considered a bona fide offering of goods or services, nor a legitimate noncommercial or fair use of the disputed domain name, without intent for commercial gain to misleadingly divert consumers or to tarnish the Complainant's LESAFFRE mark.

Accordingly, the Panel finds that the Complainant has established the second element of the Policy.

III. Bad Faith

To succeed under the third element of the Policy, a complainant must prove that the disputed domain name was registered and is being used by the Respondent in bad faith.

In the present case, the Panel notes that the disputed domain name is a typosquatted variation of the Complainant's LESAFFRE mark. The mark consists of a coined and inherently distinctive term. The disputed domain name is confusingly similar to the Complainant's mark, as it merely constitutes a misspelling thereof. Given the high degree of similarity between the disputed domain name and the Complainant's distinctive LESAFFRE mark, the Panel finds it more likely than not that the Respondent was aware of the Complainant's mark at the time of registration and targeted the Complainant and its mark when registering the disputed domain name.

As noted above, the disputed domain name resolves to a parking page operated by the Registrar, containing various links relating to

different subjects. By clicking on any such link, Internet users are redirected to webpages that trigger security threats. In these circumstances, the Panel considers it likely that the disputed domain name has been used to attract Internet users to the parking page associated with it, and ultimately to third-party webpages, for fraudulent or other illegitimate purposes.

Lastly, the Panel notes that the Respondent has configured MX records for the disputed domain name, suggesting that it may be used for email communications. In the circumstances of this case, such configuration further supports an inference of bad faith, given the risk that the disputed domain name could be used for deceptive or fraudulent email activity.

The Respondent's use of the disputed domain name is therefore liable to cause substantial harm to the goodwill and reputation associated with the Complainant and its distinctive LESAFFRE mark.

In light of the foregoing, the Panel finds that the disputed domain name was registered and is being used in bad faith. Accordingly, the third element of the Policy has been established.

FOR ALL THE REASONS STATED ABOVE, THE COMPLAINT IS

Accepted

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

1. **lasaffre.com**: Transferred

PANELLISTS

Name	**Angelica Lodigiani**

DATE OF PANEL DECISION 2026-09-24

Publish the Decision