

Decision for dispute CAC-UDRP-108976

Case number	CAC-UDRP-108976
-------------	-----------------

Time of filing	2026-09-04 09:47:22
----------------	---------------------

Domain names	bourso-antifraude.com
--------------	-----------------------

Case administrator

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

Complainant

Organization	BOURSORAMA
--------------	------------

Complainant representative

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

Respondent

Name	Julien Jul
------	------------

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 relies on its registration of the word mark BOURSO in France in classes 9, 35, 36, 38, 41 and 42 on 28 July 2000 pursuant to an application filed on 31 March 2000.

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

The Complainant carries on a business based in France, providing online brokerage, financial information and banking services. It has over 9 million customers. As well as its full name Boursorama, the Complainant uses the mark Bourso followed by various descriptive terms in respect of particular services which it offers. The Complainant has also registered the domain name bourso.com since 11 January 2000.

The disputed domain name, <bourso-antifraude.com>, was registered on 27 August 2026. It does not locate any website but MX servers have been configured.

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 Panel finds that the Complainant has registered rights in the mark BOURSO. The Panel is also satisfied that the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to this mark, from which it differs only in the addition of a hyphen, the descriptive term "antifraude" and the generic top level domain name suffix, .com.

The term "antifraude" is descriptive in the field of online retail financial services, indicating a facility and/or information to prevent fraud, which is a known problem in this field. The French spelling is used in the disputed domain name, as would be expected by most of the Complainant's customers. Such customers would expect the disputed domain name to be used by the Complainant's department countering fraud.

The Complainant has, to the satisfaction of the Panel, shown the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to a mark in which the Complainant has rights within the meaning of paragraph 4(a)(i) of the Policy.

NO RIGHTS OR LEGITIMATE INTERESTS

The Panel finds on the undisputed evidence that the Respondent has not used or made preparations to use the disputed domain name or any corresponding name in connection with a bona fide offering of goods or services or for any legitimate non-commercial or fair use. Nor has the Respondent been commonly known by the disputed domain name or authorised by the Complainant to use it.

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 Panel finds, on the balance of probabilities, that the disputed domain was registered and has been used for the purpose of phishing or a similar activity, or threatening to do so, by misleading (or threatening to mislead) the Complainant's customers into believing that emails from the Respondent are from the Complainant and providing confidential account information requested by the Respondent

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

The disputed domain name consists of the Complainant's registered mark and descriptive or generic elements. Evidence that it has not been used for any bona fide offering or legitimate non-commercial or fair use was undisputed, and the Respondent was not authorised by the Complainant to use it nor commonly known by it. The disputed domain name did not locate any website but MX records had been configured. Bad faith registration and use with a view to phishing or similar activity, or threatening it, inferred.

FOR ALL THE REASONS STATED ABOVE, THE COMPLAINT IS

Accepted

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

1. **bourso-antifraude.com**: Transferred

PANELLISTS

Name Jonathan Turner

DATE OF PANEL DECISION 2026-10-15

Publish the Decision