

Decision for dispute CAC-UDRP-108992

Case number	CAC-UDRP-108992
Time of filing	2026-09-15 10:27:59
Domain names	bandqservices.com

Case administrator

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

Complainant

Organization	B&Q Limited
--------------	-------------

Complainant representative

Organization	Convey srl
--------------	------------

Respondent

Name	Chika Yinka-banjo
------	-------------------

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

It results from the Complainant's documented allegations that it owns numerous trademark registrations worldwide for the marks "B&Q" and "BANDQ". In particular, the Complaint is based on UKIPO Trademark registration no. UK0002207488B <bandq> filed on 2 September 1999 and registered on 27 October 2000, for goods and services in classes 2, 6, 7, 8, 11, 19, 20 and 27.

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

Founded in 1969 in Southampton, England, by Richard Block and David Quayle, from whose initials the company name derives, B&Q (<B and Q >) currently operates over 300 stores across the United Kingdom and Ireland, employing approximately 27,000 people.

The disputed domain name was registered on 21 January 2026. It currently resolves to a website which is designated as "B&Q Interface" and purports to provide information concerning services available at B&Q stores, including timber cutting, key cutting, paint mixing and other store-related services. No disclaimer informing users that said website is unaffiliated with the Complainant is displayed on the website.

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).

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

1.

The Panel finds that the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to the Complainant's BANDQ trademark, which it incorporates identically and in its entirety at the beginning of the disputed domain name. The addition of the descriptive term "services" does not prevent a finding of confusing similarity and, given the Complainant's store-related services, reinforces the association with the Complainant.

2.

The Panel finds that the Complainant has established a prima facie case that the Respondent lacks rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name. In the absence of a Response or any other information from the Respondent to the contrary, that case remains un rebutted.

First, neither the evidence in the record nor the Whois information indicates that the Respondent is commonly known by the disputed domain name within the meaning of paragraph 4(c)(ii) of the Policy. The underlying registrant information disclosed by the Registrar likewise provides no support for such a finding.

Second, the Complainant's uncontested evidence establishes that the disputed domain name resolves to a website titled "B&Q Interface", which purports to provide information about services available at B&Q stores, including timber cutting, key cutting, and paint mixing. It enables users to locate nearby stores, check service availability, calculate distances, and obtain directions, thereby presenting itself as an official B&Q customer tool. The website displays no disclaimer explaining that it is unaffiliated with the Complainant. The Complainant has no relationship with the Respondent and has never licensed or otherwise authorized the Respondent to use its trademark on the website or in the disputed domain name.

In the Panel's view, these circumstances demonstrate that the Respondent selected the disputed domain name to take unfair advantage of, abuse, or otherwise act to the detriment of the Complainant's registered trademark. The website's presentation and functionality, coupled with the absence of a disclaimer, exacerbate the confusion arising from the incorporation of the Complainant's distinctive trademark by impersonating the Complainant. Such use constitutes neither a bona fide offering of goods or services under paragraph 4(c)(i) of the Policy nor a legitimate noncommercial or fair use under paragraph 4(c)(iii).

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

3.

The Panel finds that, by using the disputed domain name, the Respondent has intentionally attempted to attract Internet users, for commercial gain, to its website or another online location by creating a likelihood of confusion with the Complainant’s trademark as to the source, sponsorship, affiliation, or endorsement of that website or location, or of a product or service offered there, within the meaning of paragraph 4(b)(iv) of the Policy.

The Complainant’s documented and uncontested evidence establishes that the disputed domain name resolves to a website titled “B&Q Interface”, which purports to provide information about services available at B&Q stores. This demonstrates that the Respondent was aware of the Complainant’s trademarks and business. In the absence of evidence to the contrary, the Panel is satisfied that the Respondent also knew, when registering the disputed domain name, that it incorporated the Complainant’s BANDQ trademark in its entirety. The knowing registration of a domain name incorporating a third party’s trademark, without rights or legitimate interests, is indicative of bad-faith registration.

Although the Panel cannot determine whether users can book services through the website, the purported commercial offering and impersonation of the Complainant are sufficient to establish the Respondent’s bad-faith intent to mislead Internet users.

The following additional circumstances, considered together, support the findings that the Respondent knew it lacked rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name and that the disputed domain name was registered and is being used in bad faith:

- The disputed domain name identically incorporates the BANDQ trademark, registered more than 25 years before the domain name’s registration;
- The Respondent neither answered the Complainant’s cease-and-desist communication nor submitted a formal Response;
- The Respondent has provided no evidence of actual or contemplated good-faith use; and
- Any good-faith use of the disputed domain name is implausible.

Accordingly, the Panel finds that the disputed domain name was registered and is 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. **bandqservices.com**: Transferred

PANELLISTS

Name	Tobias Malte Müller
------	---------------------

DATE OF PANEL DECISION 2026-10-26

Publish the Decision