Decision for dispute CAC-UDRP-109052

Case number	CAC-UDRP-109052
Time of filing	2026-10-05 10:22:03
Domain names	saintgobain.cam

Case administrator

Name	Olga Slanařová (Case admin)

Complainant

Organization	COMPAGNIE DE SAINT-GOBAIN

Complainant representative

Organization	NAMESHIELD S.A.S.

Respondent

Name	vila vill

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 trademark registrations for SAINT-GOBAIN in numerous jurisdictions, including the following registrations (collectively, the “SAINT-GOBAIN marks”):

- International trademark registration No. 740183 for SAINT-GOBAIN, registered on July 26, 2000;
- International trademark registration No. 596735 for SAINT-GOBAIN (figurative mark), registered on November 2, 1992; and
- International trademark registration No. 551682 SAINT-GOBAIN (figurative mark), registered on July 21, 1989.

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

The Complainant is a French company specialising in the production, processing and distribution of materials for the construction and industrial markets. Itys history spans approximately 350 years. The Complainant is now one of the world’s leading industrial groups, with a turnover of around EUR 46.5 billion in 2025 and 162,000 employees across 81 countries.

The Complainant owns numerous domain names incorporating the SAINT-GOBAIN mark, including <saint-gobain.com>, which was registered on December 29, 1995.

The disputed domain name was registered on September 28, 2026, and resolves to an inactive page. However, Mail Exchange

("MX") records have been configured for the disputed domain name, enabling it to be used for email communications.

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 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

A. Identical or Confusingly Similar

Paragraph 4(a)(i) of the Policy requires a complainant to show that a domain name is identical or confusingly similar to a trade mark or service mark in which the complainant has rights.

The Complainant has submitted evidence of its registered rights in the SAINT-GOBAIN marks. The Panel is satisfied that the Complainant has established rights in the SAINT-GOBAIN trade mark for the purposes of the Policy.

In this case, the disputed domain name comprises the entirety of the Complainant's SAINT-GOBAIN word mark, save for the omission of the hyphen. This minor difference does not prevent the mark from being readily recognisable within the disputed domain name. The ".com" generic Top-level domain is a standard registration requirement and is disregarded for the purposes of the comparison.

Consequently, the Panel finds that the Complainant has shown that the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to a trade mark in which the Complainant has rights and that paragraph 4(a)(i) of the Policy has been satisfied.

B. Rights or Legitimate Interests

Once a 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 show that it has rights or legitimate interests in respect of the disputed domain name (see WIPO Jurisprudential Overview 3.1, section 2.1).

In this case, the Complainant has established a prima facie case that the Respondent lacks rights or legitimate interests in respect of the disputed domain name. The Respondent has failed to assert any such rights or legitimate interests or come forward with

evidence to rebut the case.

The Complainant has provided evidence that it has owned registered trademark rights in SAINT-GOBAIN long before the date that the disputed domain name was registered. Further, there is no evidence that the Respondent was licensed or otherwise authorized by the Complainant to use the Complainant's SAINT-GOBAIN marks or that the Respondent is commonly known by the disputed domain name. There is no evidence that the Respondent has used or made demonstrable preparations to use the disputed domain name in connection with a bona fide offering of goods or services.

The Respondent failed to file a Response and has therefore failed to rebut the Complainant's prima facie case.

Accordingly, the Panel finds that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the disputed domain name and that paragraph 4(a)(ii) of the Policy has been satisfied.

C. Registered and Used in Bad Faith

Under paragraph 4(a)(iii) of the Policy, the Complainant must establish that the disputed domain name was registered and is being used in bad faith. Paragraph 4(b) of the Policy sets out non-exhaustive circumstances that may evidence bad faith under paragraph 4(a)(iii) of the Policy.

The SAINT-GOBAIN marks have been registered and used for many years, well before the registration of the disputed domain name. The Panel accepts that the SAINT-GOBAIN marks are well known and considers it highly likely that the Respondent was aware of the Complainant and its prior trademark rights when registering the disputed domain name.

UDRP panels have recognised that the registration by an unaffiliated party of a domain name that is identical or confusingly similar to a widely-known trade mark can by itself create a presumption of bad faith. (See WIPO Overview 3.1, section 3.1.4.)

Further, the Panel notes that MX records have been configured for the disputed domain name. Although the mere configuration of MX records does not, without more, establish fraudulent activity, it enables the disputed domain name to be used for email communications and may indicate an intention to engage in impersonation, phishing or other fraudulent conduct. In the present circumstances, particularly the distinctiveness and reputation of the SAINT-GOBAIN marks, the close similarity of the disputed domain name to those marks, and the absence of any explanation from the Respondent, the configured MX records provide further support for an inference of bad faith.

Accordingly, having regard to the totality of the circumstances, the Panel finds that the disputed domain name was registered and is being used in bad faith. The Complainant has therefore satisfied 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. **saintgobain.cam**: Transferred

PANELLISTS

Name	**Francine Tan**

DATE OF PANEL DECISION 2026-10-31

Publish the Decision