Decision for dispute CAC-UDRP-109090

Case number	CAC-UDRP-109090
Time of filing	2026-10-19 10:27:17
Domain names	credibourso.com

Case administrator

Name	Olga Slanařová (Case admin)

Complainant

Organization	BOURSORAMA

Complainant representative

Organization	NAMESHIELD S.A.S.

Respondent

Name	Tania Viou

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 has evidenced to be the owner of the following trademark registration relating to its BOURSO brand:

- word trademark BOURSO, Institut National de la Proprieté Industrielle (INPI), registration No.: 3009973, registration date: July 28, 2000, status: active.

Also, the Complainant has demonstrated to own since January 2000 the domain name <bourso.com> which resolves to the Complainant's official website at "www.boursorama.com" which is set up in the French language, and which is used to promote the Complainant's business in the online financial industry.

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

The disputed domain name was registered on October 15, 2026. By the time of the rendering of this decision, it does not resolve to any active content on the Internet. The Complainant, however, has demonstrated that at some point before the filing of the Complaint, e.g. on October 16, 2026, the disputed domain name resolved to a website at "www.credicourso.com" which was set up in the French language and which purported to offer financial services in competition with those offered by the Complainant, thereby prominently displaying the Complainant's BOURSO trademark as part of a logo "Credibourso". Such website apparently did not contain any disclaimer on to the non-existing business relationship between the Parties.

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

First, the Panel finds that the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to the Complainant's BOURSO trademark, as it incorporates the latter in its entirety, simply adding the term "credi". Numerous UDRP panels have recognized that incorporating a trademark in its entirety can be sufficient to establish that the disputed domain name is at least confusingly similar to a registered trademark. Moreover, it has also been held in many UDRP decisions and has meanwhile become a consensus view among UDRP panels that the mere addition of other terms (such as e.g. the term "credi") is not capable of dispelling the confusing similarity arising from such entire incorporation of the Complainant's BOURSO trademark in the disputed domain name.

Therefore, the Complainant has established the first element under the Policy as set forth by paragraph 4(a)(i).

Second, the Complainant contends, and the Respondent has not objected to these contentions, that the Respondent has neither made use of, or demonstrable preparations to use, the disputed domain name in connection with a bona fide offering of goods or services, nor is the Respondent commonly known under the disputed domain name, nor is the Respondent making a legitimate noncommercial or fair use of the disputed domain name without intent for commercial gain.

The Respondent is neither affiliated with the Complainant, nor has it been authorized to use the Complainant's BOURSO trademark, either as a domain name or in any other way. Also, there is no reason to believe that the Respondent's name somehow corresponds with the disputed domain name, and the Respondent does not appear to have any trademark rights associated with the term "bourso" on its own. Finally, the Complainant has demonstrated that – at some point before the filing of the Complaint, e.g. on October 16, 2026 – the disputed domain name resolved to a website at "www.credicourso.com" which was set up in the French language and which purported to offer financial services in competition with those offered by the Complainant, thereby prominently displaying the Complainant's BOURSO trademark as part of a logo "Credibourso". Such use of the disputed domain name, obviously in a manner that aims at somehow unduly profiting from the Complainant's BOURSO trademark and its undisputed reputation, neither qualifies as a bona fide nor as a legitimate noncommercial or fair use under the UDRP, not even under the so-called Oki Data test which would have required the Respondent e.g. to disclose the non-existing business relationship between the Parties which the Respondent clearly did not.

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

that, therefore, the Complainant has also satisfied paragraph 4(a)(ii) and, thus, the second element of the Policy.

Finally, the Panel holds that the disputed domain name was registered and is being used by the Respondent in bad faith.

It is obvious from the circumstances of this case that the Respondent was well aware of the Complainant's business in the online financial industry when registering the disputed domain name, and that the latter is directly targeting the Complainant and its BOURSO trademark. Moreover, resolving the disputed domain name to a website at "www.credicourso.com" set up in the French language and purporting to offer financial services in competition with those offered by the Complainant, thereby prominently displaying the Complainant's BOURSO trademark as part of a logo "Credibourso", leaves no doubt that the Respondent, by registering and using the disputed domain name, had the intention to somehow unduly profit from the undisputed reputation attached to the Complainant's BOURSO trademark, and, thus, the Respondent intentionally attempted to attract, for commercial gain, Internet users to its own website by creating a likelihood of confusion with the Complainant's BOURSO trademark as to the source, sponsorship, affiliation or endorsement of the Respondent's own website. Such circumstances are evidence of registration and use of the disputed domain name in bad faith within the meaning of paragraph 4(b)(iv) of the Policy.

Therefore, the Complainant has also satisfied the third element under the Policy as set forth by paragraph 4(a)(iii).

FOR ALL THE REASONS STATED ABOVE, THE COMPLAINT IS

Accepted

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

1. **credibourso.com**: Transferred

PANELLISTS

Name	**Stephanie Hartung**

DATE OF PANEL DECISION 2026-11-16

Publish the Decision