

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

Boursorama v. John Deecon, TrafficDomains INC
Case No. D2025-3716

1. The Parties

The Complainant is Boursorama, France, represented by Nameshield, France.

The Respondent is John Deecon, TrafficDomains INC, Malaysia

2. The Domain Names and Registrar

The disputed domain names <boursobank.icu> and <quiz-boursobank.icu> are registered with Web Commerce Communications Limited dba WebNic.cc (the “Registrar”).

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the “Center”) on September 12, 2025. On September 15, 2025, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain names. On September 15, 2025, the Registrar transmitted by email to the Center its verification response, disclosing registrant and contact information for the disputed domain names which differed from the named Respondent (Domain Admin, Whoisprotection.cc) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on September 16, 2025, providing the registrant and contact information disclosed by the Registrar, and inviting the Complainant to submit an amendment to the Complaint. The Complainant filed an amended Complaint on the same date.

The Center verified that the Complaint together with the amended Complaint satisfied the formal requirements of the Uniform Domain Name Dispute Resolution Policy (the “Policy” or “UDRP”), the Rules for Uniform Domain Name Dispute Resolution Policy (the “Rules”), and the WIPO Supplemental Rules for Uniform Domain Name Dispute Resolution Policy (the “Supplemental Rules”).

In accordance with the Rules, paragraphs 2 and 4, the Center formally notified the Respondent of the Complaint, and the proceedings commenced on September 17, 2025. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was October 7, 2025. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent’s default on October 8, 2025.

The Center appointed Alissia Shchichka as the sole panelist in this matter on October 10, 2025. The Panel finds that it was properly constituted. The Panel has submitted the Statement of Acceptance and Declaration of Impartiality and Independence, as required by the Center to ensure compliance with the Rules, paragraph 7.

4. Factual Background

The Complainant is BOURSORAMA, a company active in the fields of online brokerage, financial information services, and online banking. The Complainant operates primarily through its main platform “www.boursorama.com”, which provides financial and economic information as well as online banking services to customers in France and abroad.

The Complainant has evidenced to be the registered owner of numerous trademark registrations including, but not limited to, the following:

- French trademark registration No. 3009973, registered on July 28, 2000, for the word mark BOURSO, in classes 9, 35, 36, 38, 41, and 42; and
- International Trademark Registration No. 1757984, registered on August 28, 2023, for the figurative mark BOURSOBANK in classes 9, 16, 35, 36, 38, and 41.

The Complainant is also the owner of various domain names incorporating its trademarks, including <boursocom> (registered on January 11, 2000) and <boursobank.com> (registered on November 23, 2005), which are used in connection with its online services.

The aforementioned trademarks and domain names were registered prior to the disputed domain names <boursobank.icu> (registered on September 9, 2025) and <quiz-boursobank.icu> (registered on September 10, 2025). At the time of this Decision, the disputed domain names are inactive. However, according to the evidence provided by the Complainant, the disputed domain name <boursobank.icu> previously resolved to a website presenting itself as a blog discussing artificial intelligence and machine learning; the disputed domain name <quiz-boursobank.icu> previously resolved to a website displaying “ucbank.live” and promoting online surveys, and offering a consultation.

The Respondent, according to the disclosed Whols information for the disputed domain name, is located in Malaysia.

5. Parties' Contentions

A. Complainant

The Complainant contends that it has satisfied each of the elements required under the Policy for a transfer of the disputed domain names.

According to the Complainant, the disputed domain names are confusingly similar to the Complainant's BOURSO and BOURSOBANK trademarks, as they reproduce the Complainant's trademarks in their entirety. In respect of the generic Top-Level Domain (“gTLD”) “.icu”, which forms part of the disputed domain names, the Complainant requests that the Panel disregard it under the first element as it is a standard registration requirement.

The Complainant further contends that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain names, as (1) the Respondent is not commonly known by the disputed domain names; (2) the Complainant is not affiliated with the Respondent, and has never licensed or otherwise authorized the Respondent to register the disputed domain names; and (3) the disputed domain names have been used to redirect to websites displaying unrelated content, which does not constitute a bona fide offering of goods or services, nor a legitimate noncommercial or fair use under the Policy.

Finally, the Complainant asserts that the Respondent has registered and is using the disputed domain names in bad faith. In particular: (1) the BOURSO and BOURSOBANK trademarks predate the registration of the disputed domain names and enjoy significant reputation in France and abroad in connection with online financial services; (2) the Respondent was therefore aware of the Complainant's trademarks at the time of registration; (3) the Respondent intentionally registered and used the disputed domain names for commercial purposes unrelated to the Complainant's business, to create a likelihood of confusion with the Complainant's trademarks and to attract Internet users for commercial gain; and (4) the Respondent appears to have engaged in a pattern of similar conduct, as evidenced by several prior UDRP decisions involving the same Respondent.

The Complainant therefore requests that the disputed domain names be transferred to the Complainant.

B. Respondent

The Respondent did not reply to the Complainant's contentions.

6. Discussion and Findings

Under paragraph 4(a) of the Policy, the Complainant carries the burden of proving:

- (i) that the disputed domain name is identical or confusingly similar to a trademark or service mark in which the Complainant has rights; and
- (ii) that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the disputed domain name; and
- (iii) that the disputed domain name has been registered and is being used in bad faith.

The Respondent's default in the case at hand does not automatically result in a decision in favor of the Complainant, however, paragraph 5(f) of the Rules provides that if the Respondent does not submit a response, in the absence of exceptional circumstances, the Panel shall decide the dispute based upon the Complaint.

Further, according to paragraph 14(b) of the Rules, the Panel may draw such inferences from the Respondent's failure to submit a response as it considers appropriate.

A. Identical or Confusingly Similar

It is well accepted that the first element functions primarily as a standing requirement. The standing (or threshold) test for confusing similarity involves a reasoned but relatively straightforward comparison between the Complainant's trademark and the disputed domain name. WIPO Overview of WIPO Panel Views on Selected UDRP Questions, Third Edition ("[WIPO Overview 3.0](#)"), section 1.7.

The Complainant has shown rights in respect of a trademark or service mark for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 1.2.1.

The entirety of the mark BOURSOBANK is reproduced within the disputed domain name <boursobank.icu>. Accordingly, this disputed domain name is identical to the mark for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 1.7.

With respect to the second disputed domain name <quiz-boursobank.icu>, the Panel finds the mark is clearly recognizable within the disputed domain name. Accordingly, this disputed domain name is confusingly similar to the mark for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 1.7.

Although the addition of other terms here, "quiz" and a hyphen, may bear on assessment of the second and third elements, the Panel finds the addition of such term does not prevent a finding of confusing similarity between the second disputed domain name and the mark for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 1.8.

The Panel finds the first element of the Policy has been established.

B. Rights or Legitimate Interests

Paragraph 4(c) of the Policy provides a list of circumstances in which the Respondent may demonstrate rights or legitimate interests in a disputed domain name.

Although the overall burden of proof in UDRP proceedings is on the complainant, panels have recognized that proving a respondent lacks rights or legitimate interests in a domain name may result in the difficult task of “proving a negative”, requiring information that is often primarily within the knowledge or control of the respondent. As such, where a complainant makes out a prima facie case that the respondent lacks rights or legitimate interests, the burden of production on this element shifts to the respondent to come forward with relevant evidence demonstrating rights or legitimate interests in the domain name (although the burden of proof always remains on the complainant). If the respondent fails to come forward with such relevant evidence, the complainant is deemed to have satisfied the second element. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 2.1.

Having reviewed the available record, the Panel finds the Complainant has established a prima facie case that the Respondent lacks rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain names.

The Complainant has confirmed that the Respondent is not affiliated with the Complainant, or otherwise authorized or licensed to use the BOURSO and BOURSOBANK trademarks or to seek registration of any domain name incorporating the trademarks. The Respondent is also not known to be associated with the BOURSO and BOURSOBANK trademarks, and there is no evidence that the Respondent has been commonly known by the disputed domain names. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 2.3.

Furthermore, based on the available record, the Panel finds that the Respondent is not making a legitimate noncommercial or fair use of the disputed domain names, without intent for commercial gain, to misleadingly divert consumers or to tarnish the trademark or service mark at issue. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 2.4.

The disputed domain names are currently inactive. However, according to the evidence provided by the Complainant, they have been used to direct to the websites displaying unrelated content to the Complainant’s business. Noting the composition of the disputed domain names, such use cannot be regarded as a bona fide offering of goods or services or for any legitimate noncommercial purpose. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 2.5.2.

Furthermore, the Panel notes that the disputed domain names are highly similar to the Complainant’s official domain name <boursobank.com>, and infers, on the balance of probabilities, the Respondent’s intention of taking unfair advantage of the likelihood of confusion between the disputed domain names and the Complainant as to the origin or affiliation of the websites at the dispute domain names, which cannot constitute a bona fide offering of goods or services.

Accordingly, the Complainant has provided evidence supporting its prima facie claim that the Respondent lacks any rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain names. The Respondent has not rebutted the Complainant’s prima facie showing and has not come forward with any relevant evidence demonstrating rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain names such as those enumerated in the Policy or otherwise.

Therefore, the Panel concludes that the Respondent does not have any rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain names and the Complainant has met its burden under paragraph 4(a)(ii) of the Policy.

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

C. Registered and Used in Bad Faith

The Panel notes that, for the purposes of paragraph 4(a)(iii) of the Policy, paragraph 4(b) of the Policy establishes circumstances, in particular, but without limitation, that, if found by the Panel to be present, shall be evidence of the registration and use of a domain name in bad faith.

In the present case, the Panel observes that the Complainant's BOURSO and BOURSOBANK trademarks predate the Respondent's registration of the disputed domain names.

Considering the distinctiveness and reputation of the Complainant's trademarks, as well as the composition of the disputed domain names, the Panel concludes that the Respondent did not register the disputed domain names coincidentally. Rather, the Panel finds that the Respondent was aware of the Complainant's business and trademark rights at the time of registration. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 3.2.2.

Furthermore, the Panel notes that the Respondent has been involved in multiple prior proceedings regarding the registration of domain names incorporating well-known trademarks (see *Belfius Bank SA / Belfius Bank NV v. John Deecon, TrafficDomains INC*, WIPO Case No. [D2025-2746](#); *Homeaway.com, Inc. v. John Deecon, TrafficDomains INC*, WIPO Case No. [D2025-2211](#); and *Carrefour SA v. John Deecon, TrafficDomains INC*, WIPO Case No. [D2025-1511](#)).

The Respondent's history of engaging in abusive registrations of domain names that incorporate well-known trademarks demonstrates a pattern of bad faith conduct, thereby reinforcing the finding of bad faith as outlined in [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 3.2.1.

The selection of domain names identical or to confusingly similar to the Complainant's trademark, combined with the absence of any credible explanation from the Respondent, leads the Panel to conclude that the Respondent was aware of the Complainant's market reputation and intended to exploit it. In the Panel's view, the Respondent has intentionally attempted to attract Internet users to its websites, for commercial gain, by creating a likelihood of confusion with the Complainant's trademarks as to the source, sponsorship, affiliation, or endorsement of the websites or the products and services offered thereon. Pursuant to paragraph 4(b)(iv) of the Policy, such conduct constitutes evidence of registration and use of the disputed domain names in bad faith. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 3.1.4.

In light of these circumstances, the Panel finds that the Respondent's registration and use of the disputed domain names constitute bad faith.

The Panel finds that the Complainant has established the third element of the Policy.

7. Decision

For the foregoing reasons, in accordance with paragraphs 4(i) of the Policy and 15 of the Rules, the Panel orders that the disputed domain names <boursobank.icu> and <quiz-boursobank.icu> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Alissia Shchichka/

Alissia Shchichka

Sole Panelist

Date: October 14, 2025