

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

Technitoit v. Brian Desbarres, techni toiture 45
Case No. D2025-3995

1. The Parties

The Complainant is Technitoit, France, represented by Cabinet Bouchara, France.

The Respondent is Brian Desbarres, techni toiture 45, France.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <technitoiture45.com> is registered with Wix.com Ltd. (the “Registrar”).

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the “Center”) on September 30, 2025. On October 1, 2025, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On October 3, 2025, the Registrar transmitted by email to the Center its verification response disclosing registrant and contact information for the disputed domain name which differed from the named Respondent (Unknown information) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on October 14, 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 October 20, 2025.

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 October 21, 2025. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was November 10, 2025. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent’s default on November 11, 2025.


The Center appointed Elise Dufour as the sole panelist in this matter on November 17, 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 a French company active in the field of home renovation, offering services in roofing, facade refurbishment, insulation, and energy renovation. It has been operating in France since 2002 through a franchise network composed of 80 agencies and approximately 800 employees.

The Complainant is the owner of several trademarks protecting the sign TECHNITOIT, used in connection with its renovation services.

These include:

- French trademark  registration No. 4698194, registered on May 14, 2021, in classes 1, 2, 35, 37, 41 and 42.

The Complainant is also the holder of numerous domain names, and notably the domain name <technitoit.com> registered on June 3, 2006.

The disputed domain name was registered on November 15, 2021.

Evidence submitted by the Complainant shows that the disputed domain name resolves to a website offering primarily roof renovation services alongside other related services including zinc work, Velux window installation, and waterproofing.

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 name.

Notably, the Complainant contends that the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to its registered trademark TECHNITOIT. For the Complainant, the disputed domain name incorporates the Complainant's trademark TECHNITOIT in its entirety, and the addition of the letters "ure" to form the French term "toiture" (meaning "roofing" in English) does not prevent confusing similarity because it is a derivative and descriptive term directly related to the Complainant's activity and the number "45" is non-distinctive and does not alter the overall impression of similarity.

The Complainant further submits that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name, the Complainant has never authorized the Respondent to use its TECHNITOIT trademark or any variation thereof. In addition, the Complainant stresses that the Respondent does not appear to hold any registered trademark or business name corresponding to "technitoiture" or similar terms.

Finally, the Complainant argues that the Respondent registered and is using the disputed domain name in bad faith. The Complainant contends that the Respondent could not reasonably have been unaware of the Complainant when selecting an almost identical domain name in the same business sector. For the Complainant, "technitoiture" is a synonymic variation of its trademark TECHNITOIT, creating a risk of implied affiliation, especially since the Complainant itself uses the domain name <technitoit.com>. Furthermore, the Complainant argues that the composition of the disputed domain name coupled with its use to resolve to a

website promoting roof renovation services creates a likelihood of confusion with the Complainant's trademark. Finally, for the Complainant, the fact that the Respondent used a privacy protection service would indicate an intent to conceal identity and should be considered an indicator of bad faith.

B. Respondent

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

6. Discussion and Findings

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 Panel finds the mark is recognizable within the disputed domain name. Accordingly, the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to the mark for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 1.7.

Indeed, the disputed domain name reproduces the Complainant's trademark and only differs from said trademark by the addition of the letters "ure" and the addition of the number "45", which does not prevent the Complainant's trademark from being recognizable within the disputed domain name. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 1.7.

Regarding the generic Top-Level Domain ("gTLD") ".com" in the disputed domain name, it is well established that gTLDs do not generally affect the assessment of a domain name for the purpose of determining identity or confusingly similarity. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 1.11.1

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

B. Rights or Legitimate Interests

In light of the Panel's findings below in relation to bad faith, it is not necessary to consider the issue of rights or legitimate interests.

C. Registered and Used in Bad Faith

The evidence before the Panel does not indicate that the Respondent registered the disputed domain name with the intention of profiting from, or otherwise exploiting, the Complainant's trademark.

The Panel is unable to conclude that the Respondent registered the disputed domain name in bad faith with the Complainant or its trademark rights in mind. The term "technitoiture" seems to be a combination of two descriptive French words ("techni", which appears to be an abbreviation for "technic" and/or "technical", and "toiture", meaning "roofing" in English), and the number "45", which appears to refer to the French administrative department where the Respondent is located.

As to whether the Respondent knew of the Complainant at the time of registration, the Panel finds the record insufficient to support such inference. While the Complainant asserts that it is the leader in home renovation in France, it provided limited information about its business and reputation, merely submitting three recent French press articles.

The Panel's own limited Internet search for "techni" and "toit" shows that numerous third parties use of such terms as a trade name in connection with roof renovation services.

In light of this, the disputed domain name's composition of two descriptive terms weighs against a finding that the Respondent specifically targeted the Complainant.

There is also no indication that, at the time of registration, the Respondent intended to sell the domain name to the Complainant, to disrupt its business, or to prevent it from reflecting its trademark in a corresponding domain name. On the contrary, the disputed domain name is being used to promote the Respondent's own business under that name.

The Panel further notes that the Respondent's website does not appear to suggest any affiliation with, or endorsement by, the Complainant or its products and services, and does not make use of the Complainant's TECHNITOIT trademark.

Finally, while the Panel observes that the Respondent has not applied to register the TECHNITOITURE trademark, this fact alone is insufficient, in the circumstances of this case, to support a finding of bad faith under the Policy. In addition, the information displayed on the website — in particular the mobile phone number — corresponds to the details provided by the Respondent when registering the disputed domain name. This supports the conclusion that the Respondent did not attempt to conceal his identity.

Accordingly, the Panel finds that the Complainant has not established the third element of the Policy.

7. Decision

For the foregoing reasons, the Complaint is denied.

/Elise Dufour/

Elise Dufour

Sole Panelist

Date: December 2, 2025