

## ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

Compagnie De Saint-Gobain v. Johnson Michael, las pasmas  
Case No. D2025-4153

### 1. The Parties

The Complainant is Compagnie De Saint-Gobain, France, represented by Nameshield, France.

The Respondent is Johnson Michael, las pasmas, United States of America.

### 2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <saintt-gobainn.com> is registered with Gransy, s.r.o. d/b/a subreg.cz (the "Registrar").

### 3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the "Center") on October 10, 2025. On October 10, 2025, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On October 15, 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) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on October 15, 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 15, 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 Christelle Vaval as the sole panelist in this matter on November 13, 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, Compagnie de Saint-Gobain, is a French company established 350 years ago with a turnover of approximately EUR 46.6 billion in 2024 and employing approximately 161,000 people globally. It is one of the world's top industrial groups, specializing in the production, processing, and distribution of materials for the construction and industrial markets.

The Complainant owns the SAINT-GOBAIN trademark in multiple jurisdictions, including the United States of America Trademark Registration No. 1648605 (registered on June 25, 1991), International Trademark Registration No. 740184 (registered on July 26, 2000), and European Union Trade Mark Registration No. 001552843 (registered on December 18, 2001).

The Complainant owns the domain name <saint-gobain.com>.

The Respondent registered the disputed domain name on October 6, 2025, well after the Complainant's trademarks were registered. The disputed domain name does not resolve to an active website.

#### **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:

1. Identical or confusingly similar

The Complainant asserts ownership of the SAINT-GOBAIN trademark, registered across multiple jurisdictions. The disputed domain name is confusingly similar to its SAINT-GOBAIN trademark, as it fully incorporates its trademark with the addition of the non-distinctive and descriptive letters "t" and "n", which the Complainant characterizes as a clear case of typosquatting, where the disputed domain name contains an obvious misspelling of its trademark.

2. No rights or legitimate interests

The Complainant asserts that the Respondent is not commonly known by the disputed domain name as it has no affiliation with the Complainant and has not been authorized to use the SAINT-GOBAIN trademark. The disputed domain name is inactive, and there is no evidence of any legitimate use by the Respondent.

3. Registered and used in bad faith

The Complainant argues that the Respondent was aware of its prior rights over the SAINT-GOBAIN trademark, given its global reputation. The disputed domain name was registered in bad faith, given that the Respondent sought to exploit the Complainant's trademark recognition. Furthermore, the inactive status of the disputed domain name, combined with the presence of configured MX servers, suggests potential malicious intent.

## **B. Respondent**

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

## **6. Discussion and Findings**

The case record shows the Center verified the Complaint's formal compliance and formally commenced the proceeding on October 21, 2025 (with a 20-day Response deadline that fell on November 10, 2025). The Center then notified the Respondent of default on November 11, 2025.

The record reflects service consistent with the Rules and WIPO Supplemental Rules. In the absence of a Response, the Panel may draw appropriate inferences from the Respondent's default (Rules, paragraph 14), as the Center's default notice also notes.

### **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, and the disputed domain name differs from the trademark by the insertion of the letters "t" and "n". Accordingly, the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to the mark for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), sections 1.7 and 1.9.

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 name. 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 name, such as those enumerated in the Policy or otherwise. The record shows no evidence of use or demonstrable preparations to use the disputed domain name for a bona fide offering of goods or services, no legitimate noncommercial or fair use, and no indication that the Respondent has been commonly known by the disputed domain name (Policy, paragraph 4(c)).

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

### **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.

The disputed domain name was registered on October 6, 2025, well after the Complainant's trademark had become distinctive and widely recognized. In the present case, the Panel considers that the Respondent targeted the Complainant's well-known trademark when registering the disputed domain name and attempted to mimic the Complainant's domain name <saint-gobain.com>.

Paragraph 4(b) of the Policy sets out a list of non-exhaustive circumstances that may indicate that a domain name was registered and used in bad faith, but other circumstances may be relevant in assessing whether a respondent's registration and use of a domain name is in bad faith. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 3.2.1.

Panels have found that the non-use of a domain name (including a blank or "coming soon" page) would not prevent a finding of bad faith under the doctrine of passive holding. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 3.3. Having reviewed the available record, the Panel notes the reputation of the Complainant's trademark, and the composition of the disputed domain name, and finds that in the circumstances of this case the passive holding of the disputed domain name does not prevent a finding of bad faith under the Policy.

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 name <saintt-gobainn.com> be transferred to the Complainant.

*/Christelle Vaval/*

**Christelle Vaval**

Sole Panelist

Date: November 19, 2025