

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

Safran v. Golden Gate

Case No. D2024-2141

1. The Parties

The Complainant is Safran, France, internally represented.

The Respondent is Golden Gate, Canada.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <safranrgroup.com> is registered with NameCheap, Inc. (the “Registrar”).

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the “Center”) on May 24, 2024. On May 28, 2024, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On May 28, 2024, 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 May 29, 2024 providing the registrant and contact information disclosed by the Registrar, and inviting the Complainant to submit an amendment to the Complaint. A reminder was sent on June 4, 2024. The Complainant filed an amendment to the Complaint on June 6, 2024.

The Center verified that the Complaint together with the amendment to the 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 June 7, 2024. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was June 27, 2024. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent’s default on July 11, 2024.

The Center appointed Dawn Osborne as the sole panelist in this matter on July 24, 2024. 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 an international high technology company operating in the aviation, defence and space fields, and is the owner of several trademarks for SAFRAN including:

- European Union trademark registration number 004535209 registered on August 17, 2009; and duly renewed on June 25, 2015; and
- International trademark registration number 884321 registered on August 5, 2005 and duly renewed on September 10, 2015.

It has an official web site at “safran-group.com” and is the registrant of several domain names reflecting its trademark including:

- <safrangroup.com>, registration date September 28, 1999;
- <safrangroup.fr>, registration date February 28, 2005;
- <safrangroup.us>, registration date March 16, 2005; and
- <safrangroup.org>, registration date March 15, 2005.

The disputed domain name registered in 2023 does not point to an active site.

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 the Complainant's trademark SAFRAN registered as above, containing it in its entirety and merely adding an extra letter “r”, the generic word “group” (reflecting the Complainant's domain names listed above) and the generic top level domain (“gTLD”) “.com”, none of which prevents confusing similarity between the Complainant's mark and the disputed domain name.

The disputed domain name which intrinsically implies an affiliation with the Complainant does not point to an active web site. The Complainant has no rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name, is not authorised by the Complainant and does not use and is not commonly known by the disputed domain name so there is no bona fide offering of goods or services or legitimate non commercial or fair use.

Passive holding of a domain name containing a mark with a reputation is bad faith registration and use under the Policy.

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 entirety of the mark is reproduced 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.

Although the addition of other indications or terms here, “group” and a single letter “r” may bear on assessment of the second and third elements, the Panel finds the addition of these does not prevent a finding of confusing similarity between the 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 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 Respondent is not authorised by the Complainant. The disputed domain name has not been used and there is no evidence to suggest that the Respondent is commonly known by it. There is no evidence of a bona fide offering of goods or services or a legitimate noncommercial or fair use. The disputed domain name appears to be intended to be a typosquatting version of the Complainant’s domain names that contain “SAFRAN group”.

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.

In the present case, the Panel notes that the Respondent has not used the disputed domain name.

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.

While the disputed domain name has not been used, it appears to be intended to be a typosquatting version of the Complainant’s domain names that contain “SAFRAN group”. Typosquatting related conduct is commonly held to be bad faith per se under the Policy.

Panels have found that the non-use of a domain name 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 distinctiveness or 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 <safranrgroup.com> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Dawn Osborne/

Dawn Osborne

Sole Panelist

Date: July 31, 2024