

## **ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION**

CGI Inc. v. Yasmine Reda, Reda Yasmine  
Case No. D2024-5260

### **1. The Parties**

The Complainant is CGI Inc., Canada, represented by Fieldfisher LLP, United Kingdom.

The Respondent is Yasmine Reda, Reda Yasmine, France.

### **2. The Domain Name and Registrar**

The disputed domain name <cgi-grps.com> is registered with Tucows Inc. (the “Registrar”).

### **3. Procedural History**

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the “Center”) on December 20, 2024. On December 20, 2024, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On December 20, 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 (TUCOWS, INC.) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on December 23, 2024, 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 amendment to the Complaint on December 23, 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 December 27, 2024. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was January 16, 2025. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent’s default on January 17, 2025.

The Center appointed Tobias Zuberbühler as the sole panelist in this matter on January 22, 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, a worldwide provider of information technology and business consulting services, was founded in 1976. The Complainant employs over 90,000 professionals across approximately 400 offices.

The Complainant owns *inter alia* the following registrations for the mark CGI: Canadian Trademark Registration No. TMA750360 (registered on October 15, 2009); European Union Trademark Registration No. 001254622 (registered on December 14, 2000).

The disputed domain name was registered on July 9, 2024. The website associated with the disputed domain name redirects to the Complainant's legitimate website. Additionally, email addresses connected to the disputed domain name have been used to fraudulently purchase goods from third parties on behalf of the Complainant.

#### **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.

##### **B. Respondent**

The Respondent has not submitted any 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. Trademark registrations with design elements would *prima facie* satisfy the requirement that the complainant show "rights in a mark" for further assessment as to confusing similarity. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 1.10.

The mark CGI is reproduced within the disputed domain name <cgigrps.com>. 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 terms (here "-grps") may bear on assessment of the second and third elements, the Panel finds the addition of such terms 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 that 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 that 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.

Panels have held that the use of a domain name for illegitimate activity (here, fraudulent purchase of goods and impersonation) can never confer rights or legitimate interests on a respondent. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 2.13.1.

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

### **C. Registered and Used in Bad Faith**

Under the circumstances of this case, including the composition and use of the disputed domain name incorporating the Complainant’s mark together with the term “-grps” (which could be considered an abbreviation for “groups” and the Complainant was previously known as “CGI Group” between 1982 to 1993), it can be inferred that the Respondent was aware of the Complainant’s trademark when registering the disputed domain name. Further, given the use to which the disputed domain name was put, such awareness is apparent.

The Panel notes that, for the purposes of paragraph 4(a)(iii) of the Policy, 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.

Having reviewed the available record, the Panel notes the distinctiveness of the Complainant’s trademark and the composition of the disputed domain name. Panels have held that the use of a domain name for illegitimate activity (here, fraudulent purchase of goods and impersonation) constitutes bad faith. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 3.4. Under the circumstances of this case, the redirection of the disputed domain name to the Complainant’s website, combined with the Respondent’s apparent fraud scheme with associated email addresses, leads the Panel to 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 <cgi-grps.com> be transferred to the Complainant.

*/Tobias Zuberbühler/*

**Tobias Zuberbühler**

Sole Panelist

Date: February 5, 2025