

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

Euromaster Services et Management v. Joseph Smith, Gogo
Case No. D2025-1237

1. The Parties

The Complainant is Euromaster Services et Management, France, represented by Dreyfus & associés, France.

The Respondent is Joseph Smith, Gogo, Cambodia.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <euromastersparedes2024.com> is registered with DropCatch.com LLC (the "Registrar").

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the "Center") on March 26, 2025. On March 26, 2025, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On March 26, 2025, the Registrar transmitted by email to the Center its verification response confirming that the Respondent is listed as the registrant and providing the contact details.

The Center verified that 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 March 27, 2025. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was April 16, 2025. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent's default on April 17, 2025.

The Center appointed George R. F. Souter as the sole panelist in this matter on April 29, 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 wholly owned subsidiary of the well-known Michelin group, and trades under its EUROMASTER trademark, offering tyre services and fast-fitting light vehicle maintenance. Evidence of global use of the Complainant's trading under its EUROMASTER trademark has been submitted to the Panel. The Complainant employs around 10,000 people in over 2700 service centres around Europe, selling, inter alia, over 10,000,000 tyres per year.

The Complainant has widely protected its EUROMASTER trademark through trademark registrations, including French trademark EUROMASTER Registration No.1624667, registered on July 25, 1990, and European Union ("EU") trademark EUROMASTER ASSISTANCE 24/7 Registration No. 018967246, registered on December 21, 2023.

The disputed domain name was registered on January 9, 2025, and redirects to a gambling page "www.cirsy2024.org" in the Indonesian language, and is configured with email servers.

The Complainant attempted to contact the Respondent shortly after the registration of the disputed domain name, with a view to resolving the matter amicably, but to no avail.

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 Respondent is not generally known by the disputed domain name, and states that it has never granted permission to the Respondent to use its EUROMASTER trademark in connection with the registration of a domain name, or otherwise.

Further, the Complainant draws the Panel's attention to the fact that the disputed domain name is configured with email servers, and draws the Panel's attention to, inter alia, the decision in *Accor SA v. Domain Admin, C/O ID#10760, PrivacyProtect.org/Bhardwaj*, WIPO Case No. [D2017-1225](#), in which the panel recognised the adverse risks to a complainant involved in a disputed domain name configured with email servers. These include the capacity to conduct phishing operations, and the potential to obtain valuable information as to credit cards from a complainant's clients or employees, to a complainant's detriment.

B. Respondent

The Respondent did not reply to the Complainant's contentions, and was served with a Notification of the Respondent Default on April 17, 2025.

6. Discussion and Findings

A. Identical or Confusingly Similar

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 terms, here the Spanish word “paredes”, which translates to “walls” in English, and the date “2024”, 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 the first element of the Policy has been established.

B. Rights or Legitimate Interests

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

C. Registered and Used in Bad Faith

The Panel considers it implausible that the Respondent was unaware of the Complainant's well-known EUROMASTER trademark in the adoption of the disputed domain name, and has no hesitation in finding that the disputed domain name was registered in bad faith. The addition of two terms “paredes” which translates to “walls” in English, and “2024” to the disputed domain name, does not alter this finding.

Panels have held that the use of a domain name found to be confusingly similar to a complainant's trademark to imply affiliation with the Complainant in connection with the offer of goods and services other than those traded in by the Complainant can be regarded as use of the disputed domain name in bad faith, where certain circumstances apply.

Here, the Panel notes that the disputed domain name resolves to a gambling website that featured links to content clearly targeted for commercial gain. This has been found in previous UDRP cases to constitute evidence of registration and use of a domain name in bad faith as per paragraph 4(b)(iv) of 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 <euromastersparedes2024.com> be transferred to the Complainant

/George R. F. Souter/

George R. F. Souter

Sole Panelist

Date: May 13, 2025