

## **ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION**

Distribution Sanitaire Chauffage v. Martin Solange Maguerite  
Case No. D2025-1775

### **1. The Parties**

The Complainant is Distribution Sanitaire Chauffage, France, represented by Nameshield, France.

The Respondent is Martin Solange Maguerite, France.

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

The disputed domain name <cedeo-sa.com> is registered with Register SPA (the “Registrar”).

### **3. Procedural History**

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the “Center”) on May 2, 2025. On May 2, 2025, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On May 5, 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 (REDACTED FOR PRIVACY) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on May 6, 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 May 7, 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 May 9, 2025. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was May 29, 2025. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent’s default on May 30, 2025.

The Center appointed Vincent Denoyelle as the sole panelist in this matter on June 10, 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 sells sanitary, heating, ventilation, air conditioning and plumbing products for building professionals.

The Complainant is the owner of several CEDEO trade marks including the following:

- French trade mark CEDEO registered on September 8, 2017, under number 4361885; and
- French trade mark CEDEO registered on October 29, 2021, under number 4750311.

The disputed domain name was registered on April 26, 2025.

The disputed domain name redirects to the Complainant's official website at "www.cedeo.fr" and has been set up with active Mail Exchange ("MX") records.

The only information known about the Respondent is as disclosed by the Registrar.

#### **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 CEDEO trade mark as the mere addition of the term "sa" to the CEDEO trade mark in the disputed domain name does not prevent a finding of confusing similarity.

The Complainant asserts that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the disputed domain name and is not related in any way to the Complainant. The Complainant declares that it does not carry out any activity for, nor has any business with the Respondent. The Complainant states that it has not granted any licence or authorization to the Respondent to make any use of the CEDEO trade mark. Finally, the Complainant points to the use of the disputed domain name to point to the Complainant's website to conclude that this cannot qualify as a bona fide offering of goods or services or a legitimate non-commercial or fair use.

Turning to the issue of bad faith, the Complainant contends that the Respondent registered the disputed domain name in order to target the Complainant and its trade mark. The Complainant points to the use of the disputed domain name to direct to the Complainant's website as indicative of the Respondent's 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 trade mark 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 trade mark for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 1.2.1.

The entirety of the CEDEO trade mark is reproduced within the disputed domain name. Accordingly, the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to the trade mark for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 1.7.

Although the addition of other terms here, “-sa” may bear on assessment of the second and third elements, the Panel finds the addition of such term 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 Complainant has stated that it does not know the Respondent and that it has not licensed or otherwise authorised the Respondent to make any use of its trade mark CEDEO.

There is no indication that the Respondent is commonly known by the disputed domain name.

The use of the disputed domain name to direct to the Complainant’s official website at “www.cedeo.fr”, with no authorization can only serve to increase confusion that the disputed domain name is somehow affiliated with or authorized by the Complainant and is therefore misleading and cannot be considered bona fide, legitimate or fair (see for instance *Association des Centres Distributeurs E. Leclerc, A.C.D. Lec v. Eevee Nnomowoo*, WIPO Case No. [D2024-1873](#)).

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 finds that the Respondent has, on the balance of probabilities, registered the disputed domain name in bad faith given that: (i) the disputed domain name reproduces the CEDEO trade

mark, (ii) the Respondent's address disclosed by the Registrar is in France where the Complainant operates its business via numerous agencies and showrooms, and (iii) the CEDEO trade mark predates the registration of the disputed domain name by several years.

As for use of the disputed domain name, given the circumstances of the case, the Panel considers that the disputed domain name is used in bad faith.

The use of the disputed domain name to redirect to the Complainant's official website at "www.cedeo.fr", with no authorization can only serve to increase confusion that the disputed domain name is somehow affiliated with or authorized by the Complainant (see *PayPal Inc. v. Jon Shanks*, WIPO Case No. [D2014-0888](#) and *AXA S.A., AXA Investment Managers S.A. v. Domains By Proxy, Inc. / Adam Long*, WIPO Case No. [D2009-0452](#)). This circumstance, along with the Domain Name System setup of the disputed domain name (with active MX records) and the composition of the disputed domain name, lead the Panel to consider that the disputed domain name could be used to deceive Internet users. In these circumstances, the disputed domain name constitutes a potential threat hanging over the head of the Complainant especially in light of the fact that fraudulent use of domain names and emails is particularly prevalent in relation to online shopping.

The fact that the Respondent chose not to object to the Complainant's assertions can only reinforce the Panel's view that the disputed domain name was registered and is used in bad faith.

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 <cedeo-sa.com> be transferred to the Complainant.

*/Vincent Denoyelle/*

**Vincent Denoyelle**

Sole Panelist

Date: June 24, 2025