

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

Framatome v. Martin Leroy

Case No. D2025-2209

1. The Parties

The Complainant is Framatome, France, represented by Cabinet Lavoix, France.

The Respondent is Martin Leroy, United States of America.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

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

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the “Center”) on June 5, 2025. On June 6, 2025, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On June 6, 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, Privacy service provided by Withheld for Privacy ehf) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on June 11, 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 June 16, 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 June 17, 2025. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was July 7, 2025. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent’s default on July 13, 2025.

The Center appointed Andrea Jaeger-Lenz as the sole panelist in this matter on July 23, 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 the company FRAMATOME incorporated under that name since 1990 as a French “Société par actions simplifiée” and domiciled in Courbevoie, France (Annex 1 to the Complaint). First formed in 1958, it is specialized in the design and construction of nuclear power plants and the supply of equipment, services and fuel in this field. Nowadays, the Complainant is present in 20 countries worldwide and counts more than 15,000 employees (Annexes 6 and 7 to the Complaint). The Complainant owns more than 100 trademark registrations in the term FRAMATOME worldwide (as per Annex 9 to the Complaint), among them the following (as per Annex 8 to the Complaint):

European Union (“EU”) trademark no. 017608902 FRAMATOME (word), registered on June 27, 2018 for goods and services in Classes 1, 4, 5, 6, 7, 9, 11, 19, 35, 37, 38, 40, 41, and 42;

International (“IR”) trademark no. 1449585 FRAMATOME (word), registered on June 4, 2018, designating Belarus, Switzerland, China, India, Japan, Republic of Korea, Kazakhstan, Mexico, Russian Federation, Türkiye, Ukraine, United States of America, Viet Nam, for goods and services in Classes 1, 4, 5, 6, 7, 9, 11, 19, 35, 37, 38, 40, 41, 42, and 45.

The Complainant also owns the domain names <framatome.com> and <framatome.fr> (Annex 10 to the Complaint) which resolve to its company website, on which the webpage at URL “https://www.framatome.com/en/jobseekers” is dedicated to recruitment services.

The disputed domain name was registered on March 25, 2025 (Annex 2 to the Complaint), which in April 2025 resolved to a parking website offering pay-per-click (“PPC”) links to recruitment advertisements for the Complainant and its competitors (Annex 11 to the Complaint). As of May 29, 2025 and at present, the website is not accessible under the disputed domain name.

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 it owns, amongst others, trademark registrations in the designation FRAMATOME. The disputed domain name contains this trademark in its entirety in a top position, with the addition of the term “jobs” in a terminal position. This, so the Complainant argues, leads to an obvious likelihood of confusion, as FRAMATOME is easily recognizable within the disputed domain name, and the term “jobs” non-distinctive.

Further, the Complainant states that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interest in respect of the disputed domain name. The Complainant puts forth that, going by the fact that the disputed domain name resolved to a parking webpage offering PPC Links to recruitment advertisement, the Respondent earned PPC revenues in relation to such links. This cannot be viewed as offering any bona fide goods or services via the disputed domain name. Also, with a view to the disputed domain name presently not resolving to an active webpage, the Respondent’s use could not be held bona fide. The reason for that, so the Complainant argues, is that it is confusingly similar to the Complainant’s trademark, in which the Respondent does not own a license or under which it is not commonly known. Also, the Respondent is making unfair commercial use of the disputed domain name. To the Complainant’s best knowledge, there is no plausible explanation for the Respondent’s registration of the disputed domain name. There is no evidence of the Respondent

making use, or demonstrable preparation to use, the disputed domain name in connection with a bona fide offering of good or services.

Finally, the Complainant states that the disputed domain name was registered and is being used in bad faith. As to registration in bad faith, the Complainant finds that the FRAMATOME name and trademark are well-known due to longstanding use and its strong distinctiveness and reputation, in particular in France, which the Complainant underpins with earlier panel decisions involving the FRAMATOME trademark. Also, Internet searches on the term FRAMATOME are systematically associated with the Complainant. Given this, the Complainant argues that the Respondent was clearly aware of the Complainant's trademark upon registration of the disputed domain name, by which it intentionally targeted the Complainant and its trademark. Therefore, the Complainant argues, it is obvious that the Respondent intentionally attempted, upon registration of the disputed domain name, to create a likelihood of confusion with the Complainant's trademark as to the source, sponsorship, affiliation or endorsements of a website linked to the disputed domain name. As to use in bad faith, the Complainant states that the Respondent has indeed used the disputed domain name to redirect to a parking page with PPC links notably to recruitment of the Complainant and its competitors (Annex 11 of the Complaint), which underlines the awareness that the Respondent had of the Complainant. In such use, the Respondent traded off the goodwill of the Complainant's trademark. The fact that this website was no longer accessible by May 29, 2025 does not change this finding according to the Complainant, considering that in the given circumstances also passive holding must be held as bad faith use.

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 terms, here, "jobs", 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 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 registered the disputed domain name incorporating the FRAMATOME trademark of the Complainant in its entirety followed by the term "jobs" and, initially, caused the disputed domain name to resolve to a website with PPC links purportedly leading to recruitment pages of the Complainant and competitors of the Complainant, later on holding the disputed domain name merely passively.

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.

To the extent that the disputed domain name was, just prior to the start of the present UDRP proceeding, passively held, 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.

To the extent that the Respondent has used the disputed domain name to resolve to a website with PPC links to employment pages of the Complainant and its competitors, this means that the Respondent created a likelihood of confusion and likely benefited commercially from the confusion of Internet users that visited the site by mistake. Regardless of whether the Respondent was actually generating click-through revenue, it is well established that the use of a domain name to redirect Internet users to websites of competing services constitutes bad faith registration and use in and of itself. The Panel finds that by using the disputed domain name in such a manner, the Respondent intentionally attempted to attract, for commercial gain, Internet users to its website, by creating a likelihood of confusion with the Complainant's trademark as to the source, sponsorship, affiliation, or endorsement of the disputed domain name, in bad faith pursuant to 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 <framatomejobs.online> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Andrea Jaeger-Lenz/

Andrea Jaeger-Lenz

Sole Panelist

Date: August 6, 2025