

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

CAISSE DES DEPOTS ET CONSIGNATIONS v. Sebastient Fochera, Sci
Louis ruffel

Case No. D2025-3261

1. The Parties

The Complainant is CAISSE DES DEPOTS ET CONSIGNATIONS, France, represented by Nameshield, France.

The Respondent is Sebastient Fochera, Sci Louis ruffel, France.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <ciclade-caissedesdepots.com> is registered with Gransy s.r.o. d/b/a subreg.cz (the "Registrar").

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the "Center") on August 14, 2025. On August 15, 2025, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On August 15, 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 (Not Identified) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on August 18, 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 August 18, 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 August 19, 2025. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was September 8, 2025. The Respondent sent an informal email communication to the Center on August 19, 2025. On September 9, 2025, the Center informed the Parties that it would proceed to panel appointment.

The Center appointed Elise Dufour as the sole panelist in this matter on September 15, 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 part of a French group, founded in 1816, which represents a major public financial institution dedicated primarily to develop France.

The Complainant owns trademark registrations for CAISSE DES DEPOTS and CICLADE in several jurisdictions, such as the following:

- the International Trademark CAISSE DES DÉPÔTS no. 873590 registered on June 29, 2005, for goods and services in Classes 9, 16, 35, 36, 37, 38, 41, and 42;
- the International Trademark CAISSE DES DEPOTS no. 899587 registered on May 29, 2006, for goods and services in Classes 9, 16, 35, 36, 37, 38, 41, 42, and 43;
- the European Union Trade Mark Registration No. 005138615 for the words CAISSE DES DEPOTS, filed on May 29, 2006, and registered on November 22, 2007, for goods and services in Classes 9, 16, 35, 36, 37, 38, 41, 42 and 43; and
- the French trademark CICLADE no. 4274734 registered on September 16, 2016, for services in Classes 35, 36, 38, and 45.

The Complainant uses these marks in connection with its financial and public interest services, including the CICLADE service for searching dormant accounts and unclaimed insurance policies. The Complainant also operates the domain name <caissedesdepots.fr>.

The disputed domain name was registered on August 7, 2025, and resolves to a parking page with pay-per-click ("PPC") commercial links.

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 CAISSE DES DEPOTS and CICLADE trademarks, containing both marks in their entirety and adding only a hyphen and the generic Top-Level Domain ("gTLD") ".com". These additions do not prevent the Complainant's marks from being clearly recognizable in the disputed domain name, nor do they prevent the finding of confusing similarity.

The Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name. The Complainant has not authorized the Respondent to use its trademarks, and the Respondent is not commonly known by the disputed domain name. The domain name resolves to a parking page with commercial links, which is not a bona fide offering of goods or services or a legitimate noncommercial or fair use.

The Complainant contends that the disputed domain name has been registered and is being used in bad faith. The Complainant's CAISSE DES DEPOTS and CICLADE trademarks are well known and distinctive, and the combination of both marks in the disputed domain name directly refers to the Complainant's CICLADE service. The Complainant asserts that it is inconceivable that the Respondent could have

registered the domain name without actual knowledge of the Complainant's rights. Furthermore, the domain name resolves to a parking page with commercial links, which demonstrates an attempt to attract Internet users for commercial gain by creating a likelihood of confusion with the Complainant's trademarks.

This conduct constitutes evidence of registration and use in bad faith.

B. Respondent

The Respondent did not file a formal Response. However, in email communication of August 19, 2025, the Respondent initially indicated a willingness to sell the disputed domain name to the Complainant. The Complainant has provided copies of email exchanges between the Parties, from which it seems that after the Complainant had suggested that the Respondent transfers the disputed domain name at no cost, the Respondent subsequently clarified that the transfer would not be free of charge, indicating that he would not transfer the domain name without compensation.

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 Complainant's trademarks is reproduced within the disputed domain name.

Accordingly, the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to the Complainant's trademarks for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 1.7. It is well established that the gTLD, ".com" in this case, may be disregarded. See section 1.11.1 of the [WIPO Overview 3.0](#).

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.

Noting that the disputed domain name incorporates both of the Complainant's CAISSE DES DEPOTS and CICLADE trademarks in their entirety, the Panel finds that there is a reasonable likelihood that the disputed domain name would capture Internet-user traffic seeking the Complainant, and in turn likely deriving commercial gain from a likelihood of confusion between the disputed domain name and the Complainant's

trademarks. In the circumstances of the present case, the Panel finds that the Respondent's use of the disputed domain name to resolve to a parking page displaying sponsored links does not amount to a bona fide offering of goods or services within the meaning of paragraph 4(c)(i) of the Policy.

There is no evidence to suggest that the Respondent is commonly known by the disputed domain name pursuant to paragraph 4(c)(ii) of the Policy. Nor is the Respondent making any legitimate noncommercial or fair use of the disputed domain name further to paragraph 4(c)(iii) of the Policy. Rather, the evidence suggests that the Respondent registered the disputed domain name with a view to selling the disputed domain name to the Complainant, as the owner of the CAISSE DES DEPOTS and CICLADE trademarks (as is covered in further detail in the third element findings below).

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 that 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.

As noted above, the disputed domain name incorporates the Complainant's well-known CAISSE DES DEPOTS and CICLADE trademarks. The Panel considers it likely that the Respondent was aware of the Complainant and its rights when registering the disputed domain name and did so with a view to obtaining a benefit from the transfer of the domain name to the Complainant. This finding is reinforced by the Respondent's email communications, in which he initially indicated a willingness to sell the disputed domain name and subsequently made clear that a transfer would not be free of charge.

The Panel further notes that the disputed domain name has been used to point to a parking page displaying commercial links, with at least some links related to the services provided by the Complainant. Internet users seeking the Complainant online were likely to be misled to the parking page to which the disputed domain name resolves, potentially resulting in the generation of click-through revenue from the links displayed on the web page. The Panel finds that by using the disputed domain name in such a manner, the Respondent has intentionally attempted to attract, for commercial gain, Internet users to its website by creating a likelihood of confusion with the Complainant's CAISSE DES DEPOTS and CICLADE trademarks as to the source, sponsorship, affiliation, or endorsement of the Respondent's website and the goods and services advertised therein, in bad faith according 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 <ciclade-caissedesdepots.com> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Elise Dufour/

Elise Dufour

Sole Panelist

Date: September 30, 2025