

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

BPCE v. Alberts Jodis, EURO MEDIA GROUP
Case No. D2025-4883

1. The Parties

The Complainant is BPCE, France, represented by KALLIOPE Law Firm, France.

The Respondent is Alberts Jodis, EURO MEDIA GROUP, Latvia.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <bpce.online> is registered with GoDaddy.com, LLC (the “Registrar”).

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the “Center”) on November 24, 2025. On November 25, 2025, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On the same day, 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 November 27, 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 December 5, 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 December 8, 2025. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was December 28, 2025. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent’s default on December 29, 2025.

The Center appointed Kaya Köklü as the sole panelist in this matter on January 7, 2026. 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 French corporation, provides a wide range of banking, financing and insurance services, working through its Banque Populaire and Caisse d'Epargne cooperative banking networks. The Complainant, through its subsidiaries, is present in over 40 countries worldwide. Its 105,000 employees serve 36 million clients.

The Complainant is the registered owner of the BPCE trademark. Among various others, the Complainant owns the French Trademark Registration No. 3653852, registered on May 29, 2009, for BPCE, covering protection for various goods and services in classes 9, 16, 35, 36, 38, 41, and 45, and the European Union Trademark Registration No. 008375842, registered on January 12, 2010, for BPCE, covering protection for various services in class 36.

The Complainant also owns directly or through a dedicated subsidiary various domain names consisting of or comprising its BPCE mark, including <bpce.fr> and <groupebpce.com>.

The Respondent is reportedly located in Latvia.

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

According to the evidence submitted by the Complainant, the disputed domain name has not yet been actively used and resolves to a Registrar's parking page.

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 did not reply to the Complainant's contentions.

6. Discussion and Findings

According to paragraph 15(a) of the Rules, the Panel shall decide the Complaint in accordance with the Policy, the Rules and any rules and principles of law that it deems applicable.

In accordance with paragraph 4(a) of the Policy, the Complainant must prove that each of the three following elements is satisfied:

- (i) the disputed domain name is identical or confusingly similar to a trademark in which the Complainant has rights;
- (ii) the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the disputed domain name; and
- (iii) the disputed domain name has been registered and is being used in bad faith.

Paragraph 4(a) of the Policy states that a complainant bears the burden of proving that all these requirements are fulfilled, even if a respondent has not substantively replied to the complainant's contentions. *Stanworth Development Limited v. E Net Marketing Ltd.*, WIPO Case No. [D2007-1228](#).

However, concerning the uncontested information provided by a complainant, the Panel may, where relevant, accept the provided reasonable factual allegations in a complaint as true. WIPO Overview of WIPO Panel Views on Selected UDRP Questions, Third Edition, ("WIPO Overview 3.0"), section 4.3.

For the evaluation of this case, the Panel has taken note of the [WIPO Overview 3.0](#) and, where appropriate, will decide consistently with the consensus views stated therein.

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 3.0](#), section 1.7.

The Complainant has shown rights in respect of the BPCE trademark 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 without any additions or amendments. Accordingly, the disputed domain name is identical to the BPCE mark for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 1.7.

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.

Even more, the Panel further notes that the nature of the disputed domain name indicates the Respondent's illegitimate intention to mislead Internet users into believing that any associated website is operated or endorsed by the Complainant. Noting that the disputed domain name is identical to the Complainant's BPCE trademark, the Panel believes that the Respondent's primary intent is to create confusion with the Complainant, which in view of the Panel results in an illegitimate use that cannot confer rights or legitimate interests upon the Respondent.

Based on the current record, 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.

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.

In the present case, the Panel believes that the Respondent was aware of the Complainant and its BPCE trademark when registering the disputed domain name. In the absence of a response by the Respondent, the Panel believes that the Respondent's choice of the disputed domain name, which consists of the Complainant's BPCE trademark in its entirety, demonstrates its knowledge of the Complainant and intention to target the Complainant. This constitutes bad faith registration under the Policy.

As regards bad faith use of the disputed domain name, the Panel notes that the disputed domain name has so far resolved to a parking page only. Panels have found that such non-use of a domain name would not prevent a finding of bad faith under the doctrine of passive holding. Although panelists will look at the totality of the circumstances in each case, factors that have been considered relevant in applying the passive holding doctrine include: (i) the degree of distinctiveness or reputation of the complainant's mark, (ii) the failure of the respondent to submit a response or to provide any evidence of actual or contemplated good-faith use, (iii) the respondent's concealing its identity or use of false contact details (noted to be in breach of its registration agreement), and (iv) the implausibility of any good faith use to which the domain name may be put. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 3.3. Having reviewed the available record, the Panel notes the longstanding reputation of the Complainant's BPCE trademark, the inherently misleading composition of the disputed domain name (which is identical to the BPCE trademark), and the unlikelihood of any good faith use of the disputed domain name and finds that, in the absence of a response and considering the circumstances of this case, the passive holding of the disputed domain name does not prevent a finding of bad faith under the Policy.

Consequently, the Panel finds that the Respondent's registration and use of the disputed domain name constitutes 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 <bpce.online> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Kaya Köklü/

Kaya Köklü

Sole Panelist

Date: January 20, 2026