

## **ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION**

Credit Industriel Et Commercial S.A. v. Domain Administrator  
Case No. D2025-5007

### **1. The Parties**

The Complainant is Credit Industriel Et Commercial S.A., France, represented by MEYER & Partenaires, France.

The Respondent is Domain Administrator, United States of America ("United States").

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

The disputed domain names <cicclient.com> and <contactcic.com> are registered with NameSilo, LLC (the "Registrar").

### **3. Procedural History**

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the "Center") on December 3, 2025. On December 3, 2025, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain names. On December 3, 2025, the Registrar transmitted by email to the Center its verification response disclosing registrant and contact information for the disputed domain names which differed from the named Respondent (User #68a10270 Privacy, See PrivacyGuardian.org / User #9214cd05 Privacy, See PrivacyGuardian.org) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on December 4, 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 amendment to the Complaint on December 10, 2025.

The Center verified that the Complaint together with the amendment to 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 December 11, 2025. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was December 31, 2025. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent's default on January 2, 2026.

The Center appointed Kaya Köklü as the sole panelist in this matter on January 8, 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 company, is a bank with a long history that dates back to 1859. It currently has more than 4.7 million clients in France and abroad.

The Complainant is the registered owner of the CIC trademark. Among various others, the Complainant is the holder of the French Trademark Registration No. 1358524, registered on November 21, 1986, for C.I.C., covering protection for services in classes 35 and 36; and the European Union Trade Mark Registration No. 005891411, registered on March 5, 2008, for CIC, covering protection for goods and services in classes 9, 16, 35, and 36.

In addition, the Complainant owns and operates various domain names consisting of or comprising its CIC trademark, such as <cic.fr> and <cic.eu>.

The Respondent is reportedly located in the United States.

The disputed domain names were both registered on August 8, 2025.

According to the case record, each of the disputed domain names resolves to a parked page displaying Pay-Per-Click ("PPC") 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 names.

##### **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 names are 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 names; and
- (iii) the disputed domain names have been registered and are being used in bad faith.

Paragraph 4(a) of the Policy states that the Complainant bears the burden of proving that all these requirements are fulfilled, even if the Respondent has not 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 the Complainant, the Panel may, where relevant, accept the provided reasonable factual allegations in the Complaint as true. See section 4.3 of the WIPO Overview of WIPO Panel Views on Selected UDRP Questions, Third Edition ("[WIPO Overview 3.0](#)").

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 names. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 1.7.

The Complainant has shown rights in respect of the CIC trademark for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 1.2.1.

Although the addition of other terms, here, "client" and "contact" respectively, 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 names and the CIC 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 names. 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 names 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.

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 finds it is more likely than not that the Respondent was aware of the Complainant and its CIC trademark when registering the disputed domain names. In the Panel's view, the Respondent's deliberate choice of the disputed domain names, which comprise the Complainant's CIC trademark in its entirety in combination with the descriptive terms "client" and "contact", which are frequently associated with the Complainant's banking services, demonstrates the Respondent's knowledge of the Complainant and intention to target the Complainant and mislead Internet users.

With regard to bad faith use, the Panel notes that the disputed domain names are linked to the parked pages displaying some PPC links. The Panel further notes that the nature of the disputed domain names creates a likelihood of confusion with the Complainant's mark, as Internet users may reasonably assume an association with the Complainant. Given these circumstances, the Panel concludes that the Respondent is intentionally attempting to attract Internet users for commercial gain by creating a likelihood of confusion with the Complainant's trademark, within the meaning of paragraph 4(b)(iv) of the Policy.

Also, the Panel accepts the failure of the Respondent to submit a substantive response to the Complainant's contentions as an additional indication for bad faith use.

In the light of the above and having reviewed the record, the Panel finds the Respondent's registration and use of the disputed domain names 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 names <cicclient.com> and <contactcic.com> be transferred to the Complainant.

*/Kaya Köklü/*

**Kaya Köklü**

Sole Panelist

Date: January 22, 2026