

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

Rubis Energie v. Francis Plat, CORA SARL

Case No. D2026-0415

1. The Parties

The Complainant is Rubis Energie, France, represented by IP Twins, France.

The Respondent is Francis Plat, CORA SARL, France.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <rubiseenergies.com> is registered with Hostinger Operations, UAB (the “Registrar”).

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the “Center”) on February 2, 2026. On February 2, 2026, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On February 3, 2026, 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 (unknown / The RDAP server redacted the value) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on the same day, 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 February 9, 2026.

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 February 11, 2026. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was March 3, 2026. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent’s default on March 13, 2026.

The Center appointed Christiane Féral-Schuhl as the sole panelist in this matter on March 16, 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.


The Respondent sent email communications to the Center on March 25 and 27, 2026.

4. Factual Background

The Complainant is a French company named Rubis Energie that operates energy and bitumen distribution activities, mainly in Europe, Africa and the Caribbean. The Complainant is a subsidiary of Rubis Group, a French company in the energy sector listed on Euronext Paris, and operating over 40 countries in Europe, Africa, Asia and the Caribbean.

The Complainant is the owner of several trademarks (“the RUBIS ENERGIE Trademarks”) including the following:

- The French combined trademark  No 3447950, registered on August 31, 2006, for products and services in classes 19, 40 and 42

- The International figurative trademark  No 1219226, registered on June 18, 2014, for products and services in classes 4, 35, 37, 38 and 39

The Complainant is also the owner of several domain names, including <rubisenergie.com>.

The disputed domain name was registered on January 22, 2026, and redirects to the official website of the Complainant without authorization and is associated with email servers.

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 its RUBIS ENERGIE Trademarks, since the disputed domain name contains the trademark in its entirety. The Complainant adds that the mere doubling of the first letter “e” and addition of the letter “s” to the term “energie” is not sufficient to avoid a finding of confusing similarity.

The Complainant asserts that the Respondent has neither rights nor legitimate interests in the disputed domain name. The Complainant explains that the Respondent has no trademark or service mark related to the RUBIS ENERGIE term and that the Respondent is neither a licensee of the Complainant, nor does it have any authorization from the Complainant to reproduce its RUBIS ENERGIE Trademarks. The Complainant adds that the Respondent does not provide bona fide offering of goods and services, nor does it make a legitimate noncommercial or fair use of the disputed domain name, considering that the website accessible from the disputed domain name resolves to the Complainant's website without its authorization.

Finally, the Complainant asserts that the disputed domain name was registered and is being used in bad faith by the Respondent. First, the Complainant states that the Respondent registered the disputed domain name with the Complainant's name and trademark in mind and that the choice of the disputed domain name cannot have been accidental. The Complainant considers that the fact that the disputed domain name redirects users to the Complainant's website unequivocally shows that the Respondent knew of the Complainant and its trademarks when registering and using the disputed domain name. The Complainant also asserts that the sole detention of the disputed domain name by the Respondent, in an attempt to

prevent the Complainant from reflecting its trademark in a domain name, is a strong evidence of bad faith. In addition, the disputed domain name is associated with email servers, which may be used for fraudulent purposes. The Complainant states that the only plausible explanation for the Respondent's registration and use of the disputed domain name is that the Respondent intends to cause confusion, mistake and deception by means of the disputed domain name.

B. Respondent

The Respondent did not formally reply to the Complainant's contentions. However, the Respondent sent email communications to the Center on March 25 and 27, 2026. The Respondent mainly claimed that the Respondent's domain name is different to the Complainant's domain name, that they are not using the same slogan or logo and that facts should be carefully checked by the Complainant's representative before the Complainant attempts to claim the disputed domain name. The Respondent further added that in the event of a false accusation, they would file a complaint for making false allegations. These communications were sent after notification of its default without substantively replying to the Complainant's contentions. Therefore, the Panel has decided not to take these communications into consideration in accordance with paragraph 10 of the Rules, and the Panel further notes that even if considered these would not have altered the outcome of this proceeding.

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 Select UDRP Questions ("[WIPO Overview 3.1](#)"), section 1.7.

The Complainant has shown rights in respect of a trademark or service mark for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), 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 3.1](#), section 1.7.

Although the addition of other terms here, the mere doubling of the first letter "e" and addition of the letter "s" to the term "energie" may bear on assessment of the second and third elements, the Panel finds the addition of such letters does not prevent a finding of confusing similarity between the disputed domain name and the mark for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), 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 that 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 3.1](#), 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.

Indeed, it appears that the Respondent has no connection or affiliation with the Complainant and has not received any permission to use the RUBIS ENERGIE Trademarks in the disputed domain name. Moreover, there is no evidence that the Respondent is commonly known by the disputed domain name. Finally, it appears that the Respondent is not making a legitimate noncommercial or fair use of the disputed domain name, given that the disputed domain name redirects Internet users to the Complainant's website without any authorization, which may result in a likelihood of confusion with the Complainant's trademarks as to the origin and operation of the disputed domain name.

Furthermore, Panels have held that the use of a domain name for illegitimate activity can never confer rights or legitimate interests on a respondent. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 2.13.1. The Panel notes that here the Complainant claimed that the redirection to the Complainant's website is made to defraud Internet users in making believe that the disputed domain name is operated by, associated with or endorsed by the Complainant. Likewise, the Complainant claims that the disputed domain name is associated with email servers, which may be used by the Respondent to defraud partners or potential partners of the Complainant. Panels have found that circumstantial evidence can support a complainant's otherwise credible claim of illegal respondent activity. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 2.13.2. The fact that the disputed domain name appears to be a typosquatting variation of the Complainant's domain name, together with the redirection to the Complainant's website, and the activation of Mail Exchange (MX) records, calls into question the Respondent's intention with the disputed domain name, without the Respondent coming forward with any relevant evidence demonstrating rights or legitimate interests. In any case, the composition of the disputed domain name is one that carries a risk of implied affiliation with the Complainant.

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 has registered the disputed domain name well after the registration of the RUBIS ENERGIE Trademarks. The Panel considers that the Respondent has the RUBIS ENERGIE Trademarks in mind when registering the disputed domain name, considering that the disputed domain name redirects Internet users to the Complainant's website. The Panel considers that the only plausible explanation for the Respondent's registration and use of the disputed domain name is that the Respondent intends to cause confusion, mistake and deception by means of the disputed domain name, and potentially to configured MX servers on the disputed domain name, in a threat of abusive use of the disputed domain name.

Having reviewed the record, the Panel finds the Respondent's registration and use of the disputed domain name carries a risk of implied affiliation, and its composition and redirection is capable of creating a likelihood of confusion with Complainant's trademark, which constitutes bad faith under the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 3.1.4.

Furthermore, 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 3.1](#), section 3.2.1.

Having reviewed the record, also noting the circumstances discussed under the second element of this Decision, the Panel finds 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 <rubiseenergies.com> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Christiane Féral-Schuhl/

Christiane Féral-Schuhl

Sole Panelist

Date: March 30, 2026