

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

VINCI CONSTRUCTION v. WEALTH ONLY

Case No. D2026-0805

1. The Parties

The Complainant is VINCI CONSTRUCTION, France, represented by REGIMBEAU, France.

The Respondent is WEALTH ONLY, euroviaqc, United States of America ("US").

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <euroviaqc-ca.com> (hereinafter referred to as the "Disputed Domain Name") is registered with Squarespace Domains II LLC (hereinafter referred to as the "Registrar").

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the "Center") on February 25, 2026. On February 25, 2026, the Center acknowledged receipt of the Complaint and transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the Disputed Domain Name. On February 25, 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 (Redacted for Privacy, euroviaqc) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on February 27, 2026, 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 to the Complaint on March 2, 2026.

The Center verified that 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 March 3, 2026. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was March 23, 2026. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent's default on March 25, 2026.

The Center appointed Michal Havlík as the sole panellist in this matter on April 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 (formerly named EUROVIA) is a multinational company based in France and operating in the construction sector focusing on three main fields: infrastructure dedicated to water, construction and renovation of buildings, and civil engineering structures, such as bridges, tunnels, dams and major industrial facilities. The Complainant has many subsidiaries around the world including one in Québec, Canada bearing company name EUROVIA. In Québec, the Complainant operates its business at its official website under the domain name <euroviaqc.ca>. Apart from that, the Complainant holds of several domain names, such as <eurovia.com>, registered on February 25, 1998, and <eurovia.ca>, registered on May 29, 2009.

The Complainant owns multiple trademark registrations (hereinafter referred to as the “EUROVIA trademarks”) among others including:

- Canadian trademark registration No. TMA641456 for EUROVIA registered on June 7, 2005 with filing date January 20, 2003;
- French trademark registration No. 1439722 for EUROVIA registered on May 13, 1988 with filing date October 21, 1987;
- US trademark registration No. 3017196 for EUROVIA registered on November 22, 2005 with filing date of January 20, 2003
- International trademark registration No. 675408 for EUROVIA with registration date April 21, 1997 valid in various jurisdictions.

The Disputed Domain Name was registered on July 12, 2023. Having checked the Disputed Domain Name, the Panel notes that there is no change after filing of the Complaint and the Disputed Domain Name remains inactive.

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.

The Complainant contends that the Disputed Domain Name is highly similar to the EUROVIA trademarks in which the Complainant has rights. Moreover, the Disputed Domain Name replicates the distinctive verbal element of the Complainant's EUROVIA trademark in its entirety. According to the Complainant, the addition of the terms “qc” and “ca” would instantly be understood by the public as referring to the geographical location of the company EUROVIA, namely Québec, which is a Canadian province, and Canada, as a country where Québec is located. Moreover, such interpretation is even more likely when the Complainant has numerous subsidiaries named EUROVIA in Canada, including EUROVIA Québec.

Furthermore, the Disputed Domain Name is nearly identical to Complainant's widely used domain name <euroviaqc.ca> which resolves to EUROVIA Québec's official website. Therefore, according to the Complainant, the Disputed Domain Name will naturally be viewed as referring to the Complainant's Canadian subsidiaries and activities and it also will appear to be officially authorized by the Complainant.

The Complainant further states that given the above-mentioned, Internet users would infer that any website hosted under the Disputed Domain Name is an official website belonging to the Complainant. Consequently, Internet users would believe that any email coming from the Disputed Domain Name is an official communication from the Complainant, which means that the Disputed Domain Name could therefore be used for fraudulent purposes.

The Complainant submits that the Respondent lacks both rights and legitimate interests in the Disputed Domain Name. The Complainant has not given consent for the Respondent to register a domain name that incorporates the Complainant's trademarks.

Finally, the Complainant alleges that the registration and use of the Disputed Domain Name show bad faith. With regard to the long-term and broad use of the Complainant's trademarks, the Respondent must have known about their existence when registering the Disputed Domain Name. The Complainant notes that the Disputed Domain Name does not resolve to an active website, which supports a finding of bad faith.

B. Respondent

The Respondent did not reply to the Complainant's contentions.

6. Discussion and Findings

Under paragraph 4(a) of the Policy, the Complainant has the burden of proving the following:

- (i) that the Disputed Domain Name is identical or confusingly similar to a trademark or a service mark in which the Complainant has rights;
- (ii) that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the Disputed Domain Name; and
- (iii) that the Disputed Domain Name has been registered and is being used in bad faith.

A. Identical or Confusingly Similar

The Complainant has sufficiently demonstrated existence of its trademark rights among numerous jurisdictions. Therefore, the Complainant has shown the existence of valid trademark for the purpose of the Policy. WIPO Overview of WIPO Panel Views on Select UDRP Questions ("[WIPO Overview 3.1](#)"), section 1.2.1.

The entirety of the Complainant's trademark is reproduced within the Disputed Domain Name.

Although the addition of the elements "ca", "qc", and a hyphen 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 trademarks for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.8.

The applicable generic Top-Level Domain ("gTLD") in a domain name ".com" is viewed as a standard registration requirement and as such is disregarded under the first element confusing similarity test. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.11.1.

Accordingly, the Disputed Domain Name is confusingly similar to the trademark to trademarks in which the Complainant has rights for the purpose of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), 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, previous panels have recognized that proving a respondent lack of 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 right 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 (even though 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 that the Complainant has established a prima facie case that the Respondent lacks rights or legitimate interests in the Disputed Domain Name since it does not own any registered trademark rights for the term “eurovia” and the Disputed Domain Name fully incorporates the EUROVIA trademarks.

As stated above, the terms “qc” and “ca” are likely to be perceived as geographic indicators with no particular distinctiveness. The Disputed Domain Name appears to imitate the composition of the Complainant’s official domain name <euroviaqc.ca>. As a result, the composition of the Disputed Domain Name creates a risk of implied affiliation and cannot constitute fair use as it effectively creates confusion with the Complainant’s trademark and official website. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 2.5.1.

Moreover, the Respondent has not rebutted the Complainant’s prima facie showing and has not come forward with any relevant evidence illustrating 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 purpose of paragraph 4(a)(iii), paragraph 4(b) of the Policy establishes circumstances, in particular, but without limitation, 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 3.1](#), section 3.2.1.

The Panel notes that the EUROVIA trademarks predate the registration of the Disputed Domain Name by many years and have been intensively used in numerous jurisdictions including the US, where the Respondent allegedly resides. As a result of such use, the EUROVIA trademarks are highly distinctive and well-known, at least in the construction and civil engineering industry. The registration of a domain name containing a well-known trademark constitutes bad faith per se, see *The Gap, Inc. v. Deng Youqian*, WIPO Case No. [D2005-0517](#) or *Caesar World, Inc. v. Forum LLC*, WIPO Case No. [D2009-0113](#).

The Panel further notes that apart from containing the EUROVIA trademarks entirely, the Disputed Domain Name contains the terms “qc” and “ca” which clearly refer to the locations where the Complainant’s business operates, therefore, it lacks distinctive character. The Disputed Domain Name creates a confusion with the domain name <euroviaqc.ca> used for the official website of the Complainant in Québec. Moreover, when registering the Disputed Domain Name, the Respondent indicated “euroviaqc” as a registrant organization, which clearly shows Respondent’s attempt to replicate Complainant’s company name and conceal its

identity. Therefore, Internet users may easily get false impression that the Disputed Domain Name belongs to the Complainant's portfolio of domain names.

Whether the passive holding of the Disputed Domain Name supports a finding of bad faith or not under the established UDRP case law, see *Telstra Corporation Limited v. Nuclear Marshmallows*, WIPO Case No. [D2000-0003](#), requires in particular a holistic assessment of the following four factors:

- (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 of its identity or use of false contact details;
- (iv) the implausibility of any good faith use by the Respondent.

The first factor is fulfilled according to the Panel as it was established by the Complainant above that the EUROVIA trademarks are highly distinctive and well-known. The second factor is fulfilled as well since the Respondent did not respond to any of the Complainant's statements as mentioned above. The third factor is also satisfied because the Respondent tried to conceal its identity because when registering the Disputed Domain Name, the Respondent indicated "euroviaqc" as a registrant organization. And lastly the fourth factor is satisfied as well because as it follows from the above-mentioned, there is no conceivable legitimate purpose for holding the Disputed Domain Name, therefore, bad faith may be inferred. Consequently, the Panel notes that all four requirements have been satisfied.

In the light of the above-mentioned, the Panel concludes that the Respondent has registered and used the Disputed Domain Name in bad faith.

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 <euroviaqc-ca.com> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Michal Havlík/

Michal Havlík

Sole Panellist

Date: April 21, 2026