

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

Compagnie De Saint-Gobain v. Name Redacted
Case No. D2026-1502

1. The Parties

The Complainant is Compagnie De Saint-Gobain, France, represented by Nameshield, France.

The Respondent is Name Redacted.¹

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <saint-gabains.com> is registered with IONOS SE (the “Registrar”).

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed in English with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the “Center”) on April 9, 2026. On April 9, 2026, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On April 10, 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) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on April 10, 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 Complaint in English on April 13, 2026.

On April 10, 2026, the Center informed the parties in German and English, that the language of the Registration Agreement for the disputed domain name is German. On April 13, 2026, the Complainant requested English to be the language of the proceeding. The Respondent did not submit any comment on the Complainant’s submission.

¹ The Respondent appears to have used the name of a third party when registering the disputed domain name. In light of the potential identity theft, the Panel has redacted the Respondent’s name from this Decision. However, the Panel has attached as Annex 1 to this Decision an instruction to the Registrar regarding transfer of the disputed domain name, which includes the name of the Respondent. The Panel has authorized the Center to transmit Annex 1 to the Registrar as part of the order in these proceedings, and has indicated Annex 1 to this Decision shall not be published due to the exceptional circumstances of this case. See *Banco Bradesco S.A. v. FAST-12785241 Attn. Bradescourgente.net / Name Redacted*, WIPO Case No. [D2009-1788](#)

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 in German and English of the Complaint, and the proceedings commenced on April 14, 2026. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was May 4, 2026. On May 3, 2026, the Center received an email communication from a party stating in essence that it had become the victim of an identity theft. Accordingly, the Center notified the Parties in English and German of the Commencement of Panel Appointment Process on May 5, 2026.

The Center appointed Andrea Mondini as the sole panelist in this matter on May 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 was founded more than 360 years ago, has more than 161,000 employees and is a global supplier of construction materials.

The Complainant owns numerous trademark registrations in several jurisdictions, including:

TRADEMARK	JURISDICTION	REGISTRATION NUMBER	REGISTRATION DATE
SAINT-GOBAIN	International Registration	740183	July 26, 2000
SAINT-GOBAIN (logo)	International Registration	740184	July 26, 2000

The Complainant holds several domain names containing the trademark SAINT-GOBAIN, among them <saint-gobain.com> which was registered on December 29, 1995 and hosts its main website.

The disputed domain name was registered on March 25, 2026.

According to the evidence submitted with the Complaint, the disputed domain resolves to a 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.

Notably, the Complainant contends as follows:

The trademark SAINT-GOBAIN has been extensively used to identify the Complainant and its products. The disputed domain name is confusingly similar to the SAINT-GOBAIN trademark in which the Complainant has rights, because the substitution of the letter “o” by the letter “a” and the addition of the letter “s” constitute typosquatting and are not sufficient to prevent a finding of confusing similarity.

The Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the disputed domain name.

The Respondent has not been authorized by the Complainant to use this trademark, is not commonly known by the disputed domain name, and there is no evidence of the Respondent's use, or demonstrable preparation to use, the disputed domain name in connection with a bona fide offering of goods and services.

The disputed domain name was registered in bad faith because it is obvious that the Respondent had knowledge of both the Complainant and its well-known trademark SAINT-GOBAIN at the time it registered the disputed domain name.

Respondent is using the disputed domain name in bad faith, by passively holding the domain name.

Moreover, the disputed domain name has been set up with MX records, which suggests that it may be used for email purposes.

B. Respondent

On May 3, 2026, the Center received an email from a third party apparently in receipt of the Center's written notice of the proceeding claiming to have no relationship with the disputed domain name and stating the following: "I did not create the domain 'saint-gabain.com.' [sic] I was the victim of a hacking attack on my IONOS customer account, followed by identity theft. The hackers in question created the domain 'saint-gabains.com.' I have filed a report with the police regarding this matter. All information available to me about this case can be found in the attached report. I have arranged for the deletion of the domain 'saint-gabains.com' with IONOS; this should have been completed by now".

6. Discussion and Findings

According to paragraph 4(a) of the Policy, in order to succeed, a complainant must establish each of the following elements:

- (i) the disputed domain name is identical or confusingly similar to the trademark or service mark 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.

6.1 Language of the Proceedings

While the Registration Agreement for the disputed domain name is in German, the Complainant has pointed out in its email communication of April 13, 2026, that the English language is the language most widely used in international relations and that in order to proceed in German, the Complainant would have had to retain specialized translation services at a cost very likely to be higher than the overall costs of these proceedings. The use of German in this case would therefore impose a burden on the Complainant which must be deemed significant in view of the low costs of these proceedings. Therefore, the Complainant has requested English to be the language of the proceedings.

Paragraph 11(a) of the Rules stipulates that, "unless otherwise agreed by the Parties, or specified otherwise in the Registration Agreement, the language of the administrative proceeding shall be the language of the Registration Agreement, subject to the authority of the Panel to determine otherwise, having regard to the circumstances of the administrative proceeding".

Taking into account the circumstances of this case, the Panel does not consider it prejudicial to the Respondent if English were adopted as the language of the proceedings. The Panel notes that the relevant case related communications were sent in both English and German and that the Respondent did not reply to any of those communications or comment on the language of the proceedings. The Panel also finds that substantial additional expense and delay would likely be incurred if the Complaint had to be translated into German. In view of the Policy aim of facilitating a time- and cost-efficient procedure for the resolution of domain name disputes, the Panel finds it appropriate to exercise its discretion according to paragraph 11(a) of the Rules and allow the proceedings to be conducted in English.

6.2 Substantive Issues

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 Panel finds the mark SAINT-GOBAIN is clearly recognizable within the disputed domain name.

The replacement of the letter "o" with the letter "a" and the addition of the ending "s" to the disputed domain name is considered an intentional misspelling of the Complainant's mark and does not prevent a finding of confusing similarity under the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.9

The addition of the generic Top-Level Domain ("gTLD") ".com" in the disputed domain name is a standard registration requirement and as such may be disregarded under the confusing similarity test under the Policy, paragraph 4(a)(i). [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.11.1.

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 for a complainant to prove 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.

Furthermore, the composition of the disputed domain name itself suggests a connection or implied affiliation between the Complainant and the Respondent which in fact does not exist. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 2.5.1

Based on the available 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. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 3.2.1.

In the view of the Panel, noting that the Complainant's trademark predates the registration of the disputed domain name and considering that the Complainant's trademark is well-known and that the disputed domain name constitutes typosquatting, it is inconceivable that the Respondent could have registered the disputed domain name without knowledge of the Complainant's well-known trademark. In the circumstances of this case, this is evidence of registration in bad faith.

The disputed domain name currently resolves to a parking site.

From the inception of the UDRP, panelists have found that the non-use of a domain name (including a blank or "coming soon" page) would not by itself prevent a finding of bad faith under the doctrine of passive holding. To the contrary, in looking at the totality of circumstances in each case, panelists have found that the registration and non-use of a domain name can still constitute bad faith for purposes of the Policy.

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 taking active steps to conceal its identity or (iv) the use of false or inaccurate contact details (noted to be in breach of the respondent's registration agreement). [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 3.3.

Having reviewed the available record, the Panel notes the distinctiveness and reputation of the Complainant's trademark, the composition of the disputed domain name which constitutes typosquatting of the Complainant's trademark, the failure of the Respondent to submit a response or to provide any evidence of actual or contemplated good-faith use, and the fact that the Respondent appears to have used the name of a third party when registering the disputed domain name. Therefore, the Panel finds that in the circumstances of this case, the passive holding of the disputed domain name does not prevent a finding of bad faith under the Policy.

Based on the available record, the Panel finds that the Complainant has established the third element of the Policy with regard to the disputed domain name.

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 <saint-gabains.com> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Andrea Mondini/

Andrea Mondini

Sole Panelist

Date: May 20, 2026