ARBITRATION
AND
MEDIATION CENTER

WIPO
WORLD
INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY
ORGANIZATION

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

Financière Lafarge SAS, and Lafarge SA v. Name Redacted
Case No. D2026-2261

1. The Parties

The Complainants are Financiere Lafarge SAS and Lafarge SA, France, represented by Mathias Avocats, France.

The Respondent is Name Redacted[1].

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <lafarge-gestion.com> 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 May 26, 2026. On May 27, 2026, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On May 27, 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 (Registration Private, Domains By Proxy, LLC) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainants on May 29, 2026, providing the registrant and contact information disclosed by the Registrar, and inviting the Complainants to submit an amendment to the Complaint. The Complainants filed an amended Complaint on June 3, 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

[1] The Respondent appears to have used the name of an employee of the Complainant purporting to represent the latter when registering the disputed domain name. In light of this identity theft, the Panel has redacted Respondent's name from this Decision. However, the Panel has attached Annex 1 to this Decision with an instruction to the Registrar regarding the 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Annex 1 to the Registrar as part of the order in this proceeding, and has indicated Annex 1 to this Decision shall not be published due to the exceptional circumstances of this case.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.

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 June 4, 2026. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was June 24, 2026. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent’s default on June 25, 2026.

The Center appointed Benjamin Fontaine as the sole panelist in this matter on June 29, 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 Complainants are FINANCIERE LAFARGE SAS and LAFARGE SA.

The Complainant is active in the field of construction materials, in particular cement and concrete.

According to uncontested elements, FINANCIERE LAFARGE SAS is the financial holding company of LAFARGE group. Besides, the Complainant employs 4,200 people spread across more than 470 industrial sites in France and 200 researchers.

The Complainant is notably the owner of the following trade marks:

- LAFARGE, international trade mark registration No. 762717, registered on April 6, 2001, duly renewed since then,
- LAFARGE, international trade mark registration No. 648681, registered on December 18, 1995, duly renewed since then.

The disputed domain name, <lafarge-gestion.com>, was registered on January 8, 2026.

At the time of this Decision, the disputed domain name is no longer used in connection with an active website.

However, at the time of filing the Complaint, the disputed domain name initially resolved to a website displaying the Complainant’s semi-figurative trade mark, and purporting to offer financial services allegedly provided by a company named “Financière Lafargue”, whose company registration number and postal address were those of the Complainant.

According to the information disclosed by the Registrar, when it registered the disputed domain name, the Respondent provided the name of the Complainant and of one of its employees, and indicated to be located at the same address as the Complainant.

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 identically reproduces its earlier well-known trade mark LAFARGE and the addition of the term “gestion” , which will be perceived as referring to the nature of the services offered by the Complainant FINANCIERE LAFARGE SAS and purportedly offered under the disputed domain name, does not prevent a finding of confusing similarity between the disputed domain name and the mark for the purposes of the Policy.

Then, the Complainant claims that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the disputed domain name. The Complainant asserts that it registered the trade mark LAFARGE in numerous countries around the world and is the sole legitimate owner of trade marks, corporate names, domain names incorporating LAFARGE. The Complainant also submits that it has not authorized any third party to identify to the public as LAFARGE or "lafarge-gestion" in a domain name.

Third, the Complainant submits that the disputed domain name was registered and is being used in bad faith. The Complainant contends that, taking into consideration its longstanding use of the well-known trade mark LAFARGE worldwide, there is no chance that the disputed domain name may have been registered by the Respondent by mere coincidence. The Complainant also argues that the reproduction of its semi-figurative trade mark evidences that the Respondent was aware of its rights. Moreover, the Complainant submits that the Respondent, when registering the disputed domain name has fraudulently impersonated one of its employees. Lastly, the Complainant submits that the disputed domain name was used in a fraudulent scheme impersonating it in order to deceive Internet users by purporting to offer financial services under the name of the Complainant.

B. Respondent

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

6. Discussion and Findings

A. Consolidation of Complainants

The Complaint was brought by two Complainants, although the trade marks relied upon are held by only one of them, and no explanation was provided regarding their consolidation.

In assessing whether a complaint filed by multiple complainants may be brought against a single respondent, panels look at whether (i) the complainants have a specific common grievance against the respondent, or the respondent has engaged in common conduct that has affected the complainants in a similar fashion, and (ii) it would be equitable and procedurally efficient to permit the consolidation. WIPO Overview of WIPO Panel Views on Select UDRP Questions ("WIPO Overview 3.1"), section 4.11.1.

In the present situation, the Panel finds that:

- According to uncontested elements, the Complainants belong to the same group of companies;

- One of the Complainants has been specifically targeted by the fraudulent scheme implemented by the Respondent;

- The Respondent has remained silent.

As a result, the Panel considers that the Complainants may have a common grievance against the Respondent, and that in any case accepting a consolidated Complaint would not be prejudicial to the Respondent.

Therefore, the Panel permits the consolidation of the Complainants, which will hereinafter be referred to collectively as the Complainant.

B. 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 3.1, 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 LAFARGE 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 "gestion") 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 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.

According to the evidence submitted by the Complainant, the link of the website to which the disputed domain name resolves was found in email communications sent as part of a fraudulent email scheme impersonating the Complainant using another domain name. In addition, the actual website to which the disputed domain name previously resolved, displayed the Complainant's semi-figurative trade mark, purporting to represent the financial division of the Complainant. Panels have categorically held that the use of a domain name for illegal activity (e.g., phishing/identity theft, impersonation/passing off, or other types of fraud) can never confer rights or legitimate interests on a respondent. WIPO Overview 3.1, section 2.13.1.

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 notably finds that the disputed domain name reproduces the prior trade mark of the Complainant. Besides, the Respondent used the name and contact details of the Complainant and of one of its employees when it registered the disputed domain name. Also, the website to which the disputed domain name previously resolved, displayed the Complainant's semi-figurative trade mark, as well as the Complainant's name and other identifying elements, purporting to represent the financial division of the Complainant. In addition, according to the evidence submitted by the Complainant, the link of the website to which the disputed domain name resolves was found in email communications sent as part of a fraudulent email scheme impersonating the Complainant using another domain name.

In these circumstances, the Respondent was necessarily aware of the Complainant's trade mark when it registered the disputed domain name.

Panels have held that the use of a domain name for illegitimate activity, (e.g., phishing/identity theft, impersonation/passing off, or other types of fraud) constitutes bad faith. WIPO Overview 3.1, section 3.4. Having reviewed the record, 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 <lafarge-gestion.com> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Benjamin Fontaine/
Benjamin Fontaine
Sole Panelist
Date: July 9, 2026