WIPO
WORLD
INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY
ORGANIZATION

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

JACQUET BROSSARD DISTRIBUTION v. Floran Dere
Case No. D2026-2678

1. The Parties

The Complainant is JACQUET BROSSARD DISTRIBUTION, France, represented by Ebrand France, France.

The Respondent is Floran Dere, United States of America (the “United States” or the “US”).

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <jacquetbrossard.cam> is registered with Spaceship, Inc. (the “Registrar”).

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the “Center”) on June 19, 2026. On June 19, 2026, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On June 19, 2026, the Registrar transmitted by email to the Center its verification response confirming that the Respondent is listed as the registrant and providing the contact details.

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 July 1, 2026. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was July 21, 2026. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent’s default on July 23, 2026.

The Center appointed Taras Kyslyy as the sole panelist in this matter on August 4, 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 is a French industrial pastry and bakery products company, which specializes in producing and selling processed specialty breads and pastries since 1885. It is present in over 50 countries, including the US, where it has enjoyed significant commercial activity since 2013. Furthermore, the Complainant operates a dedicated entity, “Jacquet North America” based in New York, specifically intended for the commercialization of the Jacquet Brossard products into the United States.

The Complainant is the owner of numerous trademarks, composed with JACQUET and BROSSARD, including for instance the US trademark registration No. 4579819 for JACQUET, registered on August 5, 2014, and international trademark registration No. 917373 for BROSSARD, registered on December 8, 2006.

The Complainant is also the owner of multiple domain names composed of “jacquetbrossard”, including the “.be”, “.ch”, “.de”, “.es”, “.eu”, “.it”, “.lu”, “.nl”, “.paris”, and “.net” Top-Level Domains (“TLDs”), including for instance the domain names <jacquetbrossard.com> and <jacquetbrossard.fr>.

The disputed domain name was registered on April 1, 2026, and does not resolve to any active website. The Complainant sent a formal notice to the Respondent. The Respondent answered that he is not bound by the European laws and the disputed domain name is on sale for USD 500.

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 the Complainant’s trademark. The disputed domain name incorporates the Complainant’s trademarks “JACQUET” and “BROSSARD” entirety, with the only alteration being the “.cam” TLD.

The Complainant also contends that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name. The Respondent is not commonly known under the name “Jacquet Brossard” or under the disputed domain name. The registration of both the Complainant’s trademarks and domain names by the Complainant all precede the date of registration of the disputed domain name. If searched on the Internet the terms “jacquet brossard” lead to the Complainant’s trademarks. A search for “jaquet brossard” associated with the Respondent gives no results. Before any notice to the Respondent of the dispute, there is no evidence of the Respondent’s use of the disputed domain name in connection with bona fide offering of goods or services. The disputed domain name does not resolve to any active website or content. There is no indication of demonstrable preparations to use the disputed domain name in connection with a bona fide offering of goods or services, such as the existence of a business plan, promotional material, or any other concrete evidence of contemplated legitimate use. The passive holding of the disputed domain name is even more significant in the present case, given that the disputed domain name identically reproduces the Complainant’s distinctive trademarks and trade name. And the Complainant never authorized, licensed, or otherwise permitted the Respondent to use its trademarks or to register the disputed domain name. The Respondent is not affiliated with the Complainant in any way. The Respondent was made aware of the situation and refused any cooperation. He even attempted to sell the disputed domain name to the Complainant. Such conduct demonstrates that the Respondent registered and held the disputed domain name primarily for speculative and commercial purposes, taking unfair advantage of the Complainant’s rights and reputation. The Respondent, located in the United States, could not reasonably have ignored the Complainant’s prior rights in the Complainant’s distinctive trademarks at the time of registration.

Finally, the Complainant contends that the disputed domain name was registered and is being used in bad faith. The Respondent intentionally attempted to attract, for commercial gain, Internet users by creating a likelihood of confusion with the Complainant's trademarks. The disputed domain name identically reproduces the Complainant's trademarks and closely imitates the Complainant's official domain name, the only difference being the substitution of the letter "o" with the letter "a" in the TLD. This typographical variation is insufficient to dispel confusion and, on the contrary, constitutes a classic example of typosquatting designed to mislead Internet users. By registering the disputed domain name that entirely reproduces the Complainant's distinctive signs, with this obvious spelling mistake in the composition of the disputed domain name, the Respondent deliberately created a likelihood of confusion as to the source, sponsorship, affiliation, or endorsement of the disputed domain name. The disputed domain name was registered primarily for the purpose of selling or otherwise transferring the domain name registration to the Complainant for valuable consideration in excess of the Respondent's out-of-pocket costs. The Respondent registered the disputed domain name incorporating the Complainant's distinctive trademarks and subsequently attempted to sell the disputed domain name to the Complainant for its own commercial benefit. Such conduct demonstrates that the Respondent's purpose was not to make any legitimate use of the disputed domain name, but rather to exploit the Complainant's trademark rights and reputation in order to obtain financial gain. Moreover, the disputed domain name has never resolved to any active website or legitimate content, which further confirms the absence of any bona fide intention to use the disputed domain name in connection with legitimate activities. The Respondent had knowledge of the Complainant's rights and nevertheless maintained the disputed domain name in bad faith. The Respondent could not reasonably have ignored the Complainant's prior rights at the time of registration. The Complainant's trademarks are distinctive and are reproduced identically in the disputed domain name. Furthermore, after having been contacted by the Complainant and informed of the resulting risk of confusion and trademark infringement, the Respondent refused to cooperate or take any corrective action.

B. Respondent

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

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 Complainant's marks are each reproduced within the disputed domain name. Accordingly, the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to the marks for the purposes of the Policy. WIPO Overview 3.1, section 1.7.

The applicable gTLD in a domain name (e.g., ".com", ".club", ".nyc") is viewed as a standard registration requirement and as such is disregarded under the first element confusing similarity test. Thus, the Panel disregards the gTLD ".cam" for the purposes of the confusing similarity test. WIPO Overview 3.1, section 1.11.1.

The Panel finds that 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.

The available evidence does not confirm that the Respondent is commonly known by the disputed domain name, which could demonstrate its rights or legitimate interests (see, e.g., *World Natural Bodybuilding Federation, Inc. v. Daniel Jones, TheDotCafe*, WIPO Case No. D2008-0642).

The Complainant did not license or otherwise authorize the Respondent to use of its JACQUET or BROSSARD trademarks, nor is there any evidence of an affiliation between the Parties. Accordingly, there is no actual or contemplated bona fide or legitimate use of the disputed domain name could be reasonably claimed (see, e.g., *Sportswear Company S.P.A. v. Tang Hong*, WIPO Case No. D2014-1875).

Moreover, the Complainant has provided evidence that, following contact by the Complainant, the Respondent stated that the disputed domain name was available for purchase for USD 500. The Panel notes that the Respondent has not come forward with any explanation for its registration of a domain name wholly incorporating the Complainant's trademarks. In these circumstances, the Respondent's offer to sell the disputed domain name does not constitute a bona fide offering of goods or services or a legitimate noncommercial or fair use of the disputed domain name. Rather, it further supports the absence of rights or legitimate interests on the part of the Respondent.

The Panel finds that 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 registered the disputed domain name incorporating the entirety of the Complainant's distinctive and well-known trademarks and selected the ".cam" gTLD, apparently in reference to the Complainant's corresponding domain name using the ".com" gTLD. The Panel finds that these circumstances indicate that the Respondent knew or should have known of the Complainant and its trademarks at the time of registering the disputed domain name, which supports a finding of bad faith.

Bad faith under the UDRP is broadly understood to occur where a respondent takes unfair advantage of or otherwise abuses a complainant's mark. To facilitate assessment of whether this has occurred, and bearing in mind that the burden of proof rests with the complainant, paragraph 4(b) of the Policy provides that any one of the following non-exclusive scenarios constitutes evidence of a respondent's bad faith:

(i) circumstances indicating that the respondent has registered or acquired the domain name primarily for the purpose of selling, renting, or otherwise transferring the domain name to the complainant who is the owner of the trademark or service mark or to a competitor of that complainant, for valuable consideration in excess of the respondent's documented out-of-pocket costs directly related to the domain name; or
(ii) the respondent has registered the domain name in order to prevent the owner of the trademark or service mark from reflecting the mark in a corresponding domain name, provided that the respondent has engaged in a pattern of such conduct; or
(iii) the respondent has registered the domain name primarily for the purpose of disrupting the business of a competitor; or
(iv) by using the domain name, the respondent has intentionally attempted to attract, for commercial gain, Internet users to its website or other on-line location, by creating a likelihood of confusion with the complainant's mark as to the source, sponsorship, affiliation, or endorsement of the respondent's website or location or of a product or service on the respondent's website or location.

In this regard, the Panel finds that at least the first of the above scenarios applies to the present case confirming the Respondent's bad faith. WIPO Overview 3.1, section 3.1.

Having reviewed the available record, the Panel notes the distinctiveness or reputation of the Complainant's trademarks, and the composition of the disputed domain name, and finds that in the circumstances of this case the disputed domain name was registered and is being used in 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 <jacquetbrossard.cam> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Taras Kyslyy/
Taras Kyslyy
Sole Panelist
Date: August 13, 2026