

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

VINCI and VINCI CONSTRUCTION v. John Vinci, Vinci construction
Case No. D2026-3363

1. The Parties

The Complainant is VINCI, VINCI CONSTRUCTION, France, represented by Cabinet Regimbeau, France.

The Respondent is John Vinci, Vinci construction, Canada.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <vinciconstructioncanada.com> is registered with Name.com, Inc. (the "Registrar").

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the "Center") on July 29, 2026. On July 30, 2026, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On July 31, 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, Domain Protection Services, Inc.) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on August 3, 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 on August 7, 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 August 11, 2026. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was August 31, 2026. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent's default on September 1, 2026.

The Center appointed Daniel Peña as the sole panelist in this matter on September 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 Complainants are Vinci, a French company incorporated in 1986, and its subsidiary Vinci Construction, incorporated in 1988. Vinci is a global leader in concessions, energy, and construction, operating through more than 7,000 establishments in over 120 countries, with a turnover of EUR 74.6 billion in 2025 and approximately 294,000 employees worldwide. Vinci Construction is a major international construction group with 117,000 employees across more than 100 countries, including numerous subsidiaries in Canada such as Vinci Construction Canada, Inc.

The Complainants own multiple registered trademarks VINCI CONSTRUCTION, including French Trademark No. 3247127 (February 27, 2004), EU Trademark No. 003394251 (February 21, 2005), UK Trademark No. UK00903394251 (February 21, 2005), and International Trademark No. 1416410 (March 2, 2018), all duly renewed.

The disputed domain name <vinciconstructioncanada.com> was registered on June 18, 2026 with Name.com, Inc. The domain name resolves to a website purporting to offer construction services under the name “Vinci Construction Ltd” in North America and Europe. The Complainants lodged an abuse report with the Registrar on July 1, 2026, but no action was taken.

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 Complainants contend that the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to their registered trademarks VINCI CONSTRUCTION. The domain name reproduces the Complainants’ mark in its entirety, with the mere addition of the geographic term “canada”. This addition does not dispel confusion but rather reinforces the association with the Complainants’ Canadian subsidiaries, such as Vinci Construction Canada Inc. Internet users are likely to perceive the disputed domain name as an official site of the Complainants’ Canadian operations.

The Complainants further contend that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name. The Respondent is not affiliated with the Complainants, has not been authorized to use their trademarks, and is not commonly known by the designation “vinci construction”. The website to which the domain resolves purports to offer construction services under the name Vinci Construction Ltd, thereby misrepresenting itself as connected to the Complainants. Such use cannot confer any rights or legitimate interests under the Policy.

The Complainants also submit that the disputed domain name was registered and is being used in bad faith. By incorporating the Complainants’ well-known trademark and presenting itself as Vinci Construction Ltd, the Respondent intentionally seeks to attract Internet users for commercial gain by creating a likelihood of confusion with the Complainants’ marks. The domain name is liable to mislead consumers into believing that communications or services offered under it are authorized by the Complainants. This conduct falls squarely within paragraph 4(b)(iv) of the Policy.

The Complainants rely on their portfolio of registered trademarks, domain names, and corporate registrations in Canada and other jurisdictions to demonstrate longstanding rights. Screenshots of the disputed domain show its use in connection with construction services, further evidencing the risk of confusion and misrepresentation.

B. Respondent

The Respondent did not reply to the Complainants' contentions.

6. Discussion and Findings

A. Identical or Confusingly Similar

Under paragraph 4(a)(i) of the Policy, the Complainant must show that the disputed domain name is identical or confusingly similar to a mark in which it has rights.

The Complainants have established rights in the trademark VINCI CONSTRUCTION, which is widely protected through trademark registrations and domain names and used extensively in their global business operations.

The disputed domain name incorporates the Complainants' mark in its entirety, with only the addition of the geographic term "canada". As noted in section 1.8 of the WIPO Overview of WIPO Panel Views on Select UDRP Questions ("[WIPO Overview 3.1](#)"), the addition of descriptive or geographic terms does not prevent a finding of confusing similarity where the trademark remains clearly recognizable.

Panels have consistently held that the inclusion of a complainant's mark in its entirety is sufficient to establish confusing similarity, and the generic Top-Level Domain ".com" is disregarded in this assessment [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.11.

The Panel therefore finds that the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to the Complainants' mark. The first requirement under paragraph 4(a)(i) of the Policy is satisfied.

B. Rights or Legitimate Interests

Under paragraph 4(a)(ii) of the Policy, the Complainant must show that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the disputed domain name.

The Complainants state that they have not authorized the Respondent to use their mark and that the Respondent is not affiliated with them in any way. There is no evidence that the Respondent is commonly known by the designation "vinci construction" or that it has acquired any rights in that name.

The disputed domain name resolves to a website offering construction services under the name "vinci construction ltd", which misrepresents itself as connected to the Complainants. According to section 2.5 of the [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), use of a domain name to impersonate or falsely suggest affiliation with a complainant cannot establish rights or legitimate interests.

On the record, the Panel finds that the Respondent has not demonstrated any circumstances under paragraph 4(c) of the Policy that would confer rights or legitimate interests. The second requirement under paragraph 4(a)(ii) of the Policy is therefore satisfied.

C. Registered and Used in Bad Faith

Under paragraph 4(a)(iii) of the Policy, the Complainants must demonstrate that the disputed domain name has been registered and is being used in bad faith.

The Panel notes that the disputed domain name incorporates in its entirety the Complainants' well-known trademark VINCI CONSTRUCTION, followed only by the geographic term "canada". Such addition does not dispel confusion but rather reinforces the association with the Complainants' Canadian subsidiary. As established in section 3.1 of the [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), panels have consistently found bad faith where a respondent registers a domain name to capitalize on the reputation of a complainant's mark.

The Complainants are multinational companies present in over 100 countries, and their trademarks have been extensively used for more than two decades. In light of their global reputation and strong Internet presence, the Panel finds it implausible that the Respondent was unaware of the Complainants' rights at the time of registration in 2026. On the contrary, the Respondent's choice of domain name evidences actual knowledge of the Complainants' mark. The registration of a domain name containing a well-known trademark constitutes bad faith per se.

The Respondent's prior knowledge is further corroborated by the Complainants' ownership of closely related domain names, as well as corporate registrations including Vinci Construction Canada Inc., all of which are easily identifiable through a simple Internet search.

The Panel also finds that the disputed domain name is being used in bad faith. The domain resolves to a website operated under the name "Vinci construction ltd", offering construction services identical to those of the Complainants. The website reproduces a logo nearly identical to the Complainants' official logo, which is registered and widely used in connection with their mark. This imitation exacerbates the likelihood of confusion and misleads Internet users into believing that the Respondent's services are authorized or endorsed by the Complainants.

Moreover, the Respondent's use of a privacy protection service to conceal its identity constitutes an additional indication of bad faith.

The Panel concludes that the Respondent registered and is using the disputed domain name in bad faith. Accordingly, the third requirement under paragraph 4(a)(iii) of the Policy is satisfied.

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 <vinciconstructioncanada.com> be transferred to the second Complainant, Vinci Construction.

/Daniel Peña/

Daniel Peña

Sole Panelist

Date: September 17, 2026