

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

BOUYGUES v. Sohaib Qureshi

Case No. DAI2025-0045

1. The Parties

The Complainant is BOUYGUES, France, represented by Nameshield, France.

The Respondent is Sohaib Qureshi, United Kingdom.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <bouygues-construction.ai> is registered with Porkbun LLC (the “Registrar”).

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the “Center”) on September 17, 2025. On September 17, 2025, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On the same day, 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 (Whois Privacy) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on September 23, 2025, 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 September 24, 2025.

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 September 26, 2025. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was October 16, 2025. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent’s default on October 17, 2025.

The Center appointed Olga Zalomiy as the sole panelist in this matter on October 22, 2025. 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 group of industrial companies focusing on construction, energy, media and telecom services. The Complainant owns multiple registrations for the BOUYGUES CONSTRUCTION trademark, such as:

- the International registration No. 732339 for the BOUYGUES CONSTRUCTION trademark, registered on April 13, 2000.
- the European Union registration No. 001589159 for the BOUYGUES CONSTRUCTION trademark, registered on May 16, 2001.

A prior UDRP panel have found the Complainant's mark to be well-known¹. The Complainant also owns the <bouygues-construction.com> domain name that incorporates its trademark.

The Respondent registered the disputed domain name on September 15, 2025. The disputed domain name does not direct users to an active website.

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 identical to its BOUYGUES CONSTRUCTION trademark because the disputed domain name reproduces the Complainant's mark in its entirety. In the Complainant's view, the addition of the suffix ".ai" does not negate the similarity.

The Complainant submits that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name because (i) the Respondent is not commonly known by the disputed domain name since he is hidden behind the privacy shield; (ii) the Respondent has not been authorized by the Complainant to use its BOUYGUES CONSTRUCTION trademark in the disputed domain name; (iii) the Respondent's passive use of the disputed domain name does not create rights or legitimate interests for the Respondent in the disputed domain name.

The Complainant asserts that the Respondent registered the disputed domain name in bad faith, because it likely registered the disputed domain name with the Complainant's trademark in mind given that the Complainant's trademark, the Complainant and its subsidiary BOUYGUES CONSTRUCTION are well-known. The Complainant argues that it is inconceivable that the Respondent would use the disputed domain name for a legitimate purpose.

B. Respondent

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

¹*Bouygues v. Rapp Catherine*, WIPO Case No. [D2021-0778](#).

6. Discussion and Findings

Pursuant to paragraph 4(a) of the Policy, to succeed in this proceeding, the Complainant must prove each of the following elements with respect to the disputed domain name:

- (i) the disputed domain name is identical or confusingly similar to a trademark or service mark in which the Complainant has rights; and
- (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.

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 Selected UDRP Questions, Third Edition ("[WIPO Overview 3.0](#)"), section 1.7.

The Complainant has shown rights in respect of a trademark or service mark for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 1.2.1.

The mark is recognizable within the disputed domain name. Accordingly, the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to the mark for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 1.7. The inclusion of the country-code Top-Level Domain ("ccTLD") ".ai" is typically disregarded in the context of the confusing similarity assessment, being a technical requirement of registration. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), 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 proving 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 3.0](#), 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 evidence on record shows that the Respondent is not commonly known by the disputed domain name, nor has it been authorized by the Complainant to use the Complainant's trademark in a domain name. The Panel finds that the composition of the disputed domain name, which is confusingly similar to the Complainant's trademark (the only difference is the addition of the dash in between the words) and identical its domain name shows that the Respondent likely intended to confuse users seeking or expecting the Complainant, which negates finding of fair use of the disputed domain name.

The Respondent is making neither legitimate noncommercial use of the disputed domain name, nor is the Respondent using it for a bona fide offering of goods or services.

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 notes that the Respondent registered the disputed domain name, which is almost identical to its distinctive trademark 25 years after the Complainant's first trademark registration. Apart from the ccTLD, the disputed domain name is identical to the Complainant's domain name associated with its official website. Therefore, it is likely that the Respondent registered the disputed domain name with the knowledge of the Complainant and its trademark.

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 3.0](#), section 3.2.1.

Panels have found that the non-use of a domain name (including a blank or "coming soon" page) would not prevent a finding of bad faith under the doctrine of passive holding. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 3.3. Having reviewed the available record, the Panel notes the distinctiveness or reputation of the Complainant's trademark, the composition of the disputed domain name, the failure of the respondent to submit a response or to provide any evidence of actual or contemplated good-faith use, and the implausibility of any good faith use to which the domain name may be put, and 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.

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 <bouygues-construction.ai> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Olga Zalomiy/

Olga Zalomiy

Sole Panelist

Date: October 30, 2025