

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

Compagnie de Saint-Gobain v. Config Zoho
Case No. DCC2025-0012

1. The Parties

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

The Respondent is Config Zoho, South Africa.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <saints-gobain.cc> is registered with NameSilo, LLC (the “Registrar”).

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the “Center”) on June 10, 2025. On June 10, 2025, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On June 10, 2025, 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 (Domain Administrator, See PrivacyGuardian.org) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on June 13, 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 June 16, 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 June 18, 2025. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was July 8, 2025. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent’s default on July 13, 2025.

The Center appointed Leo (Yi) Liu as the sole panelist in this matter on July 17, 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 states that it is a French company specialized in the production, processing, and distribution of materials for the construction and industrial markets.

The Complainant states that it is now one of the top industrial groups in the world with a turnover of approximately EUR 46.6 billion in 2024 and around 161,000 employees.

The Complainant is the owner of several trademarks for SAINT-GOBAIN, including:

- European Union Trade Mark No. 001552843 for SAINT-GOBAIN, registered on December 18, 2001;
- International trademark registration No. 740184 for SAINT-GOBAIN & Design, registered on July 26, 2000;
- International trademark registration No. 740183 for SAINT-GOBAIN, registered on July 26, 2000;
- International trademark registration No. 596735 for SAINT-GOBAIN & Design, registered on November 2, 1992;
- International trademark registration No. 551682 for SAINT-GOBAIN & Design, registered on July 21, 1989.

The Complainant also owns at least one domain name corresponding to its brand, namely the domain name <saint-gobain.com> registered on December 29, 1995, which resolves to the Complainant's official website.

The disputed domain name was registered on June 4, 2025. The disputed domain name resolves to a parking page with commercial links, as evidenced by the Complainant's screenshots.

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 its well-known and distinctive trademark SAINT-GOBAIN;
- the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the disputed domain name;
- the disputed domain name was registered and is being used in bad faith.

B. Respondent

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

6. Discussion and Findings

To obtain the relief it has requested, the Complainant must prove the presence of each of the three elements of the Policy: 1) the disputed domain name is identical or confusingly similar to a trademark or service mark in which the Complainant has rights; 2) the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the disputed domain name; and 3) 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.

Based on the record submitted, 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 entirety of the mark SAINT-GOBAIN is reproduced within the disputed domain name only adding the letter "s". 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 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.

As noted above, the disputed domain name resolves to a parking page with commercial links. The Respondent has not come forward with any evidence that it has engaged in any demonstrable preparations to use the disputed domain name in connection with a bona fide offering of goods or services in accordance with paragraph 4(c)(i) of the Policy. The Respondent's name does not correspond to the disputed domain name, and there is no evidence to support a finding that the Respondent is commonly known by the disputed domain name within the meaning of paragraph 4(c)(ii) of the Policy. Nor is the Respondent making any legitimate noncommercial or fair use of the disputed domain name pursuant to paragraph 4(c)(iii) of the Policy.

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 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 disputed domain name was created recently, long after the Complainant's trademarks and domain name were registered, and points to a parking page with commercial links. Such use of the disputed domain name, inter alia, indicates that the Respondent has attempted to attract, for commercial gain, Internet users to its website, by creating a likelihood of confusion with the Complainant's mark, which falls squarely under the circumstances of bad faith under paragraph 4(b)(iv) of the Policy. Moreover, the composition of the disputed domain name, comprising a typo-variant of the Complainant's distinctive and well-known trademark, is a further indication of bad faith in this case.

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 <saints-gobain.cc> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Leo (Yi) Liu/

Leo (Yi) Liu

Sole Panelist

Date: July 31, 2025