Decision for dispute CAC-UDRP-107408

Case number	CAC-UDRP-107408
Time of filing	2025-03-14 11:39:54
Domain names	schneiderelectricegypt.com

Case administrator

Name	Olga Slanařová (Case admin)

Complainant

Organization	SCHNEIDER ELECTRIC SE

Complainant representative

Organization	NAMESHIELD S.A.S.

Respondent

Name	mohamed abd hussiny

OTHER LEGAL PROCEEDINGS

The Panel is not aware of any other legal proceedings which are pending or decided and which relate to the disputed domain name.

IDENTIFICATION OF RIGHTS

The Complainant proved to be the owner of the following trademarks composed by “schneider electric”:

- international trademark SCHNEIDER ELECTRIC® n° 715395 registered since March 15, 1999;

- international trademark SCHNEIDER S ELECTRIC® n° 715396 registered since March 15, 1999;

- European Union trademark SCHNEIDER ELECTRIC® n° 1103803 registered since March 12, 1999.

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

The Complainant, is a French company, founded in 1871. It manufactures and offers products for power management, automation, and related solutions. The Complainant's corporate website can be found at www.schneider-electric.com.

The Complainant owns several trademarks composed by "schneider electric" including the trademarks used as the basis of the complaint. Moreover the Complainant owns several domain names, including <schneider-electric.com>.

The disputed domain name <schneiderelectricegypt.com> was registered on March 1, 2025 and resolves to a parking page with commercial links.

PARTIES CONTENTIONS

COMPLAINANT:

The Complainant claims that the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to its prior trademarks as the addition of the geographic term "egypt" is not sufficient to exclude confusing similarity with "schneider electric".

Finally, the Complainant contends that TLD are disregarded when assessing confusing similarity as they are considered as standard registration requirements.

The Complainant claims that the Respondent has no rights nor legitimate interest in registering the disputed domain name. According to the Complainant's assertions, there is no evidence that the Respondent is known as the disputed domain name or is, in some way, authorized to use the trademark "schneider electric".

Finally, the actual use of the disputed domain name is not considered a "bona fide offering of goods or services" nor a "legitimate noncommercial or fair use" for the purposes of the Policy.

As regards registration and use in bad faith, the Complainant claims that since "schneider electric" is a well known trademark it is reasonable to infer that the Respondent has registered the disputed domain name with full knowledge of the Complainant's rights.

Moreover, the fact that the disputed domain name links to a PPC webpage is considered an additional index of use in bad faith.

RESPONDENT:

NO ADMINISTRATIVELY COMPLIANT RESPONSE HAS BEEN FILED.

RIGHTS

The Complainant has, to the satisfaction of the Panel, shown the disputed domain name is identical or confusingly similar to a trademark or service mark in which the Complainant has rights (within the meaning of paragraph 4(a)(i) of the Policy).

NO RIGHTS OR LEGITIMATE INTERESTS

The Complainant has, to the satisfaction of the Panel, shown the Respondent to have no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the disputed domain name (within the meaning of paragraph 4(a)(ii) of the Policy).

BAD FAITH

The Complainant has, to the satisfaction of the Panel, shown the disputed domain name has been registered and is being used in bad faith (within the meaning of paragraph 4(a)(iii) of the Policy).

PROCEDURAL FACTORS

The Panel is satisfied that all procedural requirements under UDRP were met and there is no other reason why it would be inappropriate to provide a decision.

PRINCIPAL REASONS FOR THE DECISION

1. The disputed domain name is confusingly similar to a trademark in which the Complainant has rights

The Complainant has successfully proved to be the owner of the trademark "schneider electric".

The disputed domain name combines the trademark "schneider electric" with the geographic term "egypt". The Panel finds that the "schneider electric" is fully recognizable in the disputed domain name and that its combination with "egypt" increases the likelihood of confusion with the Complainant's trademarks since the disputed domain name could be associated with a local branch of the Complainant.

According to a consolidated case law in cases where a domain name incorporates the entirety of a trademark, or where at least a dominant feature of the relevant mark is recognizable in it, the confusing similarity threshold is met.

Furthermore, the addition of ".com" is generally disregarded in view of its technical function.

As a consequence, the Panel finds that the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to the Complainant's trademarks, for the purposes of the First Element of the Policy.

2. The Respondent lacks rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name

Pursuant to paragraph 4(a)(ii) of the Policy, a complainant is required to make out a prima facie case that a respondent lacks rights or legitimate interests in a domain name. Once such a prima facie case is made, the respondent carries the burden of demonstrating its rights or legitimate interests in the domain name. If the respondent fails to do so, the complainant is deemed to have satisfied paragraph 4(a)(ii) of the Policy.

In this case, the Panel finds that the Complainant's submitted evidence and allegations are sufficient to establish a prima facie case of Respondent's lack of rights and legitimate interests in the disputed domain name.

According to the information provided by the Complainant and not contested, the Respondent is not commonly known by the disputed domain name nor it is authorized to use the Complainant's trademarks.

Additionally, the disputed domain name links to a PPC webpage.

The Panel finds that such use discloses an absence of a bona fide offering of goods or services and of a legitimate noncommercial/ fair use of the disputed domain name. In the view of the Panel, given the distinctiveness of the Complainant's trademarks, the sponsored links are used by the Respondent to capitalize on the reputation and goodwill of the "schneider electric" trademark.

For these reasons, the Panel takes the view that the Respondent lacks rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name for the purposes of the Policy.

3. The disputed domain name was registered and is used in bad faith

The Panel finds the following circumstances as material in order to establish the Respondent's bad faith in the registration of the disputed domain name:

(i) the disputed domain name was registered well after the Complainant acquired rights on the trademark "schneider electric";

(ii) the disputed domain name combines the trademark "schneider electric" with "egypt" and this, in the Panel's view, suggests that he was perfectly aware of the Complainant's business conducted under the trademark "schneider electric";

As regards use in bad faith, the disputed domain name currently resolves to PPC webpages. The links sponsored through the disputed domain name are not explicable by a "dictionary meaning" of the word "schneider electric". As a consequence the Panel finds that the disputed domain name is used to exploit the reputation and distinctiveness of the Complainant's trademark for the Respondent's commercial gain and such use is considered in bad faith,

Moreover as proved by the Complainant, MX records have been set up on the disputed domain name. This suggests that it could be used to send emails and this fact is an additional index of bad faith.

All above considered the Panel finds the evidence submitted as sufficient to prove use and registration of the disputed domain name in bad faith for the purposes of the Policy.

FOR ALL THE REASONS STATED ABOVE, THE COMPLAINT IS

Accepted

AND THE DISPUTED DOMAIN NAME(S) IS (ARE) TO BE

1. **schneiderelectricegypt.com**: Transferred

PANELLISTS

Name	Andrea Mascetti

DATE OF PANEL DECISION 2025-04-17

Publish the Decision