Decision for dispute CAC-UDRP-107546

Case number	CAC-UDRP-107546
Time of filing	2025-05-06 10:13:40
Domain names	authschnelder-electrlc.com

Case administrator

Name	Olga Slanařová (Case admin)

Complainant

Organization	SCHNEIDER ELECTRIC SE

Complainant representative

Organization	NAMESHIELD S.A.S.

Respondent

Organization	Njalla Okta LLC

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

EU TM Registration No. 001103803 SCHNEIDER ELECTRIC with a priority date of 12 March 1999 for various goods and services in classes 6, 9, 11, 36, 37, 39 and 42

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

The Complainant is a French based manufacturer and provider of power management, automation and related goods. It trades as SCHNEIDER ELECTRIC. It was founded in 1871 and now employs approximately 150,000 people worldwide. In 2024 it generated approximately 38 Billion Euro in global revenue.

The Complainant owns numerous trademarks containing or consisting of the words SCHNEIDER ELECTRIC, including the European Union trademark referred to above. It also owns numerous domain names containing the words SCHNEIDER ELECTRIC, including <schneiderelectric.com>.

The disputed domain name was registered on 28 April 2025 in the name of "Host Master, Njalla Okta LLC" with a registrant address in Saint Kitts and Nevis. The disputed domain name does not resolve to an active website. Rather it resolves to a webpage which merely displays a template index.

PARTIES CONTENTIONS

The Complainant contends that the requirements of the Policy have been met and that the disputed domain name should be transferred to it.
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

Paragraph (4)(a) of the Policy lists three elements that the Complainant must prove to merit a finding that the disputed domain name registered by the Respondent should be transferred to the Complainant:

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

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.

The Panel is satisfied that the Complainant has satisfied all three elements for the principal reasons set out below.

RIGHTS IN AN IDENTICAL OR CONFUSINGLY SIMILAR TRADEMARK

The Complainant asserts it has an EU trademark registration consisting of the words SCHNEIDER ELECTRIC. This registration predates the registration date of the disputed domain name by over 25 years.

To satisfy paragraph 4(a)(i) of the Policy it is enough that the Panel is satisfied that the Complainant has registered rights in a trademark that predates the registration of the disputed domain name in a single jurisdiction (even if that single jurisdiction is not one in which the Respondent resides or operates) (Koninklijke KPN N.V. v. Telepathy, Inc D2001-0217 (WIPO May 7, 2001); see also WIPO Case Nos. D2012-0141 and D2011-1436). The Complainant has clearly satisfied such in relation to the trademark SCHNEIDER ELECTRIC.

The next question is whether the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to the SCHNEIDER ELECTRIC trademark.

The Panel disregards the gTLD suffix ".com" for the purpose of this comparison. Further, the Panel accepts the Complainant's submissions that the suffix "AUTH" merely indicates authorisation. This term is commonly used in online media for this descriptive meaning. It's presence in the disputed domain name is likely to be of no brand significance to internet users. Rather, such users are likely to focus on the "SCHNELDER-ELECTRIC" elements in the disputed domain name. These elements are strikingly similar to the Complainant's SCHNEIDER ELECTRIC trademark. The substitution of an "I" with an "L" is subtle and will not prevent confusion.

The disputed domain name is therefore confusingly similar to the SCHNEIDER ELECTRIC trademark.

NO RIGHTS OR LEGITIMATE INTERESTS

The Respondent's name according to information provided by the registrar for the disputed domain name is "Host Master" of "Njalla Okta LLC". This name bears no resemblance to "AUTHSCHNELDER-ELECTRIC". Further, the website to which the domain name resolves does not have content that would indicate any right or legitimate interest in the disputed domain name.

The Respondent has no rights or interests in the disputed domain name.

BAD FAITH

The Panel accepts that the Complainant's SCHNEIDER ELECTRIC trademark is distinctive and well known internationally.

Whilst it appears the Respondent is yet to use the disputed domain name to operate an active website or email service, it is nevertheless concerning to the Panel that a domain name so strikingly similar to a well known brand has been registered and initial steps have been taken to prepare for the publication of such a website. In such circumstances, it is reasonable to infer that the Respondent registered the strikingly similar disputed domain name with full knowledge of the Complainant's right in the SCHNEIDER ELECTRIC trademark. Such similarity will inevitably confuse web-users. It is further reasonable to infer that the only foreseeable purpose that the Respondent had to register the disputed domain name and direct it to a website, that is yet to be properly developed, was to opportunistically profit from such confusion or assist another person to do so. Such opportunism has been recognised as bad faith by numerous panels, the Panel refers to the commentary of the learned Gerald M Levine, Domain Name Arbitration, Legal Corner Press, 2nd ed. 2019, pp. 432 to 434.

The Respondent has registered and used the disputed domain name in bad faith.

FOR ALL THE REASONS STATED ABOVE, THE COMPLAINT IS

Accepted

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

1. **authschnelder-electrlc.com**: Transferred

PANELLISTS

Name	**Andrew Sykes**

DATE OF PANEL DECISION 2025-06-06

Publish the Decision