Decision for dispute CAC-UDRP-107581

Case number	CAC-UDRP-107581
Time of filing	2025-05-15 09:38:28
Domain names	schneiderelectrichq.com, schneiderelectricpro.com, schneiderelectricweb.com

Case administrator

Name	Olga Slanařová (Case admin)

Complainant

Organization	SCHNEIDER ELECTRIC SE

Complainant representative

Organization	NAMESHIELD S.A.S.

Respondent

Name	Imad Bouziani

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 names.

IDENTIFICATION OF RIGHTS

The Complainant owns several trademarks for "SCHNEIDER ELECTRIC", including:

International trademark No. 715395 (registered March 15, 1999);

International trademark No. 715396 (registered March 15, 1999);

EU trademark No. 1103803 (registered March 12, 1999).

It also owns domain names such as:

<schneiderelectric.com> (registered April 4, 1996);

<schneider-electric-dms.com> (registered September 25, 2012).

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

The Complainant, which was founded in 1871, is a French industrial business trading internationally. It manufactures and offers products for power management, automation, and related solutions.

The disputed domain names were registered on May 6, 2025 and resolve to the Complainant's official website www.se.com. MX servers are configured for the disputed domain names.

PARTIES CONTENTIONS

COMPLAINANT' CONTENTIONS:

Identical or confusingly similar

The Complainant states that the disputed domain names are confusingly similar to its trademark SCHNEIDER ELECTRIC as it is identically contained.

No rights or legitimate interests

The Complainant contends that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain names under paragraph 4(a)(ii) of the Policy.

In fact, the Complainant asserts that the Respondent is not identified in the Whois record by the disputed domain names, and therefore is not commonly known by them.

Furthermore, the Complainant clarifies that the Respondent has no affiliation with, or authorisation from, SCHNEIDER ELECTRIC and has no rights to use its trademark. Moreover, the Respondent has not been granted any licence or authorisation to use the Complainant's trademark or to register the disputed domain names.

Although the disputed domain names currently redirect to the Complainant's official website, the Complainant argues this does not constitute legitimate use because it is not a bona fide offering of goods or services, nor is it a legitimate non-commercial or fair use.

The Complainant supports this position by referencing multiple UDRP decisions, where redirection to the complainant's own site was held not to establish legitimate interests for the Respondent.

Registered and used in bad faith

The Complainant points out that the disputed domain names were registered and are being used in bad faith, both due to the Respondent's prior knowledge of the trademark and the technical setup (MX records) that suggests potential for harmful use.

According to the Complainant, the disputed domain names are confusingly similar to the well-known trademark SCHNEIDER ELECTRIC, so that the Respondent must have been aware of the Complainant's long-established and internationally recognised trademark when registering the domain names.

Given the distinctiveness and global reputation of the SCHNEIDER ELECTRIC trademark, the Complainant asserts it is reasonable to infer that the Respondent registered the disputed domain names with full knowledge of the Complainant's rights.

It also points out that the disputed domain names redirect to the Complainant's own website, which the Complainant argues is further proof that the Respondent was aware of the trademark and registered the disputed domains in bad faith.

Furthermore, the Complainant alleges that the Respondent's contention was to take unfair advantage of the Complainant's reputation and to create confusion with its trademarks and domain names, which is evidenced by the existence of configured MX records (email capability), as it opens the possibility of misleading email use. In this regard, the Complainant references CAC Case No. 102827, which found that the presence of MX records alone may indicate a risk of future misuse and a lack of good faith.

RESPONDENT'S CONTENTIONS:

The Respondent did not respond to the Complaint.

RIGHTS

The Complainant has, to the satisfaction of the Panel, shown the disputed domain names are confusingly similar to a trademarks in which the Complainant has rights (within the meaning of paragraph 4(a)(i) of the Policy).

NO RIGHTS OR LEGITIMATE INTERESTS

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 names (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 names have been registered and are 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 15 of the Rules states that the Panel shall decide a Complaint on the basis of the statements and documents submitted and in accordance with the Policy, the Rules and any rules and principles of law deemed applicable.

In the case of default by a Party, Rule 14 states that if a Party, in the absence of exceptional circumstances, does not comply with a provision of, or requirement under the Rules, the Panel shall draw such inferences therefrom as appropriate.

In the present case, the Respondent has not submitted any Response and consequently has not contested any of the contentions made by the Complainant.

The Panel proceeds therefore to decide only on the basis of the Complainant's factual statements and the documentary evidence provided in support of them.

1. Identical or Confusingly Similar

The Panel finds that the disputed domain names are confusingly similar to the Complainant's well-known trademark SCHNEIDER ELECTRIC, which is fully incorporated in each of the disputed domain names. The addition of generic terms such as "HQ", "PRO", or "WEB" and the gTLD ".com" does not prevent a finding of confusing similarity. The Complainant has therefore satisfied the requirement under paragraph 4(a)(i) of the Policy.

2. No Rights or Legitimate Interests

The Complainant has made a prima facie case that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain names, which the Respondent has failed to rebut. The Respondent is neither commonly known by the disputed domain names nor authorised by the Complainant to use its trademark. Moreover, the redirection of the domain names to the Complainant's own website does not constitute a bona fide offering of goods or services or fair use. The Complainant has thus established that the Respondent lacks rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain names under paragraph 4(a)(ii) of the Policy.

3. Registered and Used in Bad Faith

Given the global reputation of the Complainant and the long-standing registration of its trademarks and disputed domain names, the Panel concludes that the Respondent must have registered the disputed domain names with full knowledge of the Complainant's rights. The redirection to the Complainant's official website and the presence of active MX records further supports a finding of bad faith use. Accordingly, the disputed domain names have been registered and are being used in bad faith within the meaning of paragraph 4(a)(iii) of the Policy.

FOR ALL THE REASONS STATED ABOVE, THE COMPLAINT IS

Accepted

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

1. **schneiderelectrichq.com**: Transferred
2. **schneiderelectricpro.com**: Transferred
3. **schneiderelectricweb.com**: Transferred

PANELLISTS

Name	**Hana Číslerová**

DATE OF PANEL DECISION 2025-06-26

Publish the Decision