Decision for dispute CAC-UDRP-107611

Case number	CAC-UDRP-107611
Time of filing	2025-05-26 10:42:06
Domain names	schneidar-electric.com

Case administrator

Organization	Iveta Špiclová (Czech Arbitration Court) (Case admin)

Complainant

Organization	SCHNEIDER ELECTRIC SE

Complainant representative

Organization	NAMESHIELD S.A.S.

Respondent

Name	jeffs jodin89

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 is the owner of several trademarks, comprising the terms SCHNEIDER ELECTRIC, which are registered for a wide range of products and services and which offer protection in approximately 50 territories throughout the world:

- the international trademark SCHNEIDER ELECTRIC, registered on 15 March 1999 under No. 715395;
- the international trademark SCHNEIDER S ELECTRIC registered on 15 March 1999 under No. 715396;
- the EU trademark mark SCHNEIDER ELECTRIC registered on 12 March 1999 under No. 1103803.

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

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

The Complainant is the owner of numerous other domain names comprising the mark SCHNEIDER ELECTRIC, such as <schneiderelectric.com>, registered since 4 April 1996.

The disputed domain name <schneidar-electric.com> was registered on 13 May 2025. The Complainant demonstrates that the website associated with the disputed domain name resolves to a parking page with commercial links and that MX servers are configured for the disputed domain name.

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

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

According to the Complainant, the substitution of the letter “E” by the letter “A” in the disputed domain name constitutes an obvious misspelling of the Complainant’s trademark SCHNEIDER ELECTRIC. This misspelling is characteristic of a typo squatting practice intended to create confusing similarity between the Complainant’s trademark and the disputed domain name. Previous panels have found that slight spelling variations do not prevent a domain name from being confusingly similar to the Complainant’s trademark (See for instance CAC Case No. 103960, SCHNEIDER ELECTRIC SE v. Michele Swanson: „The obvious misspelling of the Complainant’s trademark SCHNAIDER ELECTRIC instead of SCHNEIDER ELECTRIC is a clear evidence of "typo squatting”).

The generic Top-Level Domain extension of the disputed domain name, in this case “.com”, is typically disregarded under the confusing similarity test, as it is a standard requirement for registration.

This is not being disputed by the Respondent.

Therefore, the Complainant concludes, and the panel agrees, that the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to the Complainant’s trademark.

2. The Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the disputed domain name

The Complainant states that the Respondent is not licensed nor authorized in any way by the Complainant to make any use of the Complainant’s trademark, or apply for registration of the disputed domain name. In addition, the Complainant asserts that it does not carry out any activity for, nor has any business with the Respondent.

The Complainant asserts that the Respondent is not identified in the Whois database as the disputed domain name. According to past Panel decisions, a Respondent is not commonly known by the disputed domain name if the Whois information is not similar to the disputed domain name (see Forum Case No. FA 1781783, Skechers U.S.A., Inc. and Skechers U.S.A., Inc. II v. Chad Moston / Elite Media Group <bobsfromsketchers.com> ("Here, the WHOIS information of record identifies Respondent as "Chad Moston / Elite Media Group." The Panel therefore finds under Policy ¶ 4(c)(ii) that Respondent is not commonly known by the disputed domain name under Policy ¶ 4(c)(ii).")).

Furthermore, the Complainant claims that the disputed domain name is a typo squatted version of the Complainant's trademark SCHNEIDER ELECTRIC. Typo squatting is the practice of registering a domain name in an attempt to take advantage of Internet users' typographical errors and can evidence that a respondent lacks rights and legitimate interests in the domain name.

Lastly, the Complainant demonstrates that the disputed domain name resolves to a parking page with commercial links. The Complainant cites previous panels that have found that this is not a bona fide offering of goods or services or legitimate non-commercial or fair use (See for instance: Forum Case No. FA 970871, Vance Int'l, Inc. v. Abend ("Concluding that the operation of a pay-per-click website at a confusingly similar domain name does not represent a bona fide offering of goods or services or a legitimate non-commercial or fair use, regardless of whether or not the links resolve to competing or unrelated websites or if the respondent is itself commercially profiting from the click-through fees")).

The Panel finds that the Complainant has shown that the Respondent has not made legitimate use of the disputed domain name for a bona fide offering of goods or services. In lack of any Response from the Respondent, or any other information indicating the contrary, the Panel concludes that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the domain name.

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

The Complainant cites a past Panel decision that recognized the Complainant's trademark as well-known (see WIPO Case No. D2020-1403, Schneider Electric S.A. v. Whois Privacy Protection Foundation / Sales department ("The Complainant and its trademark are well-known worldwide. The Complainant has been established almost 150 years ago while the disputed domain name was only registered a couple of months ago. The Respondent must have been fully aware of the Complainant and its trademark when it registered the disputed domain name."). The Complainant argues that, given the distinctiveness of the Complainant's trademark and reputation, it is reasonable to infer that the Respondent has registered the domain name with full knowledge of the Complainant's trademark.

In addition, the Complainant states the misspelling of the trademark SCHNEIDER ELECTRIC in the disputed domain name was intentionally designed to be confusingly similar with the Complainant's trademark. Previous panels have seen such actions as evidence of bad faith (See Forum Case No. FA 877979, Microsoft Corporation v. Domain Registration Philippines: "In addition, Respondent's misspelling of Complainant's MICROSOFT mark in the <microssoft.com> domain name indicates that Respondent is typosquatting, which is a further indication of bad faith registration and use pursuant to Policy ¶ 4(a)(iii).").

Furthermore, the Complainant demonstrates that the disputed domain name resolves to a parking page with commercial links. The Complainant contends the Respondent has attempted to attract internet users for commercial gain to his own websites thanks to the Complainant's trademarks, which is an evidence of bad faith.

Finally, the Complainant also demonstrates that MX servers are configured to the disputed domain name and suggests therefore, that the disputed domain name may be actively used for email purposes. Past panels have held that, if several active MX servers are connected to the disputed domain name but there is no other use of the disputed domain name, it is inconceivable that the Respondent will be able to make any good faith use of the disputed domain name (cf. CAC Case No. 102827, JCDECAUX SA v. Handi Hariyono).

In lack of any Response from the Respondent or any other information indicating the contrary, the Panel concludes that 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. **schneidar-electric.com**: Transferred

PANELLISTS

Name	**Tom Heremans**

DATE OF PANEL DECISION 2025-06-27

Publish the Decision