Decision for dispute CAC-UDRP-107753

Case number	CAC-UDRP-107753
Time of filing	2025-07-17 15:02:43
Domain names	elecrtrolux.com

Case administrator

Name	Olga Slanařová (Case admin)

Complainant

Organization	AB Electrolux

Complainant representative

Organization	SILKA AB

Respondent

Name	Brian Kovic

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 owns a large portfolio of trademark registrations for the mark ELECTROLUX in numerous jurisdictions, including but not limited to:

- Iceland Reg. No. V0001239 ELECTROLUX (word), registered 29 December 1944;
- Switzerland Reg. No. 276039 ELECTROLUX (word), registered 24 April 1975;
- International Reg. No. 836605 ELECTROLUX, registered 17 March 2004;
- EU Reg. No. 000077925 ELECTROLUX, registered 16 September 1998;
- United States Reg. No. 5029069 ELECTROLUX, registered 30 August 2016.

The Complainant operates its principal website at electrolux.com, registered since 30 April 1996.

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

The Complainant, established in 1919, is a leading global producer of appliances and equipment for kitchen and cleaning products and floor care products, employing over 40,000 people in approximately 120 markets worldwide. The Complainant markets its products primarily under its flagship ELECTROLUX brand, which has been ranked among the most valuable and well-known brands globally.

The Complainant owns a large portfolio of trademark registrations for the mark ELECTROLUX in numerous jurisdictions.

The disputed domain name was registered on 21 May 2025. It is currently inactive but configured with MX (mail exchange) records.

PARTIES CONTENTIONS

The Complainant contends that:

1. **Identical or Confusingly Similar:**
   The disputed domain name incorporates the ELECTROLUX mark in its entirety with the mere addition of the letter "r", constituting a typical case of typosquatting. Such alteration does not prevent a finding of confusing similarity. The generic Top-Level Domain (".com") is to be disregarded.

2. **No Rights or Legitimate Interests:**
   The Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name. It is not affiliated with or authorised by the Complainant, holds no trademark rights in "elecrtrolux" or "electrolux", and is not making any bona fide use. The disputed domain name is inactive, and its composition carries a high risk of implied affiliation.

3. **Registered and Used in Bad Faith:**
   The Respondent registered the disputed domain name with knowledge of the Complainant's famous mark, engaging in typosquatting. Passive holding in combination with the mark's reputation, privacy protection use, and MX record activation indicates bad faith under the Policy. The domain could be used for phishing or fraudulent purposes.

The Complainant requests the transfer of the disputed domain name.

The Respondent did not file a response.

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

Identical or Confusingly Similar

The Complainant has demonstrated registered rights in the ELECTROLUX mark worldwide. The disputed domain name reproduces the mark in its entirety with the insertion of an “r” after “elec”, a minor typographical deviation insufficient to prevent a finding of confusing similarity. Panels have consistently recognised that typosquatting constitutes confusing similarity (WIPO Overview 3.0, section 1.9).

The gTLD “.com” is disregarded in this assessment. The Panel finds paragraph 4(a)(i) of the Policy is satisfied.

Rights or Legitimate Interests

The Complainant has made a prima facie showing that the Respondent lacks rights or legitimate interests. There is no evidence the Respondent is commonly known by the disputed domain name or has any trademark rights in “elecrtrolux”. The Respondent has not been authorised by the Complainant.

The disputed domain name does not resolve to an active website and appears to have never done so. Passive holding is not a bona fide offering of goods or services. The composition of the domain name itself, as a typographical variant of a famous mark, precludes any plausible legitimate use without creating confusion.

The Respondent has not come forward with any evidence to rebut the Complainant’s contentions. The Panel finds paragraph 4(a)(ii) of the Policy is satisfied.

Registered and Used in Bad Faith

The Panel is satisfied, that the Respondent both registered and is using the disputed domain name in bad faith within the meaning of paragraph 4(a)(iii) of the Policy.

Registration in bad faith
The Complainant’s ELECTROLUX trademark is distinctive, enjoys long-standing protection in numerous jurisdictions, and is recognised internationally as a well-known mark. The earliest registrations date back to 1944, and the Complainant has operated its principal domain <electrolux.com> since 1996. By contrast, the disputed domain name was registered only on 21 May 2025.

The disputed domain name reproduces the Complainant’s ELECTROLUX mark in its entirety, with only the insertion of the letter “r” after “elec”. Such a minor alteration is a prototypical case of typosquatting, designed to capture Internet users who inadvertently misspell the Complainant’s mark. Panels have repeatedly held that the registration of a domain name incorporating a well-known trademark, particularly in a typosquatted form, is by itself evidence of bad faith (see AB Electrolux v. Carolina Rodrigues, WIPO Case No. D2023-4298; Confederation Nationale Du Credit Mutuel v. Jder Isow, WIPO Case No. D2022-3817).

Given the reputation of the ELECTROLUX mark and the ease with which a simple online search would have revealed the Complainant’s rights, the Panel considers it implausible that the Respondent could have registered the disputed domain name without knowledge of the Complainant’s mark and its business. The deliberate choice of a single-letter misspelling supports the inference that the Respondent’s objective was to exploit the goodwill associated with the Complainant’s brand.

(b) Use in bad faith
Although the disputed domain name does not currently resolve to an active website, the absence of active use does not preclude a finding of bad faith. Under the passive holding doctrine (WIPO Overview 3.0, section 3.3), panels assess the totality of circumstances, including:

- the high degree of distinctiveness and fame of the complainant’s mark;
- the lack of any plausible legitimate use by the respondent;
- the respondent’s use of privacy services to conceal its identity; and
- evidence suggesting potential abusive use, such as the activation of MX (mail exchange) records.

Here, each of these factors is present. The configuration of MX records for the disputed domain name raises a substantial risk of misuse for fraudulent email schemes, including phishing, by impersonating the Complainant. The likelihood of deception is amplified by the visual similarity between <elecrtrolux.com> and the Complainant’s official domain <electrolux.com>; an email address at the disputed domain would be easily mistaken for one legitimately associated with the Complainant.

Panels have consistently treated such circumstances as strong indicators of bad faith (see Bouygues v. Name Redacted, WIPO Case No. D2021-1666; Tetra Laval Holdings & Finance S.A. v. Himali Hewage, WIPO Case No. D2020-0472).

The Panel therefore concludes that the Respondent’s conduct falls squarely within paragraph 4(b)(iv) of the Policy — namely, registration and use of a domain name to intentionally attract, for commercial gain, Internet users by creating a likelihood of confusion with the Complainant’s mark as to the source, sponsorship, affiliation, or endorsement of the disputed domain name.

Accordingly, the Panel finds that the disputed domain name was registered and is being used in bad faith.

FOR ALL THE REASONS STATED ABOVE, THE COMPLAINT IS

Accepted

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

1. **elecrtrolux.com** : Transferred

PANELLISTS

Name	**Jan Schnedler**

DATE OF PANEL DECISION 2025-08-13

Publish the Decision