Decision for dispute CAC-UDRP-107770

Case number	CAC-UDRP-107770
Time of filing	2025-07-28 11:30:02
Domain names	e-on.pro

Case administrator

Name	Olga Slanařová (Case admin)

Complainant

Organization	E.ON SE

Complainant representative

Organization	Lubberger Lehment Rechtsanwälte Partnerschaft mbB

Respondent

Name	youintrox dw

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 several EU trademarks "E.ON" and "e.on", including the trademark E.ON No. 002361558, registered on December 19, 2002, the trademark e.on No. 002362416, also registered on December 19, 2002, the trademark e.on No. 006296529, registered on July 27, 2008, and the trademark e.on No. 0876364, registered on September 9, 2005.

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

The Complainant is one of Europe's largest operators of energy networks and energy infrastructure and a provider of innovative customer solutions for approximately 48 million customers. The Complainant is a member of the EURO STOXX 50 Index, DAX Performance Index and Dow Jones Global Titans 50 Index.

All the trademarks of Complainant mentioned above are exclusively associated with the Complainant and widely recognized within the EU and internationally, due to their extensive and continuous use.

The disputed domain name was registered on July 10, 2025, and directs to a log-in page adopting typical design features that are also used by the Complainant, prominently displaying the Complainant’s logo.

PARTIES CONTENTIONS

The Complainant states that the disputed domain name is highly similar to its trademark e.on, as the disputed domain name reproduces the trademark in its entirety, only substituting the period by a hyphen.

The Complainant asserts that the addition of the TLD ".pro" is not sufficient to escape this finding, as it serves solely a technical function.

The Complainant also states that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the disputed domain name.

The Complainant asserts that the Respondent is not making a legitimate non-commercial or fair use of the disputed domain name but is instead using the domain name to operate a fake website that appears to be operated by the Complainant. As a result, the Complainant's customers may be misled into visiting the site and entering personal information under the mistaken belief that they are accessing an official portal of the Complainant.

The Complainant states that the disputed domain name was registered and is being used in bad faith.

The Complainant asserts that the disputed domain name is identical to the Complainant's well-known trademark e.on. The Complainant further states that the website under the disputed domain name is deliberately designed to appear as an official website of the Complainant, indicating that the Respondent is aware of the Complainant and its trademarks. The Complainant further notes that the domain name was registered only recently, in July 2025, and that the Respondent is concealing its identity both on the website, which lacks any imprint or other identifying information, and in the WhoIs registry.

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

PRINCIPAL REASONS FOR THE DECISION

As the Respondent did not file an administratively compliant Response, pursuant to paragraph 14(b) of the Rules for Uniform Domain Name Dispute Resolution Policy (the "Rules"), the Panel may draw such inferences therefrom as it considers appropriate. Thus, the Panel accepts the contentions of the Complainant as admitted by the Respondent.

Taking the statements and documents submitted by the Complainant under careful consideration, the Panel concludes that the Complainant has established all the elements entitling it to claim the transfer of the disputed domain name.

I. Identical or Confusingly Similar disputed domain name

The Complainant has, to the satisfaction of the Panel, shown the disputed domain name to be 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.

The disputed domain name is confusingly similar to the Complainant's trademark e.on. The disputed domain name is almost identical to the Complainant's trademark, as only the period between the letters “e” and “on” has been replaced by a hyphen (“e-on”). The punctuation mark in the middle of the terms has no significant meaning; in both cases (“e.on” and “e-on”), the average customer will focus primarily on the letters “eon”. In addition, the period and the hyphen are adjacent letters on the keyboard, and as a result, the Panel recognizes a possibility of the Respondent deliberately using an incorrect spelling of the complainant's trademark for the purpose of typosquatting. Therefore, the implemented changes do not lead to a sufficient distinction between the disputed domain name and the Complainant’s trademark.

The applicable Top-Level Domain (TLD) “.pro” is viewed as a standard registration requirement and as such is disregarded (WIPO Case No. D2014-1919 – Bentley Motors Limited v. Domain Admin / Kyle Rocheleau, Privacy Hero Inc. among others).

II. Respondent’s Rights or Legitimate Interests in the disputed domain name

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

While the overall burden of proof in UDRP proceedings lies with the Complainant, the burden of proof shifts to the Respondent where the Complainant establishes a prima facie case that the Respondent lacks rights or legitimate interests. If the Respondent fails to provide evidence for its rights or legitimate interests, the Complainant is deemed to have satisfied paragraph 4(a)(ii) of the Policy (WIPO Case No. D2004-0110 – Belupo d.d. v. WACHEM d.o.o.; WIPO case no. D2003-0455 – Croatia Airlines d.d. v. Modern Empire Internet Ltd.).

The Complainant has established a prima facie case that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name.

The disputed domain name is confusingly similar to the Complainant’s well-known trademark and therefore carries a high risk of implied affiliation (WIPO Case No. D2000-0163 – Veuve Clicquot Ponsardin, Maison Fondée en 1772 v. The Polygenix Group Co.). Moreover, as stated by the Complainant and not contested by the Respondent, the Respondent is using the disputed domain name as a fake website that appears to be operated by the Complainant, which cannot establish any rights or legitimate interests on the part of the Respondent.

Accordingly, as a result of Complainant’s allegations and without any evidence from Respondent to the contrary, the Panel is satisfied that Complainant has proven the second element of the Policy.

III. The disputed domain name has been registered and is being used in Bad Faith

The Respondent has also registered and is using the disputed domain name in bad faith within the meaning of para. 4 (a)(iii) of the Policy by intentionally attempting to attract internet users to their website by creating a likelihood of confusion with the Complainant's trademark for commercial gain.

Therefore, the Panel concludes that the Respondent has registered the disputed domain name in bad faith within the meaning of para. 4 (a)(iii) of the Policy.

The Complainant’s business had already grown into an established and internationally well-known brand at the time the Respondent registered the disputed domain name on July 10, 2025. The mere registration of a domain name that is identical to a famous or widely-known trademark by an unaffiliated entity by itself creates a presumption of bad faith (WIPO Case No. D2000-0163 – Veuve

Clicquot Ponsardin, Maison Fondée en 1772 v. The Polygenix Group Co.).

The Respondent is also using the disputed domain name in bad faith.

There are several indications that the Respondent is using the disputed domain name as a fake website that appears to be operated by the Complainant to redirect the Complainant's customers to the Respondent's website and induce them to disclose their personal data. Firstly, this is supported by the high similarity of the disputed domain name and the Complainant's trademark e.on as well as the apparent exploitation of the fact that the interchanged punctuation marks are adjacent on the keyboard and are therefore more likely to be confused (typosquatting). Secondly, this is supported by the content of the website. The website to which the disputed domain name resolves to contains a prominently placed logo of the Complainant (e.on) on a background in a shade of orange which is typical for the Complainant's corporate identity. As a result, even after accessing the website, the customer is led to believe that they are visiting a website operated by the Complainant. This leads to the conclusion that the Respondent uses the disputed domain name to redirect the Complainant's customers to its website and to induce them to enter their login details for the Complainant in the form provided for this purpose. In the Panel's view, it is inconceivable that the Respondent does not intend to use this data for commercial gain.

This finding is reinforced by the concealment of the Respondent's identity by neither providing an imprint on the website nor revealing its name in the Whois-Register (WIPO Case No. D2023-2053 – SOLVAY Société Anonyme v. Meriot Ongloo; WIPO Case No. D2007-0909 – Alarko Holding A.S. v. ",").

The Respondent has not provided any evidence of actual or contemplated good faith registration or use of the disputed domain name that could refute this prima facie assessment.

FOR ALL THE REASONS STATED ABOVE, THE COMPLAINT IS

Accepted

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

1. **e-on.pro**: Transferred

PANELLISTS

Name	**Dominik Eickemeier**

DATE OF PANEL DECISION 2025-08-27

Publish the Decision