Decision for dispute CAC-UDRP-107894

Case number	CAC-UDRP-107894
Time of filing	2025-09-01 17:03:05
Domain names	servicesolutionselectrolux.com

Case administrator

Name	Olga Slanařová (Case admin)

Complainant

Organization	AB Electrolux

Complainant representative

Organization	SILKA AB

Respondent

Organization	PT Eksa Digital Agency

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 bases its Complaint among others on the following ELECTROLUX trademarks:

- Indonesian national trademark “ELECTROLUX”, no. IDM001203405, registered on August 13, 2024, for goods in class 3;
- International trademark registration “ELECTROLUX”, no. 836605, registered on March 17, 2004, for goods and services in classes 3, 7, 8, 9, 11, 12, 21, 25, 35, 37, 39;
- European Union trademark “ELECTROLUX”, no. 000077925, registered on September 16, 1998, for goods and services in classes 3, 7, 8, 9, 11, 16, 20, 21, 35, 37;
- United States national trademark “ELECTROLUX”, no. 195691, registered on March 3, 1925, for goods in class 21.

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

Established in 1919, the Complainant is a Swedish multinational appliance manufacturer, headquartered in Stockholm. The Complainant is one of the world’s leading producers of appliances and equipment for kitchen and cleaning products and floor care products. The ELECTROLUX brand is the Complainant’s flagship brand for kitchen and cleaning appliances for both consumers and professional users, and it is commonly ranked as one of the most valuable and strongest brands in the world. According to the Complainant’s annual report in 2024, the Complainant had sales of SEK 136 billion in approximately 120 markets and more than 40,000 employees internationally.

The Complainant is the owner of ELECTROLUX trademarks in numerous jurisdictions around the world, including the ones cited above.

The Complainant establishes its online presence through, inter alia, the domain name <electrolux.com>, registered on April 30, 1996, which resolves to a website displaying information about the Complainant and its products.

The disputed domain name <servicesolutionselectrolux.com> was registered on December 6, 2024 and resolves to a website in the Indonesian language which purportedly offers repairing services for ELECTROLUX-branded products, while Mail Exchange ("MX") records are also 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.

The Complainant's contentions are the following:

The Complainant contends that the requirements of the Policy have been met and that the disputed domain name should be transferred to it. The disputed domain name <servicesolutionselectrolux.com> is confusingly similar to the Complainant's earlier well-known trademark ELECTROLUX, that the Respondent lacks rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name for a number of reasons and that the disputed domain name was registered and is being used in bad faith.

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. Confusing Similarity

The Panel agrees that the disputed domain name <servicesolutionselectrolux.com> is confusingly similar to the Complainant's earlier well-known trademark ELECTROLUX. The disputed domain name incorporates entirely the Complainant's earlier ELECTROLUX trademark with the addition of the generic terms "service" and "solutions" which are not sufficient to escape the finding that the domain name is confusingly similar to the Complainant's trademark and it does not change the overall impression of the designations as being connected to the trademark ELECTROLUX.

Moreover, the extension ".com" is not to be taken into consideration when examining the similarity between the Complainant's trademark and the disputed domain name (WIPO Case No. D2005-0016, Accor v. Noldc Inc.). The mere adjunction of a gTLD such as ".com" is irrelevant as it is well established that the generic Top Level Domain is insufficient to avoid a finding of confusing similarity (WIPO Case No. 2013-0820, L'Oréal v Tina Smith, WIPO Case No. D2008-0820 Titoni AG v Runxin Wang and WIPO Case No. D2009-0877, Alstom v. Itete Peru S.A.).

Therefore, the Panel is satisfied that the first condition under the Policy is met.

2. Lack of Respondent's rights or legitimate interests

The Complainant is required to make out a prima facie case that the Respondent lacks rights or legitimate interests. Once such prima facie case is made, the burden of proof shifts to the respondent to come forward with appropriate allegations or evidence demonstrating rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name. If the respondent fails to come forward with such appropriate allegations or evidence, a complainant is generally deemed to have satisfied paragraph 4(a)(ii) of the Policy.

Based on the available evidence, the Respondent does not appear to own any identical trademark to the disputed domain name and to the terms "servicesolutionselectrolux" or "service solutions electrolux" nor that it is commonly known by the disputed domain name or by the terms "servicesolutionselectrolux" or "service solutions electrolux".

Moreover, the Respondent is not a licensee of the Complainant.

No license nor authorization has been granted by the Complainant to the Respondent to make any use of the Complainant's trademark ELECTROLUX, or to apply for registration of the disputed domain name.

The disputed domain name resolves to a website in the Indonesian language which purportedly offers repair services for ELECTROLUX-branded products. The website does not contain any note, information or disclaimer in a prominent manner pointing out that the owner of the website has no relationship with the Complainant. The browser tab of the website shows the message "Service Electrolux Jakarta - Karya Global Technik". Also, the "more info" section of the website's home page links to a WhatsApp profile that displays in an unauthorized manner the Complainant's ELECTROLUX device trademark.

Based on the available evidence, images of the Complainant's ELECTROLUX-branded products are shown on the website in an unauthorized manner.

All the above lead to a risk of possibly misleading consumers into thinking that the website is owned by, affiliated with, or sponsored / endorsed by the Complainant, when it is not the case.

The Respondent had an opportunity to comment on the Complaint's allegations by filing a Response, which the Respondent failed to do.

All the above do not amount to a bona fide offering of goods or services, or to a legitimate noncommercial or fair use of the disputed domain name.

Thus, the Panel is satisfied that the Complainant has at least established a prima facie case that the Respondent lacks rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name.

Accordingly, the Panel takes the view that also the second requirement under the Policy is met.

3. Bad Faith

The Complainant's trademark ELECTROLUX predates the registration date of the disputed domain name and is a well-known trademark. The Respondent has chosen to register the disputed domain name which incorporates entirely the Complainant's earlier ELECTROLUX trademark with the addition of the generic terms "service" and "solutions" in order to create confusion with such trademark. Therefore, the Panel concludes that at the time of registration of the disputed domain name, the Respondent was well aware of the Complainant's trademark and has intentionally registered it in order to benefit from the distinctive character of the Complainant's trademark.

In the present case, the following factors should be considered:

- the Complainant's ELECTROLUX trademark predates the registration date of the disputed domain name, being a well-known trademark with a high distinctive character;
- the Respondent failed to submit any response and has not provided any evidence of actual or contemplated good faith use of the disputed domain name;
- the Respondent registered the disputed domain name which includes in its entirety the Complainant's ELECTROLUX earlier trademark with the addition of the generic terms "service" and "solutions" in order to create confusion with the Complainant's ELECTROLUX trademark;
- any good faith use of the disputed domain name would be implausible, as the trademark ELECTROLUX is univocally linked to the Complainant and the Respondent is not a licensee of the Complainant, nor was ever authorised to use a domain name confusingly similar to the Complainant's trademark;

- the disputed domain name resolves to a website in the Indonesian language which purportedly offers repairing services for ELECTROLUX-branded products, without including any note, information or disclaimer pointing out that the owner of the

website has no relationship with the Complainant. Additionally, the browser tab of the website shows the message “Service Electrolux Jakarta - Karya Global Technik”, while the “more info” section of the website’s home page links to a WhatsApp profile that displays without authorization the Complainant’s ELECTROLUX device trademark. Moreover, based on the available evidence, images of the Complainant’s ELECTROLUX-branded products are shown on the website in an unauthorized manner. All these lead to the assumption that the Respondent has intentionally attempted to attract, for commercial gain, Internet users to its website, by creating a likelihood of confusion with the Complainant’s ELECTROLUX mark as to the source, sponsorship, affiliation, or endorsement of the Respondent’s website and of the offered service on the Respondent’s website;

- MX records are configured for the disputed domain name, an aspect which could lead to a possible risk of fraudulent activity.

In light of the foregoing, the Panel concludes that the Respondent has registered and has been using the disputed domain name in bad faith. Thus, also the third and last condition under the Policy is satisfied.

FOR ALL THE REASONS STATED ABOVE, THE COMPLAINT IS

Accepted

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

1. **servicesolutionselectrolux.com**: Transferred

PANELLISTS

Name	**Delia-Mihaela Belciu**

DATE OF PANEL DECISION 2025-10-08

Publish the Decision