Decision for dispute CAC-UDRP-108218

Case number	CAC-UDRP-108218
Time of filing	2025-12-12 09:29:18
Domain names	scerwfix.com

Case administrator

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

Complainant

Organization	Screwfix Direct Limited

Complainant representative

Organization	Convey srl

Respondent

Name	Jerry weeks

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 the trademark "SCREWFIX" since 1996, with many international and national trademark registrations worldwide, including the following:

- UK Trademark No. UK00002068635 "SCREWFIX DIRECT", registered since November 22, 1996;
- European Trade Mark No. 002231876 "SCREWFIX", registered since September 21, 1997;
- UK Trademark No. UK00902231876 "SCREWFIX", registered since May 2, 2003;
- European Union Trade Mark No. 000646133 "SCREWFIX", registered since September 21, 1997 (hereinafter cumulatively referred to as the "Trademark").

The Respondent did not file a Response and thus, did not claim any rights on the disputed domain name.

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

The Complainant is a British company founded in 1979 in Yeovil, Somerset as the Woodscrew Supply Company by Jon Goddard-

Watts. Initially, it sold screws via a single-page mail-order catalogue. In 1992 the first catalogue was launched, branded as Screwfix Direct.

Today Screwfix operates over 1,700 stores, employs more than 14,000 people, and generates revenue exceeding £2.5 billion. The Complainant is one of the United Kingdom's largest multi-channel retailers of trade tools, accessories, and hardware, operating millions of stores in Europe, Russia, and Turkey.

The Complainant has registered several domain names consisting of or comprising the trademark SCREWFIX under several different TLDs, including <screwfix.com>, which was registered on July 21, 1997.

The disputed domain name was registered on November 1, 2025, and resolved to a third-party website which was advertising content related to the Complainant's industry, such as DIY articles/products, including woodworking items as well as Complainant's products. At the moment of this decision the disputed domain name does not resolve to an active website.

PARTIES CONTENTIONS

The Complainant contends that the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to the Trademark.

Furthermore, the Complainant contends that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name. In this regard, the Complainant states that the Respondent is not commonly known by the disputed domain name, that it is not affiliated with nor authorized by the Complainant in any way, that the Complainant does not carry out any activity for, nor has any business with the Respondent, and that neither license nor authorization has been granted to the Respondent to make any use of the Trademark or apply for registration of the disputed domain name by the Complainant.

Finally, the Complainant contends that the disputed domain name was registered and is being used in bad faith. It contends that the Respondent must have been aware of the Complainant and its Trademark at the time of registration of the disputed domain name as the Trademark is well-known and that the Respondent's use of the disputed domain name is evidence of bad faith, as it intentionally tried to attract users by creating a likelihood of confusion with the Complainant's trademark as to the source of the website associated to the disputed domain name constitutes an evidence of bad faith registration and use.

RESPONDENT:

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

Under paragraph 4(a) of the Policy, the Complainant must prove that each of the following three elements is present:

(i) the disputed domain name is identical or confusingly similar to the Complainant's trademark; and

(ii) the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the disputed domain name; and

(iii) the disputed domain name has been registered and is being used in bad faith.

1. The Panel accepts that the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to the Trademark. It is well established that typosquatting (i.e. a strategic typographical error) does not prevent a finding of confusing similarity. In the present case the word "SCERWFIX" is confusingly similar to the Trademark, as it has the letters “e” and “r” in a reversed order - a very typical case of typosquatting.

2. Although the overall burden of proof in UDRP proceedings is on the complainant, panels have recognized that proving a respondent lacks rights or legitimate interests in a domain name may result in the difficult task of “proving a negative”, requiring information that is often primarily within the knowledge or control of the respondent. As such, where a complainant makes out a prima facie case that the respondent lacks rights or legitimate interests, the burden of production on this element shifts to the respondent to come forward with relevant evidence demonstrating rights or legitimate interests in the domain name. If the respondent fails to come forward with such relevant evidence, the complainant is deemed to have satisfied the second element.

The Respondent does not appear to have operated any bona fide or legitimate business under the disputed domain name and is not making a noncommercial or fair use of the disputed domain name. Instead, the disputed domain name resolves to website that seems to be offering similar and/or competitive products and/or services as the ones of the Complainant, while taking an unfair advantage of the confusing similarity of the disputed domain name with the Trademark and the Complainant's reputation.

Consequently, the Panel finds that the Complainant has fulfilled its obligations under paragraph 4(a)(ii) of the Policy. The Respondent did not deny these assertions in any way and therefore failed to prove any rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name.

3.1 The Panel is satisfied that the Respondent registered the disputed domain name with full knowledge of the Complainant and its rights in the Trademark as the Trademark is highly distinctive, well-established and well-known.

3.2 Furthermore, the Panel accepts the Complainant's contentions that the disputed domain name has been used in bad faith under para. 4(b)(iv) of the Policy. The Respondent has used the disputed domain to intentionally attract users to its website by creating a likelihood of confusion with the Trademark as to the source, sponsorship, affiliation, or endorsement of the website and by capitalising on Complainant's reputation.

Consequently, by using the disputed domain name in such a manner, the Respondent has fulfilled the elements and requirements for a finding under paragraph 4(a)(iii) of the Policy. The Panel finds that the Complainant has also established the third element of the Policy successfully.

FOR ALL THE REASONS STATED ABOVE, THE COMPLAINT IS

Accepted

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

1. **scerwfix.com**: Transferred

PANELLISTS

Name	**Stefanie Efstathiou LL.M. mult.**

DATE OF PANEL DECISION 2026-01-12

Publish the Decision