Decision for dispute CAC-UDRP-108202

Case number	CAC-UDRP-108202
Time of filing	2025-12-04 09:23:17
Domain names	schneidermonterrey.com

Case administrator

Name	Olga Slanařová (Case admin)

Complainant

Organization	SCHNEIDER ELECTRIC SE

Complainant representative

Organization	NAMESHIELD S.A.S.

Respondent

Organization	tubos aceros

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

It results from the evidence provided by the Complainant, which remained undisputed, that the Complainant holds several trademark registrations consisting of the word elements <SCHNEIDER ELECTRIC>, in particular the following trademark registrations:

- The international trademark SCHNEIDER ELECTRIC n° 715395 registered on March 15, 1999 for goods and services in classes 6, 9, 11, 36, 37 and 42;
- The European trademark SCHNEIDER ELECTRIC n° 1103803 registered on March 12, 1999 for goods and services in classes 6, 9, 11, 36, 37 and 42.

These marks have duly been renewed and are in force.

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

The Complainant is a French company and was founded in 1871. It manufactures and offers products in particular for power management. In 2024, the Complainant´s revenues amounted to 38 billion Euros.

According to the Registrar Verification response, the disputed domain name <schneidermonterrey.com> was registered on November 10, 2025.

As demonstrated by the Complainant, the disputed domain name resolves to a commercial website relating to technology in the energy sector and falsely purporting to be associated with the Complainant by reproducing the Complainant's logo and displaying an email address under the disputed domain name ostensibly used for sales purposes. In addition, MX records have been 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 Panel finds that the disputed domain name <schneidermonterrey.com> is confusingly similar to the Complainant's trademarks <SCHNEIDER ELECTRICS> for purposes of UDRP standing.

In the present case, the disputed domain name incorporates the element <SCHNEIDER> which the Panel considers a dominant feature of the relevant mark, since the further element <ELECTRIC> is rather descriptive for the Complainant's business, i.e. electric energy. This dominant feature is recognizable within the disputed domain name, the diverging element <MONTERREY> being a geographic indication of the city of Monterrey in Mexico.

2.

In the absence of any Response or any other information from the Respondent indicating the contrary, the Panel further holds that the Complainant successfully presented a prima facie case that the Respondent lacks rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name.

In particular, it results from the Complainant's undisputed allegations and evidence that the Respondent is not affiliated with nor authorized by the Complainant in any way, and he is not related in any way to the Complainant's business. Moreover, the Respondent has not demonstrated any preparations to use the disputed domain name - which is currently inactive - in connection with a bona fide offering of goods or services. Finally, the Panel has not been presented with any evidence that could lead the Panel to the conclusion that the Respondent is commonly known by the disputed domain name or that he has acquired trademark rights. In particular, the Respondent is not identified in the Whois database under the disputed domain name.

3.

Finally, the Panel holds that the Respondent by using the disputed domain name, has intentionally attempted to attract, for commercial gain, Internet users to its website or other online location, by creating a likelihood of confusion with the Complainant's mark as to the source, sponsorship, affiliation, or endorsement of its website or location or of a product or service on its website or location. In the present case, the Panel notes that it results from the Complainant's documented allegations that the disputed domain name resolves to a website related to technology in the energy sector and falsely purports to be associated with the Complainant by reproducing the Complainant's logo and displaying an email address under the disputed domain name ostensibly used for sales purposes. Consequently, and in the absence of any evidence to the contrary, the Panel is convinced that the Respondent also knew that the disputed domain name included the dominant feature of the Complainant's trademark when it registered the disputed domain name.

In addition, the following further circumstances surrounding the disputed domain name's registration and use confirm the findings that the Respondent has registered and is using the disputed domain name in bad faith:

a. The Respondent's failure to submit a response or to provide any evidence of actual or contemplated good-faith use;
b. The implausibility of any good faith use to which the disputed domain name, identically containing the dominant feature of the Complainant's trademark, may be put;
c. The clear absence of rights or legitimate interests coupled with no response to the Respondent's choice of the disputed domain name;
d. The content of the website to which the disputed domain name directs, purportedly run by the Complainant;
e. The disputed domain name has been set up with MX records so that the Respondent could be engaged in a phishing scheme;
f. The Respondent is concealing its identity behind a privacy service provider; and
g. The fact that the address data provided by the Respondent in the registration details of the disputed domain name does not appear to be accurate, taking into account the postal service provider's inability to deliver the CAC´s written notice to thegiven address.

In the light of the above, the Panel finds that the Complainant has established the third element of the Policy.

FOR ALL THE REASONS STATED ABOVE, THE COMPLAINT IS

Accepted

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

1. **schneidermonterrey.com**: Transferred

PANELLISTS

Name	**Tobias Malte Müller**

DATE OF PANEL DECISION 2026-01-19

Publish the Decision