Decision for dispute CAC-UDRP-108409

Case number	CAC-UDRP-108409
Time of filing	2026-02-16 09:32:21
Domain names	schneiderelectricfr.com

Case administrator

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

Complainant

Organization	SCHNEIDER ELECTRIC

Complainant representative

Organization	NAMESHIELD S.A.S.

Respondent

Name	Jessica Scruggs

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 has proved to own the following trademark rights, inter alia:

- International trademark Schneider Electric (Logo) No.715395 dated March 15, 1999, duly renewed since then and covering goods and services in classes 6, 9, 11, 36, 37, 39 and 42;
- International trademark Schneider Electric (Logo) No.715396 dated March 15, 1999, duly renewed since then and covering goods and services in classes 6, 9, 11, 36, 37, 39 and 42;
- European Union trademark SCHNEIDER ELECTRIC No. 001103803 dated March 12, 1999, duly renewed since then and covering goods and services in classes 6, 9, 11, 36, 37, 39 and 42.

The Complainant also owns the following domain name:

- <schneiderelectric.com> registered on April 4, 1996.

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

The Complainant, Schneider Electric is a French industrial business company operating internationally. Founded in 1871, it develops, manufactures, and offers products for power management, automation, and related technologies. The Complainant is featured on the NYSE Euronext and the French CAC 40 stock market index and is the owner of several SCHNEIDER ELECTRIC trademarks, registered worldwide.

The Respondent registered the disputed domain name < schneiderelectricfr.com> on February 11, 2026.

The Complainant submitted the following documents to prove the abovementioned facts:

- Annex-1: Information regarding the Complainant
- Annex-2: Complainant's trademarks
- Annex-3: Complainant's domain name
- Annex-4: Whois of the disputed domain name
- Annex-5: Screenshot of the website

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

Identity (paragraph 4(a)(i) of the Policy)

The Panel finds that the disputed domain name <schneiderelectricfr.com> is confusingly similar to the Complainant's SCHNEIDER ELECTRIC trademarks.

Indeed, the Complainant's SCHNEIDER ELECTRIC trademarks are incorporated in the disputed domain name in their entirety. The only difference lies in the addition of the geographical and descriptive element "fr". Nevertheless, such addition does not prevent a likelihood of confusion between the disputed domain names and the Complainant's trademarks. (See Fendi S.r.l. v. Federico Porcedda, Case No. D2018-1265).

Thus, the Panel finds that the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to Complainant's trademarks.

Absence of Rights or Legitimate Interests (paragraph 4(a)(ii) of the Policy)

The Panel observes that there has been no evidence showing that Respondent has been commonly known by the disputed domain name or owns any registered trademark rights with respect to the disputed domain name.

Moreover, the Respondent is not affiliated with the Complainant nor authorized by it, and has never been granted a license, or any other way been authorized, in order to register the disputed domain name. In addition, the Respondent never sought the consent of the Complainant in order to register the aforementioned domain name. Consequently, the Panel finds that the Respondent lacks any right or legitimate interest in using the disputed domain name.

The Complainant also highlighted that the disputed domain name redirects to the Complainant's website. Therefore, the Panel finds that use, which amounts to impersonation, cannot constitute a bona fide offering of goods and services or a legitimate noncommercial or fair use.

Finally, the Respondent had the opportunity to provide its arguments in support of its rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name. However, by failing to file a response, the Respondent has missed this opportunity and the Panel is entitled to draw such inferences from the Respondent's failure as it considers appropriate in accordance with Paragraph 14 of the Rules.

Accordingly, the Panel finds that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the disputed domain name.

Bad faith (paragraph 4(a)(iii) of the Policy.)

The Panel notes that the Respondent was aware of the Complainant's trademark registrations and rights when it registered the disputed domain name.

The Complainant showed the disputed domain name is similar to the well-known SCHNEIDER ELECTRIC trademarks. It is inconceivable to the Panel that the Respondent could have registered the disputed domain name without knowledge of the Complainant's trademarks and business, particularly as the disputed domain name redirects to the Complainant's official website. Moreover, the time of the registration, namely February 2026, is well posterior to the registration of SCHNEIDER ELECTRIC trademarks.

Therefore, it is clear to the Panel that the Respondent was well aware of the SCHNEIDER ELECTRIC trademarks and has registered the disputed domain name with the intention to refer to the Complainant and to its trademarks.

Furthermore, it seems that the Respondent has registered the disputed domain name in bad faith for the sole purpose of disrupting the Complainant's business and attracting Internet users for commercial gain, by creating a likelihood of confusion with the Complainant's trademarks. In particular, the redirection of the disputed domain name to the Complainant's official website demonstrates such bad faith. (See Chevron Intellectual Property LLC v. Phillip Thomas/Chevron Pacific, FA 1504001615524, Forum May 29, 2015).

To the Panel's opinion, this shows that the disputed domain name was registered and is being use in bad faith.

FOR ALL THE REASONS STATED ABOVE, THE COMPLAINT IS

Accepted

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

1. **schneiderelectricfr.com**: Transferred

PANELLISTS

Name	**Nathalie Dreyfus**

DATE OF PANEL DECISION 2026-03-23

Publish the Decision