

Decision for dispute CAC-UDRP-108572

Case number CAC-UDRP-108572

Time of filing 2026-04-14 09:13:00

Domain names schneiderelectriccorporation.com

Case administrator

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

Complainant

Organization SCHNEIDER ELECTRIC SE

Complainant representative

Organization NAMESHIELD S.A.S.

Respondent

Name Tarr Circacon

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 trademarks including the terms "Schneider Electric" such as:

- The international trademark SCHNEIDER ELECTRIC n° 715395 registered on March 15, 1999;
- The international trademark SCHNEIDER S ELECTRIC n° 715396 registered on March 15, 1999;
- The European trademark SCHNEIDER ELECTRIC n° 1103803 registered on March 12, 1999.

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

The Complainant, which was founded in 1871, is a French industrial business trading internationally. It manufactures and offers products for power management, automation, and related solutions. The Complainant's corporate website can be found at www.schneider-electric.com. The disputed domain name <schneiderelectriccorporation.com> was registered on February 27, 2025 and is inactive.

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).

The addition of the term “CORPORATION” is not sufficient to escape the finding that the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to the trademark. It does not change the overall impression of the designation as being connected to the Complainant’s trademark.

It is well-established that “a domain name that wholly incorporates a Complainant’s registered trademark may be sufficient to establish confusing similarity for purposes of the UDRP”. Please see WIPO Case No. D2003-0888, Dr. Ing. h.c. F. Porsche AG v. Vasilii Terkin.

Moreover, the addition of the suffix “.COM” does not change the overall impression of the designation as being connected to the trademark SCHNEIDER ELECTRIC. It does not prevent the likelihood of confusion between the disputed domain name and the Complainant and its trademark. Please see Forum Case No. FA 153545, Gardline Surveys Ltd v. Domain Finance Ltd. (“The addition of a top-level domain is irrelevant when establishing whether or not a mark is identical or confusingly similar, because top-level domains are a required element of every domain name.”).

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).

According to the WIPO Case No. D2003-0455, Croatia Airlines d. d. v. Modern Empire Internet Ltd., 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 Respondent carries the burden of demonstrating rights or legitimate interests in the domain name. If the Respondent fails to do so, the Complainant is deemed to have satisfied paragraph 4(a) (ii) of the Policy.

The Respondent is not identified in the Whois database as the disputed domain name. Past panels have held that a respondent was not commonly known by a domain name if the Whois information was not similar to the domain name. Thus, the Respondent is not known as the disputed domain name. Please see for instance Forum Case No. FA 1781783, Skechers U.S.A., Inc. and Skechers U.S.A., Inc. II v. Chad Moston / Elite Media Group <bobsfromsketchers.com> (“Here, the WHOIS information of record identifies Respondent as “Chad Moston / Elite Media Group.” The Panel therefore finds under Policy ¶ 4(c)(ii) that Respondent is not commonly known by the disputed domain name under Policy ¶ 4(c)(ii).”).

The Respondent is not affiliated with nor authorized by SCHNEIDER ELECTRIC in any way. The Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the disputed domain name. The Complainant does not carry out any activity for, nor has any business with the Respondent.

Neither license nor authorization has been granted to the Respondent to make any use of the Complainant’s trademark SCHNEIDER ELECTRIC, or apply for registration of the disputed domain name by the Complainant.

Finally, the disputed domain name is inactive. The Respondent did not use the disputed domain name, and it confirms that Respondent has no demonstrable plan to use the disputed domain name. Please see for instance Forum Case No. FA 1773444, Ashley Furniture Industries, Inc. v. Joannet Macket / JM Consultants (“The Panel finds that Respondent’s lack of content at the disputed domain shows the lack of a bona fide offering of goods or services or a legitimate noncommercial or fair use per Policy ¶¶ 4(c)(i) and (iii).”).

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).

The disputed domain name <**schneiderelectriccorporation.com**> is confusingly similar to the well-known trademark SCHNEIDER ELECTRIC. Please see for instance WIPO Case No. D2020-1403, Schneider Electric S.A. v. Whois Privacy Protection Foundation / Sales department ("The Complainant and its trademark are well-known worldwide. The Complainant has been established almost 150 years ago while the disputed domain name was only registered a couple of months ago. The Respondent must have been fully aware of the Complainant and its trademark when it registered the disputed domain name.").

On those facts, given the distinctiveness of the Complainant's trademarks and reputation, it is reasonable to infer that the Respondent has registered the domain name with full knowledge of the Complainant's trademarks. Please see for instance WIPO Case No. D2004-0673, Ferrari S.p.A v. American Entertainment Group Inc.

Furthermore, the disputed domain name is inactive. The Respondent has not demonstrated any activity in respect of the disputed domain name, and it is not possible to conceive of any plausible actual or contemplated active use of the domain name by the Respondent that would not be illegitimate, such as by being a passing off, an infringement of consumer protection legislation, or an infringement of the Complainant's rights under trademark law.

As prior UDRP panels have held, the incorporation of a famous mark into a domain name, coupled with an inactive website, may be evidence of bad faith registration and use.

- WIPO Case No. D2000-0003, Telstra Corporation Limited v. Nuclear Marshmallows;
- WIPO Case No. D2000-0400, CBS Broadcasting, Inc. v. Dennis Toeppen.

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

The disputed domain name <**schneiderelectriccorporation.com**> is confusingly similar to the well-known trademark SCHNEIDER ELECTRIC.

On those facts, given the distinctiveness of the Complainant's trademarks and reputation, it is reasonable to infer that the Respondent has registered the domain name with full knowledge of the Complainant's trademarks.

Furthermore, the disputed domain name is inactive. The Respondent has not demonstrated any activity in respect of the disputed domain name, and it is not possible to conceive of any plausible actual or contemplated active use of the domain name by the Respondent that would not be illegitimate, such as by being a passing off, an infringement of consumer protection legislation, or an infringement of the Complainant's rights under trademark law.

FOR ALL THE REASONS STATED ABOVE, THE COMPLAINT IS

Accepted

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

1. **schneiderelectriccorporation.com**: Transferred

PANELLISTS

Name	Thomas Hoeren
------	---------------

DATE OF PANEL DECISION 2026-05-15
