Decision for dispute CAC-UDRP-108603

Case number	CAC-UDRP-108603
Time of filing	2026-04-27 09:12:18
Domain names	schneiderelectricshop.shop

Case administrator

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

Complainant

Organization	SCHNEIDER ELECTRIC SE

Complainant representative

Organization	NAMESHIELD S.A.S.

Respondent

Name	Anthony Anderson

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.

The Complainant is also the owner of domain names which include the trademark SCHNEIDER ELECTRIC such as <schneiderelectric.com> registered since April 4, 1996.

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 is at the URL www.schneider-electric.com.

The Complainant is featured on the NYSE Euronext and the French CAC 40 stock market index. In 2025, the Complainant's revenues amounted to 40 billion euros.

The disputed domain name was registered on April 22, 2026 and resolves to a website reproducing the Complainant's logo, where the Respondent identifies itself as SCHNEIDER ELECTRIC.

PARTIES CONTENTIONS

Complaint

A. The domain name is confusingly similar to a trademark or service mark in which the Complainant has rights

The Complainant states that the disputed domain name <**schneiderelectricshop.shop**> is confusingly similar to its trademark SCHNEIDER ELECTRIC contained in its entirety

The addition of the term "SHOP" 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.

The addition of the suffix ".SHOP" 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.

Thus, the disputed domain name <schneiderelectricshop.shop> is confusingly similar to the Complainant's trademark SCHNEIDER ELECTRIC.

B. The Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the domain name

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 UDRP.

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 disputed domain name if the Whois information was not similar to the disputed domain name. Thus, the Respondent is not known as the owner of the disputed domain name.

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.

The disputed domain name resolves to a page displaying the Complainant's logo, where the Respondent identifies itself as SCHNEIDER ELECTRIC. This page may be used for the purpose of collecting personal information from the Complainant's customers. This use cannot be considered a bona fide offer of services or a legitimate use of the disputed domain name, since the website misleads consumers into believing that they are accessing the Complainant's website.

Thus, the Complainant contends that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the disputed domain name <schneiderelectricshop.shop>.

C. The domain name was registered and is being used in bad faith

The disputed domain name resolves to a website reproducing the Complainant's logo and identifying itself as the Complainant. Accordingly, it is reasonable to infer that the Respondent has registered the domain name with full knowledge of the Complainant's trademarks.

By using the disputed domain name, the Respondent has intentionally attempted to attract, for commercial purposes, internet users to its website, by creating a likelihood of confusion with the Complainant's trademark as to the source, sponsorship, affiliation or endorsement of its website.

On these bases, the Complainant concludes that the Respondent has registered and is using the disputed domain name in bad faith.

Response

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

The disputed domain name is confusingly similar to the Complainant's prior trade mark adding merely the dictionary word "shop" and the gTLD ".shop" which do not prevent the said confusing similarity.

The Respondent is not commonly known by the disputed domain name and is not authorised by the Complainant.

The disputed domain name has been used for a site using the Complainant's mark in its logo form as a masthead and confusing wording to impersonate the Complainant's mark which is not a bona fide offering of goods or services or a legitimate non commercial fair use. It is registration and use in bad faith confusing Internet users for commercial gain and disrupting the Complainant's business.

FOR ALL THE REASONS STATED ABOVE, THE COMPLAINT IS

Accepted

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

1. **schneiderelectricshop.shop**: Transferred

PANELLISTS

Name	**Dawn Osborne**

DATE OF PANEL DECISION 2026-05-25

Publish the Decision