Decision for dispute CAC-UDRP-108634

Case number	CAC-UDRP-108634
Time of filing	2026-05-06 07:28:09
Domain names	schneiderelectr.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	he jxing

OTHER LEGAL PROCEEDINGS

The Panel is unaware of any other pending or decided legal proceedings in respect of the domain name <schneiderelectr.com> (the "disputed domain name").

IDENTIFICATION OF RIGHTS

The Complainant, Schneider Electric SE, owns several registered trade marks incorporating the designation SCHNEIDER ELECTRIC, including:

- International trade mark registration no. 715395, registered on 15 March 1999; and
- EU trade mark registration no. 1103803, registered on 12 March 1999.

The Complainant is also the registrant of the domain name <schneiderelectric.com>, registered in 1996.

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

A. Complainant's Assertions

The Complainant is a French industrial group founded in 1871 and active internationally in the fields of power management, automation and related industrial solutions.

The Complainant operates globally and reported revenues of approximately EUR 40 billion in 2025.

B. Respondent's Position

The Respondent did not file a Response.

C. Disputed Domain Name

The disputed domain name <schneiderelectr.com> was registered on 28 April 2026.

At the time of the Panel's review, the disputed domain name resolved to a website prominently displaying the designation "Schneider Electric" (the “Respondent’s website”). The Respondent's website contained technical content relating to battery storage, solar inverters, EV charging infrastructure and other renewable energy technologies, as well as an engineering enquiry form.

PARTIES CONTENTIONS

A. Complainant

A.1 The disputed domain name is identical or confusingly similar to a trade mark in which the Complainant has rights

The Complainant submits that the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to the SCHNEIDER ELECTRIC trade mark.

The disputed domain name reproduces the SCHNEIDER ELECTRIC trade mark almost in its entirety, omitting only the letters "i" and "c" from the word "electric". The Complainant contends that this constitutes a typical case of typosquatting.

The Complainant further submits that the inclusion of the Top-Level Domain (the "TLD") <.com> does not affect the comparison.

A.2 The Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the disputed domain name

The Complainant submits that the Respondent is not affiliated with the Complainant, has not been authorised to use the Complainant's trade mark, and is not commonly known by the disputed domain name.

The Complainant further contends that the disputed domain name resolves to a website offering competing products while displaying the designation "Schneider Electric".

The Complainant therefore submits that the Respondent is not making a bona fide offering of goods or services, nor any legitimate non-commercial or fair use.

A.3 The disputed domain name was registered and is being used in bad faith

The Complainant submits that the disputed domain name was registered and is being used in bad faith.

The Complainant relies on the long-standing use and reputation of the SCHNEIDER ELECTRIC trade mark and contends that the Respondent must have been aware of its rights at the time of registration.

The Complainant further submits that the disputed domain name is an intentional misspelling of its trade mark and that the Respondent uses the disputed domain name in connection with a website displaying the designation "Schneider Electric" and promoting competing products and services.

According to the Complainant, such conduct demonstrates an intention to attract Internet users by creating a likelihood of confusion as to source, affiliation or endorsement.

A.4 Relief Sought

The Complainant requests that the disputed domain name <schneiderelectr.com> be transferred to it in accordance with paragraph 4(i) of the UDRP Policy.

B. Respondent

No Response was filed. The Panel proceeds on the basis of the uncontested evidence and may draw appropriate inferences pursuant to Rule 14(b) of the UDRP Rules.

RIGHTS

The Complainant has, to the satisfaction of the Panel, shown that the disputed domain name is identical or confusingly similar to a trade mark in which the Complainant has rights (within the meaning of paragraph 4(a)(i) of the UDRP Policy).

NO RIGHTS OR LEGITIMATE INTERESTS

The Complainant has, to the satisfaction of the Panel, shown that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the disputed domain name (within the meaning of paragraph 4(a)(ii) of the UDRP Policy).

BAD FAITH

The Complainant has, to the satisfaction of the Panel, shown that the disputed domain name has been registered and is being used in bad faith (within the meaning of paragraph 4(a)(iii) of the UDRP Policy).

PROCEDURAL FACTORS

The Panel is satisfied that all procedural requirements under the UDRP Policy, the UDRP Rules, and the CAC Supplemental Rules have been met. The dispute is properly before the Panel.

PRINCIPAL REASONS FOR THE DECISION

A. Applicable Legal Framework

Pursuant to Rule 15 of the UDRP Rules, the Panel decides on the basis of the statements and evidence submitted, in accordance with the UDRP Policy, the UDRP Rules, and any applicable principles of law.

Under paragraph 4(a) of the UDRP Policy, the Complainant must establish, on the balance of probabilities, that:

i. the disputed domain name is identical or confusingly similar to a trade mark or service mark in which the Complainant has rights;

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.

B. Identical or Confusingly Similar

The Panel is satisfied that the Complainant has established rights in the SCHNEIDER ELECTRIC trade mark.

The disputed domain name <schneiderelectr.com> reproduces the SCHNEIDER ELECTRIC trade mark almost in its entirety. The omission of the letters "i" and "c" from the word "electric" constitutes a minor misspelling characteristic of typosquatting and does not prevent the mark from remaining clearly recognisable. The TLD is disregarded for the purpose of this assessment.

The Panel therefore finds the disputed domain name confusingly similar to the Complainant's SCHNEIDER ELECTRIC trade mark.

C. Rights or Legitimate Interests

The Complainant has made out a prima facie case.

The Respondent is not authorised to use the Complainant's SCHNEIDER ELECTRIC trade mark and is not commonly known by the disputed domain name.

The disputed domain name resolves to a website prominently displaying the designation "Schneider Electric". The website contains information relating to renewable energy technologies and includes an engineering enquiry form. In the Panel's view, such use creates the misleading impression of an association with the Complainant. The website does not disclose any relationship with the Complainant and contains no disclaimer clarifying that no such relationship exists. The Panel considers that the Respondent is seeking to take advantage of the goodwill attaching to the Complainant's trade mark. Such use is neither a bona fide offering of goods or services nor a legitimate non-commercial or fair use.

In the absence of any Response, the Panel finds that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name.

D. Registered and Used in Bad Faith

The Complainant's trade mark has been registered for many years and substantially predates the registration of the disputed domain name.

The disputed domain name is an obvious misspelling of the Complainant's trade mark. The Panel is satisfied that the Respondent

registered the disputed domain name with knowledge of the Complainant and its SCHNEIDER ELECTRIC trade mark.

The disputed domain name resolves to a website prominently displaying the designation "Schneider Electric" and presenting itself as a source of information and engineering review services relating to renewable energy equipment. The Respondent's website also contains the statement "Renewable energy information for professional buyers" and includes a footer reading "© 2026 Schneider Electric".

The use of the Complainant's trade mark throughout the Respondent's website, including in the footer, goes well beyond mere reference to the Complainant and reinforces the impression that the website is operated by, affiliated with, or authorised by the Complainant.

In these circumstances, the Panel is satisfied that the Respondent intentionally sought to create a likelihood of confusion as to source, affiliation or endorsement. The Panel finds that the Respondent has sought to obtain an unfair commercial advantage by attracting Internet users on that basis. Such conduct falls within paragraph 4(b)(iv) of the UDRP Policy.

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

E. Decision

For the foregoing reasons, in accordance with paragraph 4(i) of the UDRP Policy and Rule 15 of the UDRP Rules, the Panel orders that the disputed domain name <schneiderelectr.com> be transferred to the Complainant, Schneider Electric SE.

FOR ALL THE REASONS STATED ABOVE, THE COMPLAINT IS

Accepted

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

1. **schneiderelectr.com**: Transferred

PANELLISTS

Name	**Gustavo Moser**

DATE OF PANEL DECISION 2026-06-01

Publish the Decision