Decision for dispute CAC-UDRP-108635

Case number	CAC-UDRP-108635
Time of filing	2026-05-07 10:23:40
Domain names	schreider-electrlc.com, schrelder-electrlc.com

Case administrator

Name	Olga Slanařová (Case admin)

Complainant

Organization	SCHNEIDER ELECTRIC SE

Complainant representative

Organization	NAMESHIELD S.A.S.

Respondents

Organization	robin
Organization	gang

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 names.

IDENTIFICATION OF RIGHTS

The Complainant is the owner of several trademarks "SCHNEIDER ELECTRIC":

- 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 September 09, 2005.

The Complainant is also the owner of many domain names which include the trademark SCHNEIDER ELECTRIC such as <schneiderelectric.com> registered since April 4, 1996 and <schneider-electric-dms.com> registered since September 25th, 2012.

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

FACTS ASSERTED BY THE COMPLAINANT AND NOT CONTESTED BY THE RESPONDENT:

THE COMPLAINANT

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 Complainant is featured on the NYSE Euronext and the French CAC 40 stock market index. In 2024, the Complainant revenues amounted to 38 billion euros.

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 many domain names which include the trademark SCHNEIDER ELECTRIC such as <schneiderelectric.com> registered since April 4, 1996 and <schneider-electric-dms.com> registered since September 25th, 2012.

The disputed domain names <schreider-electrlc.com> and <schrelder-electrlc.com> (hereinafter, the „Disputed Domain Names“) were registered as follows:

- The Disputed Domain Name <schreider-electrlc.com> was created on April 25, 2026, and;
- The Disputed Domain Name <schrelder-electrlc.com> was created on April 28, 2026.

In accordance with the Complainant, the websites connected to the Disputed Domain Names are inactive and the domain name <schreider-electrlc.com> has been used in a phishing attempt. Finally, MX servers are configured for both domains.

According to Complainant’s non-contested allegations, the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interest in respect of the Disputed Domain Names and the Complainant is not related in any way to the Complainant’s business.

For the purpose of this case, the Registrar confirmed that the language of the registration agreement is English. The facts asserted by the Complainant are not contested by the Respondent.

PARTIES CONTENTIONS

COMPLAINANT:

First element: Similarity

The Complainant states that the Disputed Domain Names are confusingly similar to its trademark SCHNEIDER ELECTRIC.

The substitution of the letter “N” by the letter “R” and the substitution of the letters “I” by the letters “L” is characteristic of a typosquatting practice intended to create confusing similarity between the Complainant’s trademark and the Disputed Domain Names. Previous panels have found that the slight spelling variations does not prevent a domain name from being confusing similar to the Complainant’s trademark.

Moreover, the Complainant contends that the addition of the suffix “.COM”” does not change the overall impression of the designations as being connected to the trademark SCHNEIDER ELECTRIC. It does not prevent the likelihood of confusion between the Disputed Domain Names, the Complainant and its trademark.

Thus, the Disputed Domain Names are confusingly similar to the Complainant's trademark SCHNEIDER ELECTRIC.

Second element: Rights or legitimate interest

The Complainant asserts that the Respondent is not identified in the Whois database as the Disputed Domain Names. 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 disputed domain name.

The Complainant contends that the Respondent is not affiliated with nor authorized by SCHNEIDER ELECTRIC in any way. The Complainant contends that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the Disputed Domain Names. 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 Names by the Complainant.

Moreover, the Complainant also claims that the Disputed Domain Names are a typosquatted version of the trademark SCHNEIDER ELECTRIC. Typosquatting is the practice of registering a domain name in an attempt to take advantage of Internet users’ typographical errors and can evidence that a respondent lacks rights and legitimate interests in the domain name.

Furthermore, the Disputed Domain Name <schrelder-electrlc.com> is inactive. The Complainant contends that the Respondent did not use the Disputed Domain Name, and it confirms that the Respondent has no demonstrable plan to use the Disputed Domain Name.

Finally, the Disputed Domain Name <schreider-electrlc.com> has been used in a phishing scheme. The Complainant asserts that the Respondent uses the Disputed Domain Name to pass itself off as one of the Complainant's employees. Using the Disputed Domain Name in this manner is neither a bona fide offering of goods or services under Policy ¶ 4 (c)(i), nor a non-commercial or fair use pursuant to Policy ¶ 4(c)(iii).

Thus, the Complainant contends that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the Disputed Domain Names.

Third element: Bad faith

The Disputed Domain Names are confusingly similar to the trademark SCHNEIDER ELECTRIC. Furthermore, the Dispute Domain Name <schreider-electrlc.com> has been used in a phishing attempt. On those facts, given the distinctiveness of the Complainant's trademarks and reputation, it is reasonable to infer that the Respondent has registered the Disputed Domain Names with full knowledge of the Complainant's trademarks.

Moreover, the Complainant states the misspelling of the trademark SCHNEIDER ELECTRIC was intentionally designed to be confusingly similar to the Complainant's trademark. Previous UDRP Panels have seen such actions as evidence of bad faith.

Besides, the Disputed Domain Name <schrelder-electrlc.com> is currently inactive. The Complainant contends that 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 WIPO 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.

Furthermore, the Disputed Domain Name <schreider-electrlc.com> has been used in a phishing scheme. As such, the Respondent attempted to pass off as one of the Complainant's employees in order to receive undue payment. Therefore, the Complainant states that the Respondent used the Disputed Domain Name in bad faith, as it is well-established that using a domain name for purposes of phishing or other fraudulent activity constitutes solid evidence of bad faith use.

Finally, the Disputed Domain Names have been set up with MX records, which suggests that they may be actively used for email purposes. On these bases, the Complainant concludes that the Respondent has registered and is using the Disputed Domain Names in bad faith.

RESPONDENT

Respondent did not reply to the Complaint.

RIGHTS

The Complainant has, to the satisfaction of the Panel, shown the Disputed Domain Names are 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 Names (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 Names have 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 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. Preliminary Issue: Complaint consolidated against multiple respondents.

Paragraph 10(e) of the UDRP Rules grants a Panel the power to consolidate multiple domain name disputes. At the same time, paragraph 3(c) of the UDRP Rules provides that a complaint may relate to more than one domain name, provided that the domain names are registered by the same domain-name holder.

Where a complaint is filed against multiple respondents, panels look at whether (i) the domain names or corresponding websites are subject to common control, and (ii) the consolidation would be fair and equitable to all parties. Procedural efficiency would also underpin panel consideration of such a consolidation scenario.

In this regard, Panels have considered a range of factors, typically present in some combination, as useful to determining whether such consolidation is appropriate, such as similarities in or relevant aspects of (i) the registrants' identity(ies) including pseudonyms, (ii) the registrants' contact information including email address(es), postal address(es), or phone number(s), including any pattern of irregularities, (iii) relevant IP addresses, name servers, or webhost(s), (iv) the content or layout of websites corresponding to the disputed domain names, (v) the nature of the marks at issue (e.g., where a registrant targets a specific sector), (vi) any naming patterns in the disputed domain names (e.g., <mark-country> or <mark-goods>), (vii) the relevant language/scripts of the disputed domain names particularly where they are the same as the mark(s) at issue, (viii) any changes by the respondent relating to any of the above items following communications regarding the disputed domain name(s), (ix) any evidence of respondent affiliation with respect to the ability to control the disputed domain name(s), (x) any (prior) pattern of similar respondent behavior, or (xi) other arguments made by the complainant and/or disclosures by the respondent(s).

See paragraph 4.11.2 of WIPO Jurisprudential Overview 3.1.

The Complainant requested this Panel to analyze the possibility that the Disputed Domain Names and the named Respondent should be consolidated in a single UDRP proceeding. As described above, the Complainant argues that the Respondents are the same entity and give as an argument that the Disputed Domain Names share the same structure (namely a typosquatting replacing the same letters) as well as that the Respondents use the same name namely "Robinson" and the same phone number.

In addition to the facts described by the Complainant, the Panel has also identified that both Disputed Domain Names have been registered with the same Registrar and both domains use the same DNS servers.

The Panel further agrees with the Complainant that the Disputed Domain Names are not only similar, but also share the same domain-name composition. In particular, both Disputed Domain Names begin with the Complainant's trademark; i.e. both domains replace similar letters in the first part (instead of the brand "Schneider" they use the letters "Schreider" & "Schrelder" while in the second part both domains use a hyphen and use the same typo-term; i.e. "electrlc".

The Center has not received any response from either Respondent regarding the Complainant's consolidation request. On the basis of the evidence and facts submitted by the Complainant and reviewed by the Panel, the Panel finds that consolidation would be fair and equitable. Accordingly, the Panel accepts the Complainant's request to include both Disputed Domain Names in a single complaint.

2. Substantive Issues

According to Paragraph 4(a) of the Policy, the Complainant is required to prove each of the following three elements to obtain an order that a disputed domain name should be transferred or cancelled:

(i) the disputed domain name is identical or confusingly similar to a trademark or service mark in which the Complainant has rights; and

(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 are being used in bad faith.

The Panel has reviewed in detail the evidence available to it and has come to the following conclusions concerning the satisfaction of the three elements of paragraph 4(a) of the Policy in the proceeding:

(A) THE COMPLAINANT'S RIGHTS AND CONFUSING SIMILARITY OF THE DISPUTED DOMAIN NAMES TO THE COMPLAINANT'S RIGHTS.

Paragraph 4(a)(i) of the Policy establishes the obligation of Complainant to demonstrate that the Disputed Domain Name is identical or confusingly similar to a trademark or service mark in which the Complainant has rights.

The Complainant submitted copies of different trademarks registrations pertaining the term "SCHNEIDER ELECTRIC" for different services, including common metals, construction of buildings, hotel services, among many others.

The Complainant's trademarks were registered in March 1999 and the Disputed Domain Names were registered as follows:

- The Disputed Domain Name <schreider-electrlc.com> was created on April 25, 2026, and;
- The Disputed Domain Name <schrelder-electrlc.com> was created on April 28, 2026.

From the Panel's perspective, the Disputed Domain Names are composed of almost all letters of the first part of the trademark "SCHNEIDER" with the following replacements: In the Disputed Domain Name <schreider-electrlc.com>, the consonant "N" has been changed for the consonant "R" while in the second Disputed Domain Name <schrelder-electrlc.com>, the consonant „N" has also been changed to the consonant „R" plus the vowel „I" has been changed for the consonant „L". In both cases, the Disputed Domain Names include a hyphen plus the typo version electrlc related to the second element of trademark; i.e. „ELECTRIC".

From the Panel's perspective, this is an intentional misspelling of Complainant's trademark and a typo squatting case where internet users searching for the Disputed Domain Names <schneiderelectric.com> or <schneider-electric-dms.com> might wrongly type in the computer keyboard the wrong letter and by doing so, they would end up at Respondent's Disputed Domain Names. (See, e.g., Sanofi. v. Domains By Proxy, LLC /domain admin, WIPO Case No. D2013-0368: "The Domain Name consists of the SANOFI Mark with the letter "o" replaced by the letter "i". The replacement of "o" with "i" does not operate to prevent a finding of confusing similarity between the SANOFI Mark and the Domain Name especially in circumstance where the letters "o" and "i" are right next to each other on a typical "qwerty" keyboard, meaning that a single slip of the fingers would result in an Internet user who intended to visit the Complainant's website at www.sanofi.com visiting the Respondent's Website instead").

Furthermore, previous panels have found that special attention should be paid to domain names where the difference in spelling is so insignificant that it is hardly noticeable and does not change the distinctive character of the mark in question. See, e.g., BOURSORAMA SA v. francois goubert , CAC Case No. 104595: "This also applies to domain names where the difference in spelling is so insignificant that it is hardly noticeable and does not change the distinctive character of the mark in question. Most readers would be hard put to quickly spot the difference between "BOURSORAMA" and "BOUSORAMA". This takes some analysis, especially at the mind reads what it expects to see from previous experience. In this case, that expectation would be to read the well-known word "BOURSORAMA".

UDRP panels agree that the TLD may usually be ignored for the purpose of determining identity or confusing similarity between a domain name and the Complainant's trademark as it is a technical requirement of registration. See paragraph 1.11.1 of WIPO Jurisprudential Overview 3.0.

.

Therefore, the Panel concludes that the Complainant has satisfied the requirement under paragraph 4(a)(i) of the Policy and the Disputed Domain Names are confusingly similar to Complainant's "SCHNEIDER ELECTRIC" trademarks.

(B) RESPONDENT'S LACK OF RIGHTS OR LEGITIMATE INTERESTS IN THE DISPUTED DOMAIN NAMES.

The second element of the Policy requires that the Complainant establish that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in the Disputed Domain Names. The generally adopted approach, when considering the second element, is that if a complainant makes out a prima facie case, the burden of proof shifts to the respondent to rebut it with relevant evidence demonstrating rights or legitimate interests in the Disputed Domain Name; see, for example, CAC Case No. 102333, Amedei S.r.l. v sun xin. If the Respondent fails to do so, the Complainant is deemed to have satisfied paragraph 4(a)(ii) of the Policy (see e.g. WIPO case no. D2003-0455, Croatia Airlines d.d. v. Modern Empire Internet Ltd.).

In this vein, Paragraph 4 (c) provides circumstances which could prove rights or legitimate interest in the Disputed Domain Name on behalf of the Respondent such as:

(i) before any notice to Respondent of the dispute, Respondent is using or provides with demonstrable preparations to use, the Disputed Domain Name or a name corresponding to the domain name in connection with a bona fide offering of goods or services; or

(ii) The Respondent (as an individual, business, or other organization) has been commonly known by the domain name, even if the Respondent has acquired no trademark or service mark rights; or

(iii) The Respondent is making a legitimate noncommercial or fair use of the Disputed Domain Name, without intent for commercial gain to misleadingly divert consumers or to tarnish the trademark or service mark at issue.

The Respondent did not reply to the Complaint despite the efforts made by this Center to notify the Complaint. In this regard, the Complainant has confirmed in the Complaint that the Disputed Domain Names are not connected with or authorized by the Complainant in any way.

From the information provided by the Complainant, there is no evidence or reason to believe that the Respondent (as an individual, business or other organization) has been commonly known by the Disputed Domain Names.

The Respondent names "Robin Son", & "Robinson gang" provided in the Registrar verification dated 07 May 2026 are all what it links the Disputed Domain Names with the Respondent. Absent of any other evidence such as a personal name, nickname or corporate identifier, the Panel is of the opinion that the Respondent is not commonly known by the Disputed Domain Names.

The Complainant also mentioned that the Disputed Domain Names are a typo squatted version of the trademark "SCHNEIDER

ELECTRIC". In this regard, UDRP panels have confirmed in different decisions that when typo squatting is occurring, then this can be considered as additional evidence that the Respondent has no right or legitimate interest under the Policy. (See, e.g., Pentair Flow Services AG v. Scott Fisher, CAC Case No. 103931. "Since typosquatting is a practice of registering a domain name in an attempt to take advantage of internet users' typographical errors, this circumstance is also evidence that the Respondent lacks rights and legitimate interest in the disputed domain name").

The Complainant has also provided evidence showing that the Disputed Domain Names resolve to inactive pages. Different Panels have confirmed that the lack of content at the Disputed Domain Name can be considered as a finding that Respondent does not have bona fide offering of goods and services (see, for example, Forum Case No. FA 1773444, Ashley Furniture Industries, Inc v. Joannet Macket/JM Consultants).

The Complainant also mentioned that the Disputed Domain Name <schreider-electrlc.com> was used for phishing activities and provided relevant evidence. Furthermore, the Complainant also provided evidence about the activation of MX records which provides an indication of illegal usage of the Disputed Domain Names. In the absence of a reply from the Respondent, the Panel is ready to accept the inferences of the Complainant in the sense that the Disputed Domain Names have been used for illegal activities. In this vein, past panels have categorically held that the use of a domain name for illegal activity (e.g., the sale of counterfeit goods or illegal pharmaceuticals, phishing, distributing malware, unauthorized account access/hacking, impersonation/passing off, or other types of fraud) can never confer rights or legitimate interests on a Respondent.

Therefore, the Panel concludes that neither the Respondent nor the evidence establishes that the Respondent has any right or legitimate interest in the Disputed Domain Names. The Complainant has therefore also satisfied the requirement under paragraph 4(a)(ii) of the Policy.

In light of the reasons above mentioned, the Panel concludes that the Complainant has satisfied the second element of the Policy.

(C) BAD FAITH REGISTRATION AND USE OF THE DISPUTED DOMAIN NAMES.

Paragraph 4(a)(iii) of the Policy indicates that Complainant must assert that the Respondent registered and is using the Disputed Domain Name in bad faith. In this sense, Paragraph 4(b) of the Policy sets out four circumstances which if found by the Panel to be present, shall be evidence of the registration and use of a domain name in bad faith:

(i) circumstances indicating that the Respondent has registered or acquired the Disputed Domain Name primarily for the purpose of selling, renting, or otherwise transferring the Disputed Domain Name registration to the complainant who is the owner of the trademark or service mark or to a competitor of that complainant, for valuable consideration in excess of the Respondent's documented out-of-pocket costs directly related to the domain name; or

(ii) The Respondent has registered the domain name in order to prevent the owner of the trademark or service mark from reflecting the mark in a corresponding domain name, provided that that Respondent has engaged in a pattern of such conduct; or

(iii) The Respondent has registered the Disputed Domain Name primarily for the purpose of disrupting the business of a competitor; or

(iv) by using the domain name, the Respondent has intentionally attempted to attract, for commercial gain, Internet users to the Respondent's website or other on-line location, by creating a likelihood of confusion with the Complainant's mark as to the source, sponsorship, affiliation, or endorsement of the Respondent's website or location or of a product.

The evidence submitted by Complainant confirms that its trademarks SCHNEIDER ELECTRIC are distinctive and they have a strong reputation in the power management industry. In the absence of the Respondent's reply, the Panel finds that the Respondent, prior to the registration of the Disputed Domain Names was aware of Complainant's trademark, in particular since the Disputed Domain Names were registered in April 2026 and Complainant's trademarks were registered long before the registration of the Disputed Domain Names.

In this vein, Past Panels have consistently found that the mere registration of a domain name that is identical or confusingly similar (particularly domain names comprising typos or incorporating the mark plus a descriptive term) to a famous or widely-known trademark by an unaffiliated entity can by itself create a presumption of bad faith.

See WIPO Jurisprudential Overview, version 3.1., paragraph 3.1.4

As indicated by Complainant, the Disputed Domain Name <schreider-electrlc.com> has been used in a phishing scheme. The Respondent's bad faith in registering and using the Disputed Domain Name is evident through its malicious activities, which have directly harmed the Complainant and its customers. Specifically, the Respondent has used an email address linked to the Disputed Domain Name to perpetrate a phishing scheme targeting the Complainant's client. The fraudulent email impersonated the Complainant's legitimate business operations. The provided evidence demonstrates that the Respondent intentionally misrepresented itself as the Complainant, exploiting the goodwill and reputation of the SCHNEIDER ELECTRIC trademark to deceive and defraud. In accordance with the Complainant, the Respondent has intentionally disrupted the Complainant's business and attempted to confuse consumers for its financial gain. This clear intent to exploit the Complainant's trademark for fraudulent purposes not only undermines the legitimate interests of the Complainant but also jeopardizes the trust and security of its clients. The above emphasizes the fact that the Respondent had knowledge of the Complainant's trademarks, company names and domains, when choosing the Disputed Domain Name. Furthermore, past panelists have found that the use of a domain name for per se illegitimate activity such as the sale of counterfeit goods or phishing can never confer rights or legitimate interests on a respondent, such behavior is manifestly considered evidence of bad faith.

See WIPO Jurisprudential Overview, version 3.1., paragraph 3.1.4

As indicated by Complainant, the websites associated with the Disputed Domain Name resolve to an inactive website. Past panelist have found that the non-use of a domain name would not prevent a finding of bad faith under the doctrine of passive holding and for this purpose, the following factors should be taken into account: (i) the degree of distinctiveness or reputation of the complainant's mark, (ii) the failure of the respondent to submit a response or to provide any evidence of actual or contemplated good-faith use, (iii) the respondent's concealing its identity or use of false contact details (noted to be in breach of its registration agreement), and (iv) the implausibility of any good faith use to which the domain name may be put.

See WIPO Jurisprudential Overview, version 3.1., paragraph 3.3.

As explained before, the Complainant's mark is indeed distinctive and it has a strong reputation in the power management industry and by no replying to this Complaint, the Respondent did not show any evidence regarding the good faith to use the Disputed Domain Names. Thus, the finding of bad faith under the doctrine of passive holding can be applicable to the current case.

Furthermore, the Complainant provided evidence showing that .MX records are configured. Past Panels have found that the activation of mail exchanger record (MX record) suggests that the Respondent is using or is preparing to use the disputed domain name to send and receive email communications with the purpose of misleading the recipients as to their source. This is an additional circumstance of the Respondent's bad faith. (See, e.g., Decathlon v. Privacy service provided by Withheld for Privacy, WIPO Case No. D2021-4369.

In light of the above-mentioned findings, the Panel finds that the evidence submitted by the Complainant supports the argument that by using the Disputed Domain Names, the Respondent has intentionally attempted to attract, for commercial gain, Internet users to the Respondent's website or other on-line location, by creating a likelihood of confusion with the Complainant's mark as to the source, sponsorship, affiliation, or endorsement of the Respondent's website or location or of a product.

Therefore, the Panel concludes that Respondent registered and is using the Disputed Domain Names in bad faith and thus has satisfied the requirement under paragraph 4(a)(iii) of the Policy.

FOR ALL THE REASONS STATED ABOVE, THE COMPLAINT IS

Accepted

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

1. **schreider-electrlc.com**: Transferred
2. **schrelder-electrlc.com**: Transferred

PANELLISTS

Name	**Victor Garcia Padilla**

DATE OF PANEL DECISION 2026-06-12

Publish the Decision