Decision for dispute CAC-UDRP-108656

Case number	CAC-UDRP-108656
Time of filing	2026-05-19 10:06:18
Domain names	eoneuro.com

Case administrator

Name	Olga Slanařová (Case admin)

Complainant

Organization	E.ON SE

Complainant representative

Organization	Lubberger Lehment Rechtsanwälte Partnerschaft mbB

Respondent

Organization	OR

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 is the owner, amongst others, of the following trademark registrations:

- European Union trademark registration No. 2362416 for "e.on" (word mark), filed on September 03, 2001, registered on December 19, 2002 and duly renewed in classes 35, 39 and 40;
- European Union trademark registration No. 2361558 for "E.ON" (word mark), filed on September 03, 2001, registered on December 19, 2002 and duly renewed in classes 35, 39 and 40;
- European Union trademark registration No. 6296529 for "e.on" (word mark), filed on September 20, 2007, registered on June 27, 2008 and duly renewed in classes 7, 36, 37 and 40;
- International trademark registration No. 876364 for "e.on" (device mark), registered on September 9, 2025 in classes 4, 35, 39 and 40.

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

The Complainant, E.ON SE, is a member of Euro Stoxx 50 stock market index, DAX stock index and of the Dow Jones Global Titans 50 index. E.ON SE belongs to the E.ON Group, which is one of Europe's largest operators of energy networks and energy infrastructure and a provider of innovative customer solutions for approx. 48 million customers.

The Complainant contends that it is the owner of the registered trademark E.ON and that said trademark, by virtue of long and intensive use, is well-known to significant parts of the public in the EU and beyond. According to the Complainant, its trademark is associated exclusively with the same Complainant and its activities.

In the Complainant's view, the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to its registered trademark.

The Complainant has become aware that a third party, not associated with E.ON SE, is publishing offers for an alleged internship with an entity calling itself “E.ON Digital Energy Technology Company” for a Field Officer position in Amsterdam. The communication is being sent from the email address <eon_energy@eoneuro.com>, which corresponds to the domain in dispute <eoneuro.com>.

The offer is published at the portal erasmuscareers.org, operated by ESN Erasmus Student Network, an international non-profit association supported by the Erasmus+ programme of the European Union and the European Youth Foundation of the Council of Europe.

The Complainant informs that (i) a company named “E.ON Digital Energy Technology Company” associated with E.ON SE or E.ON Group does not exist and (ii) the domain <eoneuro.com> does not belong to E.ON Group.

The Complainant trademark registrations largely predate the registration of the disputed domain name <eoneuro.com> which was registered on May 18, 2024, and resolves to a website that lacks any substantive content.

The Complainant has requested ESN to remove the infringing and false internship offer from the website www.erasmuscareers.org.

The Complainant states that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate use in the domain name <eoneuro.com> since it is not making a legitimate non-commercial or fair use of the domain name. In particular, according to the Complainant, the disputed domain name has only been registered to approach third parties under an e-mail address that creates the impression to be an official E.ON account. For the same reasons, the Complainant concludes that the disputed domain name was registered and used in bad faith.

PARTIES CONTENTIONS

The Complainant´s contentions are summarized above.

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

Paragraph 4(a) of the Policy provides that to obtain the transfer of the disputed domain name, the Complainant must prove that each of the following elements is present:

(i) the disputed domain name is identical or confusingly similar to a trademark 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.

1) The disputed domain name fully includes the Complainant's trademark as it reproduces the mark in its entirety and is clearly recognizable within the domain name. The omission of the dot between “E” and “ON” does not diminish the recognizability of the mark. On the contrary, the element “EON” remains visually and phonetically identical to the Complainant’s mark and will be perceived by Internet users as a direct reference to the Complainant (E.ON SE v. Denis Bolovan, CAC Case No. 107991). Also, it is added to the wording "EON" the word "EURO". In this respect the Panel notes that many previous panels under the Policy have found that a geographic identifier in a domain name (as in the disputed domain name <eoneuro.com>) does not alter the finding of similarity between the domain name in dispute and the previously registered trademark (Six Continents Hotels, Inc. v. Sdf fdgg, WIPO Case No. D2004-0384 and Credit Agricole SA v. Frederik Hermansen, CAC Case No. 101249). Finally, the generic Top-Level Domain “.com” is obviously a mere standard registration requirement and should be disregarded when assessing whether a disputed domain name is confusingly similar to a trademark in which the Complainant has rights (see, among others, Credit Mutuel Arkea vs. Domain Administration - CAC Case No. 102345). Accordingly, the Complainant has, to the satisfaction of the Panel, shown that the domain name is identical or confusingly similar to a trademark in which the Complainant has rights. The Complainant therefore succeeds on the first element of the Policy.

2) The Complainant provided prima facie evidence that the Respondent does not have rights or legitimate interests in respect of the disputed domain name, as it was never authorized to use it by the Complainant. In addition, nothing in the evidence suggests that the Respondent is commonly known under the disputed domain name. Actually, the Respondent, in the absence of any substantial response, has not shown any facts or elements to justify prior rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name. The Complainant therefore succeeds also on the second element of the Policy.

3) Paragraph 4(b) of the Policy provides a non-exclusive list of circumstances that evidence registration and use of a domain name in bad faith. Any one of the following is sufficient to support a finding of 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 the complainant, for valuable consideration in excess of the Respondent's documented out-of-pocket costs directly related to the disputed domain name; or

(ii) the respondent has registered the disputed 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 the 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 disputed domain name, the respondent has intentionally attempted to attract, for commercial gain, Internet users to its website or other online 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 or service on the respondent's website or location.

The Respondent registered the disputed domain name on May 18, 2024, and therefore many years after the first registrations of the Complainant trademark "E.ON". In consideration of the reputation achieved by the above-mentioned trademark, it is clear that the Respondent was surely aware of the Complainant's trademark when it registered the domain name in dispute. Moreover, the Respondent appears to have attempted to benefit commercially from the appropriation of the "E.ON" mark in the disputed domain name.

In particular, as alleged and proven by the Complainant, the disputed domain name has been used to post an attractive job advertisement requesting that CVs be sent to the email address eon-energy@eoneuro.com, which is clearly linked to the domain name <eoneuro.com>. The aforementioned job offer appears to have been published on the ESN portal and is therefore on a website heavily frequented by university students and former university students who, on the one hand, might be interested in working for a prestigious company and, on the other, trust in the reliability of the Erasmus Student Network. However, contrary to appearances, the vacancy comes from a company which, despite its name (E.ON Digital Energy Technology Company), is in no way connected to the Complainant or to E.ON Group, and which probably does not even

exist. Therefore, according to the Panel, the sole reason for this vacancy being posted is to extract personal data from unsuspecting applicants. This is undoubtedly a fraudulent activity constituting an attempt at phishing. This finding leads to the obvious conclusion that the disputed domain name has been registered in bad faith.

Therefore, the evidence in this case clearly shows that the defendant's conduct constitutes preparatory activity for phishing by using an address that impersonates the Complainant. Previous panels have held that the use of a domain name for illegal activity, here claimed fraudulent impersonation of Complainant in phishing e-mail, constitutes use in bad faith (see, between many others, WIPO Case No. D2024-2724, Cresset Administrative Services Corporation v. Sabrina Daniels). The Respondent has not participated in this case to explain its actions and so, based upon a preponderance of the available evidence, the Panel finds it highly likely that the Respondent registered and uses the disputed domain name in bad faith by disrupting the Complainant's business and by seeking commercial gain through confusion with the Complainant's trademark, per Paragraphs 4(b)(iii) and (iv), (see, between many others CAC Case No. 105344, LendingClub Bank, National Association v. Lennys Alvarez).

In consideration of the above, the Panel concludes that the Respondent registered and is using the disputed domain name in bad faith. The Complainant therefore succeeds also on the third element of the Policy.

FOR ALL THE REASONS STATED ABOVE, THE COMPLAINT IS

Accepted

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

1. **eoneuro.com**: Transferred

PANELLISTS

Name	**Guido Maffei**

DATE OF PANEL DECISION 2026-06-26

Publish the Decision