

Decision for dispute CAC-UDRP-108701

Case number	CAC-UDRP-108701
Time of filing	2026-06-04 09:52:14
Domain names	schnedier-electric.com

Case administrator

Name	Olga Dvořáková (Case admin)
------	------------------------------------

Complainant

Organization	SCHNEIDER ELECTRIC SE
--------------	------------------------------

Complainant representative

Organization	NAMESHIELD S.A.S.
--------------	--------------------------

Respondent

Name	Joseph Moore
------	---------------------

OTHER LEGAL PROCEEDINGS

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

IDENTIFICATION OF RIGHTS

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

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

The Complainant also owns numerous domain names incorporating its trade mark, including <schneiderelectric.com>, registered in 1996.

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

A. The Complainant's Assertions

The Complainant is a French industrial group founded in 1871 and is a global leader in energy management and industrial automation solutions. It operates internationally and reported revenues of approximately EUR 40 billion in 2025.

B. The Respondent's Position

The Respondent did not file a Response.

C. Disputed Domain Name

The disputed domain name <schnedier-electric.com> was registered on 29 April 2026. At the time of this Decision, it resolves to an inactive webpage. Nonetheless, the evidence before the Panel further demonstrates that the disputed domain name has been used in connection with a phishing scheme.

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 it owns long-standing registered rights in the trade mark SCHNEIDER ELECTRIC.

The disputed domain name reproduces the Complainant's trade mark in its entirety, save for the transposition of the letters "d" and "i" in the word "Schneider". The Complainant contends that this constitutes a classic example of typosquatting and does not prevent a finding of confusing similarity.

The Complainant further submits that the generic Top-Level Domain (the "TLD") <.com> is a standard registration requirement and is to be disregarded.

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

The Complainant submits that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the disputed domain name.

It states that the Respondent is not affiliated with the Complainant, has never been authorised to use the Complainant's trade mark SCHNEIDER ELECTRIC, and is not commonly known by the disputed domain name.

The Complainant further submits that the disputed domain name has been used in connection with a phishing scheme impersonating one of the Complainant's employees in an attempt to obtain payments from customers. Such conduct, the Complainant contends, cannot constitute either a *bona fide* offering of goods or services or 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 upon the longstanding reputation of the trade mark SCHNEIDER ELECTRIC, the deliberate misspelling of that trade mark, and the Respondent's use of the disputed domain name as part of a phishing scheme.

The Complainant contends that such conduct demonstrates both knowledge of the Complainant's rights and an intention to exploit those rights for fraudulent purposes.

A.4 Relief Sought

The Complainant requests that the disputed domain name <schnedier-electric.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 submitted by the Complainant and may draw such inferences as it considers appropriate 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 trade mark SCHNEIDER ELECTRIC.

The disputed domain name <schnedier-electric.com> reproduces the SCHNEIDER ELECTRIC trade mark in its entirety, save only for the transposition of the letters "d" and "i" within the word "Schneider". This is a textbook example of typosquatting. The Complainant's trade mark remains immediately recognisable within the disputed domain name. The TLD is disregarded for the purposes of the comparison.

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

C. Rights or Legitimate Interests

The Complainant has established a *prima facie* case.

The Respondent has not been authorised to use the Complainant's trade mark and there is no evidence that it is not commonly known by the disputed domain name.

More significantly, the evidence demonstrates that the disputed domain name has been used in connection with a phishing scheme in which the Respondent purported to impersonate one of the Complainant's employees in an attempt to obtain payments from customers. Such conduct is inherently incompatible with any *bona fide* offering of goods or services or any legitimate non-commercial or fair use of the disputed domain name.

The Panel finds that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the disputed domain name.

D. Registered and Used in Bad Faith

The Complainant's trade mark SCHNEIDER ELECTRIC has been used internationally for many years and enjoys a substantial reputation.

The disputed domain name is an obvious misspelling of the Complainant's trade mark. In these circumstances, the Panel has no difficulty concluding that the Respondent registered the disputed domain name with knowledge of the Complainant and its rights.

The decisive factor, however, is the evidence that the disputed domain name was used in connection with a phishing scheme in which the Respondent purported to impersonate one of the Complainant's employees in order to induce customers to make payments to an unauthorised account. The use of a domain name for phishing or other fraudulent activity is manifestly incompatible with good faith. Coupled with deliberate typosquatting, it leaves no conceivable basis upon which the Respondent's conduct could be regarded as legitimate.

Although the disputed domain name presently resolves to an inactive webpage, that circumstance does not detract from the evidence of prior fraudulent use.

The Panel finds that the disputed domain name was 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 <schnedier-electric.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. **schnedier-electric.com**: Transferred

PANELLISTS

Name	Yana Zhou
------	------------------

DATE OF PANEL DECISION 2026-06-29

Publish the Decision
