Decision for dispute CAC-UDRP-108694

Case number	CAC-UDRP-108694
Time of filing	2026-06-12 10:26:30
Domain names	eonenergyfit.com

Case administrator

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

Complainant

Organization	E.ON SE

Complainant representative

Organization	Lubberger Lehment Rechtsanwälte Partnerschaft mbB

Respondent

Organization	IPC tech inc

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 relies on registered trade mark rights in the word mark E.ON including:

1. EUTM No. 002361558, E.ON, registered on 19 December 2002 in classes 35, 39 and 40;

2. EUTM No. 002362416, e.on, registered on 19 December 2002 in classes 35, 39 and 40;

3. EUTM No. 006296529, e.on, registered on 27 June 2008 in classes 7, 36, 37 and 40; and

4. EUTM No. 00876364, a figurative mark including the word element e.on, registered on 9 September 2005 in classes 4, 35, 39 and 40.

The Complainant also relies on its longstanding and extensive use of E.ON as a company name and trade mark and says that E.ON is a highly distinctive mark with a substantial reputation in the European Union and beyond.

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

The Complainant is a major European energy company. It operates energy networks and infrastructure and provides energy-related

customer solutions under the E.ON mark. The E.ON Group is one of Europe's largest operators of energy networks and energy infrastructure and supplies services to approximately 48 million customers. 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.

The disputed domain name <eonenergyfit.com> was registered on 26 January 2026. It incorporates the word element of the Complainant's E.ON mark, omitting the dot, and adds the words "energyfit".

According to the Complaint and the evidence, the disputed domain name resolved to a website that mimicked an official E.ON website as of 3 June 2026.

The Respondent is IPC tech inc / Alex Lee of Malaysia. Nothing in the record suggests any relationship between the Respondent and the Complainant.

PARTIES CONTENTIONS

The Complainant contends that the requirements of the Policy have been met and that the disputed domain name should be transferred to it.
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

Under paragraph 4(a) of the Policy, the Complainant must establish each of the following: (i) that the disputed domain name is identical or confusingly similar to a trade mark or service mark in which the Complainant has rights; (ii) that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the disputed domain name; and (iii) that the disputed domain name has been registered and is being used in bad faith.

The Policy does not provide for a default decision. Even in the absence of a Response, the Panel must be satisfied on the evidence that each element of paragraph 4(a) has been proved by the Complainant.

1 Identical or Confusingly Similar

The Panel is satisfied that the Complainant has rights in the E.ON name and mark by virtue of its registered trade marks and its longstanding and substantial use of that mark for over 20 years. The Panel is also satisfied that E.ON is a well-known mark in the energy sector in the EU.

The disputed domain name reproduces the word element of the Complainant's mark as "eon". The omission of the dot does not prevent the mark from being immediately recognisable. Punctuation of that kind cannot in any event be reproduced in the same

manner within an ordinary domain name, and Internet users will readily perceive “eon” as the Complainant’s name and mark.

The addition of the expression “energyfit” does not prevent a finding of confusing similarity. The first part of that expression, “energy”, points directly to the Complainant’s field of activity. The combined term therefore reinforces rather than dispels the association with the Complainant. An Internet user encountering <eonenergyfit.co> would naturally understand it as referring to an E.ON energy service, programme, product, efficiency initiative or customer portal.

This is consistent with previous decisions involving the Complainant and its E.ON mark, including CAC-UDRP-106946 concerning <eonenergy.lat>, CAC-UDRP-107770 concerning <e-on.pro>, and CAC-UDRP-106086 concerning a domain name reproducing E.ON without the dot. Those decisions reflect the settled principle that the addition of an energy-related or other descriptive term does not avoid confusing similarity.

The suffix “.com” is ordinarily disregarded for the purpose of the first element of the Policy.

The Panel therefore finds that the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to a trade mark in which the Complainant has rights. The first element of paragraph 4(a) of the Policy is satisfied.

2. Rights or Legitimate Interests

It is well established that while the ultimate burden of proof remains on the complainant, for this second limb of the Policy, a complainant is required to make out a prima facie case that a respondent lacks rights or legitimate interest, then the burden of proof shifts to the respondent to come forward with relevant evidence demonstrating rights or legitimate interests. See Croatia Airlines d.d. v. Modern Empire Internet Ltd., WIPO Case No. D2003-0455.

The Complainant has made out that prima facie case. The WHOIS information does not show that the Respondent is commonly known by the disputed domain name, either by “E.ON”, or by “EON Energy Fit”. There is no evidence that the Respondent owns any corresponding trade mark rights, or that it has been licensed, authorised or otherwise permitted by the Complainant to use the E.ON mark.

Nor does the use shown in the record support any right or legitimate interest. The disputed website reproduces not only the same overall commercial impression but the same page structure, sequence of sections, headings, promotional text, FAQs, footer, and branding. Entire sections appear to have been copied verbatim or with only trivial modifications. The cumulative impression is that the Respondent deliberately reproduced the Complainant's official site including the "About" page with the company name and corporate address of a UK subsidiary of the Complainant so that Internet users would believe they were dealing with E.ON itself. The only material differences are relatively minor visual changes, such as the omission or alteration of certain illustrations and customer review elements, while the overall layout and wording and functionality appear to remain substantially identical.

Panels have consistently held that use of a domain name for impersonation, phishing, passing off, credential harvesting or other fraudulent activity can never confer rights or legitimate interests on a respondent. The present record shows a website carefully and deliberately designed to cause visitors to believe that they had reached an official E.ON service of the Complainant. The copying of actual content from the Complainant’s website removes any plausible suggestion of bona fides.

The Respondent has not come forward to rebut the Complainant’s case or to identify any genuine good-faith reason for registering and using the disputed domain name nor is any apparent on the face of the matter. The Panel finds that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name.

The second element of paragraph 4(a) of the Policy is satisfied.

3. Registered and Used in Bad Faith

The Panel also finds that the disputed domain name was registered and is being used in bad faith.

The E.ON mark is highly distinctive, longstanding and well known. The disputed domain name combines the mark with an energy-related expression. That composition directly targets the Complainant’s business. It is implausible that the Respondent selected the disputed domain name without knowledge of the Complainant and its rights.

The use made of the disputed domain name confirms that conclusion. The website did not merely refer to the Complainant. It imitated an official E.ON website and copied its look, feel and content, including material from the Complainant’s genuine online presence. It gave the company name and address of a UK subsidiary of the Complainant. The Respondent therefore plainly had the Complainant in mind when registering and using the disputed domain name.

The Panel has also compared the evidence provided of screenshots of the website resolving from the disputed domain name with the screenshots of the Complainant's official website on 3 June 2026. The similarities are striking. This is not merely a case of adopting a similar look and feel. It is, on the evidence before the Panel, a substantial reproduction of the Complainant's own website designed to create the false impression that Internet users have reached an official E.ON webpage. Such deliberate copying is compelling evidence that the Respondent had actual knowledge of the Complainant and intentionally sought to impersonate it. It is inconsistent with any conceivable good-faith use and strongly supports the conclusion that the disputed domain name was registered and is being used in bad faith within the meaning of paragraph 4(b)(iv) of the Policy.

Paragraph 4(b)(iv) of the Policy identifies bad faith where a respondent, by using a domain name, intentionally attempts to attract Internet users to a website or other online location for commercial gain by creating a likelihood of confusion with the complainant’s

mark as to source, sponsorship, affiliation or endorsement. The circumstances here fall squarely within that provision. The domain name suggests an E.ON energy service and the website reinforces that suggestion by impersonating the Complainant.

Indeed, it is impossible to think of any possible good faith reason for the disputed domain name and its website. There is an obvious risk of phishing or other fraudulent misuse. A website that copies a major energy supplier's branding and content may be used to obtain personal information, account credentials, payment data or other sensitive information from customers who believe they are dealing with the Complainant. The Panel need not determine the precise form of intended fraud. The deliberate impersonation itself, coupled with the misleading domain name, is sufficient to establish bad faith.

The Respondent's concealment of meaningful identifying information on the website and its failure to participate in the proceeding are not independently decisive, but they reinforce the inferences arising from the objective evidence. The Respondent has offered no explanation for the registration, the copied website, or the false appearance of affiliation.

Taking all of the circumstances together - the reputation of the E.ON mark, the targeted composition of the disputed domain name, the Respondent's evident knowledge of the Complainant, the copying of the Complainant's website content, the false appearance of official affiliation, the absence of rights or legitimate interests, and the risk of phishing or other fraudulent use - the Panel concludes that the disputed domain name was registered and is being used in bad faith within the meaning of paragraph 4(a)(iii) and paragraph 4(b)(iv) of the Policy.

The third element of paragraph 4(a) of the Policy is satisfied.

FOR ALL THE REASONS STATED ABOVE, THE COMPLAINT IS

Accepted

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

1. **eonenergyfit.com**: Transferred

PANELLISTS

Name	**Victoria McEvedy**

DATE OF PANEL DECISION 2026-07-22

Publish the Decision