

Decision for dispute CAC-UDRP-108888

Case number	CAC-UDRP-108888
-------------	-----------------

Time of filing	2026-07-31 10:02:15
----------------	---------------------

Domain names	schneider-electirc.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	Eling Siaw
------	------------

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 of the International trademark SCHNEIDER ELECTRIC with registration No. 715395, registered on March 15, 1999 for goods and services in International Classes 6, 9, 11, 36, 37, 39 and 42 (the "SCHNEIDER ELECTRIC trademark"), registered in a number of jurisdictions including Malaysia, where the Respondent is located.

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

The Complainant was founded in 1871. It is a French manufacturer of products for power management, automation, and related solutions. The Complainant's revenue for 2025 amounted to EUR 40 billion. It is the owner of the domain name <schneiderelectric.com>, registered since April 4, 1996, which is used to redirect to its official website at www.se.com.

The disputed domain name was registered on June 30, 2026 and resolves to a parking page with pay-per-click ("PPC") links.

PARTIES CONTENTIONS

COMPLAINANT:

The Complainant states that the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to its SCHNEIDER ELECTRIC trademark, because the inversion of the letters “i” and “r” in the term “electric” creates a typosquatting version of the trademark intended to create confusing similarity with it.

The Complainant asserts that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the disputed domain name, because it is not affiliated with or authorised by the Complainant and does not have any business with it.

The Complainant contends that the disputed domain name was registered and is being used in bad faith. According to the Complainant, the misspelling of the SCHNEIDER ELECTRIC trademark was intentionally designed to be confusingly similar with the Complainant’s trademark. The Complainant adds that the disputed domain name resolves to a registrar parking page with commercial links related to the Complainant. According to it, the Respondent attempts to attract Internet users for commercial gain to the website at the disputed domain name exploiting the goodwill of the Complainant’s trademark for its own commercial gain.

RESPONDENT:

The Respondent did not submit a Response in this proceeding.

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

Pursuant to the Policy, paragraph 4(a), a complainant must prove each of the following to justify the transfer of a domain name:

- (i) the 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 domain name; and
- (iii) the respondent has registered and is using the domain name in bad faith.

Identical or confusingly similar

It is well accepted that the first element functions primarily as a standing requirement. The standing (or threshold) test for confusing similarity involves a reasoned but relatively straightforward comparison between the Complainant’s trademark and the disputed domain name. WIPO Overview of WIPO Panel Views on Select UDRP Questions (“WIPO Overview 3.1”), section 1.7. The Complainant has shown rights in respect of the SCHNEIDER ELECTRIC trademark for the purposes of the Policy. WIPO Overview 3.1, section 1.2.1.

The Panel notes that a common practice has emerged under the Policy to disregard in appropriate circumstances the general Top-Level Domain (“gTLD”) section of domain names for the purposes of the comparison under the Policy, paragraph 4(a)(i). The Panel sees no reason not to follow the same approach here, so it will disregard the “.com” gTLD section of the disputed domain name.

The disputed domain name incorporates the SCHEIDER ELECTRIC trademark with a minor difference - the letters "i" and "r" in the element "electric" are inverted. This difference has a low effect on the overall impression made by the disputed domain name, where the Complainant's trademark is easily recognisable, and the disputed domain name appears as an intentional variation of the trademark.

As discussed in section 1.9 of the WIPO Overview 3.1, a domain name which consists of a variation of a trademark (typically a common, obvious, or intentional misspelling, referred to as typosquatting) is considered by panels to be confusingly similar to the relevant mark for purposes of the first element. This stems from the fact that the domain name contains sufficiently recognisable aspects of the relevant mark. Under the second and third elements, panels will normally find that employing a misspelling in this way signals an intention on the part of the respondent (typically corroborated by infringing website content) to confuse users seeking or expecting the complainant.

The Panel therefore finds that the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to the SCHNEIDER ELECTRIC trademark in which the Complainant has rights.

Rights and legitimate interests

Paragraph 4(c) of the Policy provides a list of circumstances in which the Respondent may demonstrate rights or legitimate interests in a disputed domain name.

Although the overall burden of proof in UDRP proceedings is on the complainant, panels have recognised that proving that a respondent lacks rights or legitimate interests in a domain name may result in the difficult task of "proving a negative", requiring information that is often primarily within the knowledge or control of the respondent. As such, where a complainant makes out a prima facie case that the respondent lacks rights or legitimate interests, the burden of production on this element shifts to the respondent to come forward with relevant evidence demonstrating rights or legitimate interests in the domain name (although the burden of proof always remains on the complainant). If the respondent fails to come forward with such relevant evidence, the complainant is deemed to have satisfied the second element. WIPO Overview 3.1, section 2.1.

Having reviewed the available record, the Panel finds the Complainant has established a prima facie case that the Respondent lacks rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name. The Respondent has not rebutted the Complainant's prima facie showing and has not come forward with any relevant evidence demonstrating rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name such as those enumerated in the Policy or otherwise.

In the Panel's view, the circumstances of this case do not support a finding that the Respondent has rights and legitimate interests in the disputed domain name. It is a misspelled version of the SCHNEIDER ELECTRIC trademark and of the Complainant's domain name <schneider-electric.com>, and displays PPC links related to the Complainant and its business, which creates an appearance that the disputed domain name is related to the Complainant and its activities.

In the absence of any arguments or evidence to the contrary, this leads the Panel to the conclusion that it is more likely than not that the Respondent, being aware of the goodwill of the Complainant's SCHNEIDER ELECTRIC trademark, has registered the disputed domain name targeting this trademark in an attempt to exploit its goodwill by attracting Internet users who may believe that the disputed domain name and the third party websites to which it redirects through PPC links are somehow related to the Complainant.

The Panel therefore finds that the second element of the Policy has been established.

Bad faith

Paragraph 4(b) of the Policy lists four illustrative alternative circumstances that shall be evidence of the registration and use of a domain name in bad faith by a respondent, namely:

"(i) circumstances indicating that you have registered or you have acquired the domain name primarily for the purpose of selling, renting, or otherwise transferring the 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 your documented out-of-pocket costs directly related to the domain name; or

(ii) you have 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 you have engaged in a pattern of such conduct; or

(iii) you have registered the domain name primarily for the purpose of disrupting the business of a competitor; or

(iv) by using the domain name, you have intentionally attempted to attract, for commercial gain, Internet users to your 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 your website or location or of a product or service on your website or location."

The distinctive SCHNEIDER ELECTRIC trademark was registered twenty-seven years before the disputed domain name and has been extensively used around the world. The disputed domain name is an obvious misspelling of the SCHNEIDER ELECTRIC trademark and of the Complainant's domain name <schneider-electric.com>, which makes it appear as an official online location of the Complainant, and is being used for a webpage displaying PPC links related to the Complainant. This may confuse and attract Internet users, and the Respondent has not provided any plausible explanation of its choice of a domain name and its plans how to use it.

As discussed in section 2.9 of the WIPO Overview 3.1, panels have found that the use of a domain name to host a parked page comprising PPC links does not represent a bona fide offering where such links compete with or capitalise on the reputation and goodwill of the complainant’s mark or otherwise mislead Internet users.

Considering the above, the Panel accepts that the Respondent has registered the disputed domain name targeting the Complainant’s SCHNEIDER ELECTRIC trademark and with the intention of taking an unfair advantage of its goodwill, which supports a finding of bad faith.

This satisfies the Panel that the disputed domain name was registered and is being used in bad faith.

FOR ALL THE REASONS STATED ABOVE, THE COMPLAINT IS

Accepted

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

- 1. schneider-electirc.com: Transferred

PANELLISTS

Name	Assen Alexiev
------	---------------

DATE OF PANEL DECISION 2026-09-03

Publish the Decision