Decision for dispute CAC-UDRP-109001

Case number	CAC-UDRP-109001
Time of filing	2026-09-17 09:25:39
Domain names	accounting-se.com

Case administrator

Name	Olga Slanařová (Case admin)

Complainant

Organization	SCHNEIDER ELECTRIC SE

Complainant representative

Organization	NAMESHIELD S.A.S.

Respondent

Name	Scott Meham

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 owns the following trademarks for SCHNEIDER ELECTRIC:

- International trademark SCHNEIDER ELECTRIC number 715395, registered on 15 March 1999;
- International trademark SCHNEIDER ELECTRIC number 715396, registered on 15 March 1999.

The Complainant also owns many domain names including the term “SE”, such as:

- <se.com> registered on 6 June 1997;
- <se.co> registered on 26 April 2010; and
- <se.fr> registered on 26 December 2014; and
- <se.app> registered on 1 May 2018.

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

The Complainant is a French industrial business trading globally. It was founded in 1871. It manufactures and offers products for power management, automation and related solutions.

The Complainant has owned trademark registrations for SCHNIEDER ELECTRIC since 1997. It has used the acronym of its trademark, “SE”, for many years, which it also uses in its domain name registrations, such as <se.com> registered in 1997.

The Respondent registered the disputed domain name <accounting-se.com> on 21 August 2026.

PARTIES CONTENTIONS

The Complainant claims that the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to its trademark, SCHNEIDER ELECTRIC, which was registered in 1999. For many years before the registration of the disputed domain name, the Complainant has used the letters “SE” as the abbreviation of its trademark and owns numerous domain names worldwide containing or comprising “SE”, such as <se.com>, registered in 1997. It submits that a Google search for webpages that contain both the terms “SCHNEIDER ELECTRIC” and “SE” yielded over 50 million results.

The Complainant contends that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the disputed domain name and states that:

- the Respondent is not commonly known as the disputed domain name and is not identified in the Whois database as the disputed domain name;
- the Respondent is not affiliated with nor authorised to use the Complainant’s trademark or apply for registration of the disputed domain name by the Complainant, nor does the Complainant carry out any activity for, nor has any business with the Respondent; and
- the Respondent has used the disputed domain name to pass itself off as one of the Complainant’s employees to obtain undue payment from its clients.

The Complainant argues that given the notoriety of its trademark, which is ranked 65 in the top 100 most valuable marks in Interbrand’s 2025 Top 100, the Respondent registered the disputed domain name in bad faith with actual knowledge of Complainant’s rights in the SCHNEIDER ELECTRIC mark and its acronym SE, prior to registration of the disputed domain name

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

Paragraph 4(a) of the Policy requires the Complainant to prove that:

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 the disputed domain name; and
iii. the disputed domain name has been registered and used in bad faith.

The Panel must decide the Complainant based on the statements and documents submitted and in accordance with the Policy, the Rules and any rules and principles of law deemed applicable, see UDRP Rules paragraph 15. The applicable standard of proof is the balance of probabilities, that is, it is more likely than not that the claimed fact is true.

IDENTICAL OR CONFUSINGLY SIMILAR

The Complainant owns the registered trademark SCHNEIDER ELECTRIC and for many years has used the acronym “SE” in connection with its services. The disputed domain name, <accounting.se.com>, comprises the term “accounting”, which is a generic word associated with the Complainant’s business activities, plus the letters “SE”, which is the acronym of the Complainant’s trademark.

To establish unregistered or common law trademark rights for purposes of the UDRP, the Complainant must show that its mark has become a distinctive identifier that consumers associate with the Complainant’s goods and/or services. See WIPO Overview 3.1 at section 1.3. The Complainant has for many years used the acronym “SE” in communications related to its services and in its numerous domain names, such as, <se.com>, which has been registered since 1997 and has been used for the Complainant’s official website. Although the acronym “SE” has many meanings, it has through long usage also achieved significance as an identifier for the Complainant, as illustrated by the Respondent using the acronym in the disputed domain name to impersonate the Complainant and target the Complainant’s customers as part of a phishing scheme.

Ignoring the top-level domain “.com” and the generic word “accounting”, the Panel concludes that the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to the Complainant’s common law trademark and that the requirements of Paragraph 4(a)(i) of the Policy have been met.

NO RIGHTS OR LEGITIMATE INTERESTS

Paragraph 4(c) of the Policy sets out how a Respondent may demonstrate rights or legitimate interests to the disputed domain name, which include without limitation:

(i) before notice of the dispute, the Respondent has used, or made demonstrable preparations to use, the domain name or a name corresponding to it in connection with a bona fide offering of goods or services; or

(ii) the Respondent has been commonly known by the domain name; or

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

The Complainant has established a prima facie case that the Respondent lacks rights or a legitimate interest in the disputed domain name. There is no evidence to show that the Respondent is commonly known as the disputed domain name. The Respondent is not affiliated with nor authorised by the Complainant, nor has any business with the Complainant. The Respondent’s use of the disputed domain name to impersonate the Complainant is not a bona fide offering of goods or services, nor a legitimate noncommercial or fair use of the disputed domain name.

The burden now shifts to the Respondent to show relevant rights. The Respondent has not filed a Response nor disputed any of the Complainant’s assertions. Considering all the factors outlined above, the Panel finds that the Respondent lacks rights or a legitimate interest in the disputed domain name and the requirements of paragraph (a)(ii) of the Policy have been satisfied.

REGISTERED AND USED IN BAD FAITH

The Complainant has long-standing rights in the registered trademark, SCHNEIDER ELECTRIC and common law rights in the acronym "SE". The Respondent has used a privacy service to register the disputed domain name. The Respondent has then used the disputed domain name for the purposes of a fraudulent phishing email impersonating the Complainant and featuring the Complainant's trademark. This targeting of the Complainant’s brand evidences that the Respondent knew of the Complainant's rights when he registered the disputed domain names and has registered and used it in bad faith. The Panel finds that the requirements of paragraph (a)(iii) of the Policy have been met.

FOR ALL THE REASONS STATED ABOVE, THE COMPLAINT IS

Accepted

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

1. **accounting-se.com**: Transferred

PANELLISTS

Name	**Veronica Bailey**

DATE OF PANEL DECISION 2026-10-23

Publish the Decision