

Decision for dispute CAC-UDRP-108984

Case number	CAC-UDRP-108984
Time of filing	2026-09-09 09:04:18
Domain names	squaredusa.com

Case administrator

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

Complainant

Organization	SNA HOLDING INC
--------------	-----------------

Complainant representative

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

Respondent

Name	themytexa shouse
------	------------------

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 <squaredusa.com>.

IDENTIFICATION OF RIGHTS

The Complainant is the owner of the following trademark registration:

- U.S. Registration No. 279120 for SQUARE D (stylized), registered on January 6, 1931, covering goods in International Class 9.

The disputed domain name <squaredusa.com> was registered on July 3, 2026.

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

The Complainant, formerly known as Square D Company, is an American manufacturer of electrical equipment founded in 1902 and headquartered in Andover, Massachusetts. Since its acquisition in 1991 by Schneider Electric, SQUARE D has been operated as one of Schneider Electric's flagship brands. The Complainant's SQUARE D products include circuit breakers, load centers, panelboards, contactors, relays and motor starters.

The disputed domain name resolves to a website entitled "Square D Official Website". The website presents itself as the SQUARE D brand, describes the Complainant's corporate history, including its founding in 1902 and its acquisition by Schneider Electric in 1991, in the first person, and promotes SQUARE D circuit breakers, panels, panelboards, transformers and pressure switches, with links

inviting users to purchase products on a third-party retail platform.

PARTIES CONTENTIONS

Complainant

I. Confusing similarity

The Complainant contends that the disputed domain name incorporates its SQUARE D trademark in its entirety, that the addition of the geographic term "usa" does not alter the overall impression of a connection with the Complainant, and that the ".com" suffix is to be disregarded. The Complainant also refers to a prior CAC decision in which its rights in SQUARE D were recognized.

II. Rights or legitimate interests

The Complainant contends that the Respondent is not known by the disputed domain name, is not affiliated with the Complainant, and has not been licensed or authorized to use the SQUARE D trademark or to register the disputed domain name. It further contends that the Respondent uses the disputed domain name for a website offering goods bearing the SQUARE D trademark, on which the Respondent presents itself as SQUARE D.

III. Bad faith

The Complainant contends that SQUARE D is well known and distinctive, as shown by Internet search results referring to the Complainant, and that the website's references to the SQUARE D trademark and related electrical products show that the Respondent knowingly targeted the Complainant. It further contends that the Respondent uses the disputed domain name to attract Internet users, for commercial gain, by creating a likelihood of confusion with the Complainant's trademark as to the source, sponsorship, affiliation or endorsement of the website and the goods offered on it.

Accordingly, the Complainant requests that the disputed domain name be transferred to it.

Respondent

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

The Uniform Domain Name Dispute Resolution Policy (UDRP) of the Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers (ICANN) (the "Policy") provides that the Complainant must prove each of the following to obtain transfer or cancellation of the

domain name:

1. that the Respondent's domain name is identical or confusingly similar to a trademark or service mark in which the Complainant has rights; and
2. that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the domain name; and
3. that the domain name has been registered and is being used in bad faith.

1) The disputed domain name is confusingly similar to a trademark in which the Complainant has rights

The Panel finds that the Complainant has established rights in the SQUARE D trademark through the U.S. registration identified above.

The disputed domain name incorporates the SQUARE D trademark in its entirety. Domain names cannot contain spaces, and the omission of the space between "SQUARE" and "D" does not affect the recognizability of the trademark.

The addition of the geographic term "usa" does not prevent a finding of confusing similarity. The Complainant's trademark remains readily recognizable within the disputed domain name. Consistent with section 1.8 of the WIPO Overview 3.1, where the relevant trademark is recognizable within the disputed domain name, the addition of geographic or other terms does not prevent a finding of confusing similarity under the first element.

The ".com" generic Top-Level Domain is a standard registration requirement and is disregarded for purposes of the confusing similarity assessment.

Accordingly, the Complainant has satisfied paragraph 4(a)(i) of the Policy.

2) The Respondent lacks rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name

Although the overall burden of proof rests with the Complainant, once a complainant makes out a prima facie case, the burden of production shifts to the respondent to demonstrate rights or legitimate interests (section 2.1 of the WIPO Overview 3.1).

The Complainant has stated that it has not licensed or otherwise authorized the Respondent to use the SQUARE D trademark or to register the disputed domain name, and that it has no business relationship with the Respondent. The Respondent is identified in the registrar's records as "themytexa shouse", a name bearing no resemblance to the disputed domain name, and there is no evidence that the Respondent has been commonly known by the disputed domain name or has acquired any rights in the term SQUARE D.

The Panel is therefore satisfied that the Complainant has made out a prima facie case. The Respondent has not submitted a Response and has not rebutted it.

The evidence further shows that the disputed domain name resolves to a website entitled "Square D Official Website", which presents itself as the SQUARE D brand and recounts the Complainant's corporate history in the first person. The composition of the disputed domain name, combining the Complainant's trademark with a reference to the Complainant's home market, reinforces that impression. Use of a domain name to impersonate the trademark owner cannot constitute a bona fide offering of goods or services or a legitimate noncommercial or fair use.

Accordingly, the Complainant has satisfied paragraph 4(a)(ii) of the Policy.

3) The disputed domain name has been registered and is being used in bad faith

The Complainant's SQUARE D trademark has been registered in the United States since 1931, nearly a century before the registration of the disputed domain name on July 3, 2026. On the evidence submitted, including the Internet search results for "SQUARE D", which refer predominantly to the Complainant and its products, the Panel accepts that the SQUARE D trademark is distinctive and well established in connection with electrical equipment. Consistent with section 4.3 of the WIPO Overview 3.1, the Respondent's default does not by itself establish the Complainant's assertions, and the Panel has reached its conclusions on the evidence of record.

The Panel finds that the Respondent registered the disputed domain name with knowledge of, and with the intention of targeting, the Complainant and its SQUARE D trademark. Although the string "squared" may in the abstract be read as an ordinary English word, the content of the Respondent's website excludes that reading. The website reproduces the SQUARE D trademark, recounts the Complainant's history, and refers to the Complainant's product lines. That content shows that the Respondent was familiar with the Complainant and its business and selected the disputed domain name because of its association with the Complainant.

The website is commercial in character: it invites users to shop for SQUARE D products and directs them to purchase pages on a third-party retail platform. By using the disputed domain name in this manner, the Respondent has intentionally attempted to attract, for commercial gain, Internet users to its website by creating a likelihood of confusion with the Complainant's trademark as to the source, sponsorship, affiliation or endorsement of the website and of the products promoted on it, within the meaning of paragraph 4(b)(iv) of the Policy.

The Panel further finds that the disputed domain name and the associated website constitute impersonation and a false suggestion of affiliation within the meaning of section 3.1.4 of the WIPO Overview 3.1. The website does not merely refer to the Complainant's products; it holds itself out as the Complainant's official website. The search results submitted by the Complainant show the Respondent's website appearing among the first results for "SQUARE D" under the title "Square D Official Website", which illustrates

the risk that Internet users will take it for the Complainant's own website.

Having found bad faith under paragraph 4(b)(iv), the Panel need not address the Complainant's further contention that the Respondent registered the disputed domain name primarily to disrupt the business of a competitor.

Accordingly, the Complainant has satisfied paragraph 4(a)(iii) of the Policy.

FOR ALL THE REASONS STATED ABOVE, THE COMPLAINT IS

Accepted

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

- 1. **squaredusa.com**: Transferred

PANELLISTS

Name	Barbora Donathová
------	-------------------

DATE OF PANEL DECISION	2026-10-26
------------------------	------------

Publish the Decision