

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

AB Electrolux v. 凡文龙 (Wenlong Fan)

Case No. D2022-0890

1. The Parties

Complainant is AB Electrolux, Sweden, represented by SILKA AB, Sweden.

Respondent is 凡文龙 (Wenlong Fan), China.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <electrolux.com> is registered with West263 International Limited (the “Registrar”).

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed in English with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the “Center”) on March 15, 2022. On March 15, 2022, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On March 16, 2022, the Registrar transmitted by email to the Center its verification response disclosing registrant and contact information for the disputed domain name which differed from the named Respondent and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to Complainant on March 16, 2022, providing the registrant and contact information disclosed by the Registrar, and inviting Complainant to submit an amendment to the Complaint. Complainant filed an amendment to the Complaint in English on March 17, 2022.

On March 16, 2022, the Center transmitted an email communication to the Parties in English and Chinese regarding the language of the proceeding. On March 17, 2022, Complainant confirmed its request that English be the language of the proceeding. Respondent did not comment on the language of the proceeding.

The Center verified that the Complaint together with the amendment to the Complaint satisfied the formal requirements of the Uniform Domain Name Dispute Resolution Policy (the “Policy” or “UDRP”), the Rules for Uniform Domain Name Dispute Resolution Policy (the “Rules”), and the WIPO Supplemental Rules for Uniform Domain Name Dispute Resolution Policy (the “Supplemental Rules”).

In accordance with the Rules, paragraphs 2 and 4, the Center formally notified Respondent in English and Chinese of the Complaint, and the proceedings commenced on March 22, 2022. In accordance with the

Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was April 11, 2022. Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified Respondent's default on April 12, 2022.

The Center appointed Yijun Tian as the sole panelist in this matter on April 21, 2022. The Panel finds that it was properly constituted. The Panel has submitted the Statement of Acceptance and Declaration of Impartiality and Independence, as required by the Center to ensure compliance with the Rules, paragraph 7.

4. Factual Background

A. Complainant

Complainant, AB Electrolux, is a company incorporated in Stockholm, Sweden. Founded in 1919, Complainant is a world leading producer of appliances and equipment for kitchen and cleaning products and floor care products. According to its annual report in 2021, Complainant had sales of SEK 126 billion and about 52,000 employees internationally.

Complainant has exclusive rights in the ELECTROLUX marks. Complainant is the owner of several ELECTROLUX marks worldwide, including a Swedish trademark registration for ELECTROLUX, registered since June 29, 1920 (Swedish trademark registration number 23382); and International trademark registration for ELECTROLUX registered, covering also China, since March 17, 2004 (International registration number 836605). Complainant also operates several domain names which contain the ELECTROLUX mark in its entirety, such as <electrolux.com> (registered in 1996), <electrolux.se>, <electrolux.fr>, and <electrolux.es>.

B. Respondent

Respondent is 凡文龙 (Wenlong Fan), China.

The disputed domain name <electrlolux.com> was registered on February 20, 2022, long after the ELECTROLUX marks were registered. The disputed domain name does not resolve to an active website.

5. Parties' Contentions

A. Complainant

Complainant contends that the disputed domain name is identical or confusingly similar to the ELECTROLUX marks.

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

Complainant contends that the disputed domain name was registered and is being used in bad faith.

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

B. Respondent

Respondent did not reply to Complainant's contentions.

6. Discussion and Findings

6.1. Language of the Proceeding

The language of the Registration Agreement for the disputed domain name is Chinese. Pursuant to the Rules, paragraph 11(a), in the absence of an agreement between the parties, or specified otherwise in the Registration Agreement, the language of the administrative proceeding shall be the language of the Registration Agreement. From the evidence presented on the record, no agreement appears to have been entered into between Complainant and Respondent to the effect that the language of the proceeding should be English. Complainant filed initially its Complaint in English, and has requested that English be the language of the proceeding for the following main reasons:

- (a) the disputed domain name is exclusively constituted of letters using the Latin alphabets.
- (b) Complainant and its representative are located in Sweden. Although they have no knowledge of the Chinese language, they are able to communicate in English, which is the primary language for international relations.
- (c) in order to proceed in the Chinese language, Complainant would have had to retain specialized translation services at a cost very likely to be higher than the overall costs of the proceeding. The use of Chinese, in this case, would therefore impose a burden on Complainant, which must be deemed significant in view of the low cost of the proceeding.
- (d) it is important to highlight for a better understanding of the proceeding that the disputed domain name is almost identical to the Complainant's well-known ELECTROLUX mark and that it does not resolve to an active website.

Respondent did not make any submissions with respect to the language of the proceeding and did not object to the use of English as the language of the proceeding.

Paragraph 11(a) of the Rules allows the panel to determine the language of the proceeding having regard to all the circumstances. In particular, it is established practice to take paragraphs 10(b) and (c) of the Rules into consideration for the purpose of determining the language of the proceeding. In other words, it is important to ensure fairness to the parties and the maintenance of an inexpensive and expeditious avenue for resolving domain name disputes (*Whirlpool Corporation, Whirlpool Properties, Inc. v. Hui'erpu (HK) electrical appliance co. ltd.*, WIPO Case No. [D2008-0293](#); *Solvay S.A. v. Hyun-Jun Shin*, WIPO Case No. [D2006-0593](#)). The language finally decided by the panel for the proceeding should not be prejudicial to either one of the parties in its abilities to articulate the arguments for the case (*Groupe Auchan v. xmxzl*, WIPO Case No. [DCC2006-0004](#)). WIPO Overview of WIPO Panel Views on Selected UDRP Questions, Third Edition ("[WIPO Overview 3.0](#)") further states:

"Noting the aim of conducting the proceedings with due expedition, paragraph 10 of the UDRP Rules vests a panel with authority to conduct the proceedings in a manner it considers appropriate while also ensuring both that the parties are treated with equality, and that each party is given a fair opportunity to present its case.

Against this background, panels have found that certain scenarios may warrant proceeding in a language other than that of the registration agreement. Such scenarios include (i) evidence showing that the respondent can understand the language of the complaint, (ii) the language/script of the domain name particularly where the same as that of the complainant's mark, (iii) any content on the webpage under the disputed domain name, (iv) prior cases involving the respondent in a particular language, (v) prior correspondence between the parties, (vi) potential unfairness or unwarranted delay in ordering the complainant to translate the complaint, (vii) evidence of other respondent-controlled domain names registered, used, or corresponding to a particular language, (viii) in cases involving multiple domain names, the use of a particular language agreement for some (but not all) of the disputed domain names, (ix) currencies accepted on the webpage under the disputed domain name, or (x) other indicia tending to show

that it would not be unfair to proceed in a language other than that of the registration agreement.” ([WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 4.5.1; see also *L’Oreal S.A. v. MUNHYUNJA*, WIPO Case No. [D2003-0585](#)).

On the record, Respondent appears to be located in China and is thus presumably not a native English speaker, but considering the following aspects, the Panel has decided that the language of the proceeding shall be English: (a) the disputed domain name <electrlolux.com> is registered in Latin characters, rather than Chinese script; (b) the generic Top-Level Domain (“gTLD”) of the disputed domain name is “.com”, so the disputed domain name seems to be prepared for users worldwide, particularly English speaking countries; (c) the Center has notified Respondent of the language of the proceeding in both Chinese and English, and Respondent has indicated no objection to Complainant’s request that English be the language of the proceeding; (d) the Center also notified Respondent in both Chinese and English of the Complaint, and informed Respondent that it would accept a response in either English or Chinese, but Respondent chose not to file any response.

Considering these circumstances, the Panel finds that the choice of English as the language of the present proceeding is fair to both Parties and is not prejudicial to either one of the Parties in its ability to articulate the arguments for this case. Having considered all the matters above, the Panel determines under paragraph 11(a) of the Rules that English shall be the language of the proceeding, and the decision will be rendered in English.

6.2. Substantive Issues

Paragraph 4(a) of the Policy requires that Complainant must prove each of the following three elements to obtain an order that the disputed domain name should be cancelled or transferred:

- (i) the disputed domain name registered by Respondent is identical or confusingly similar to a trademark or service mark in which Complainant has rights;
- (ii) 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.

On the basis of the evidence introduced by Complainant and in particular with regard to the content of the relevant provisions of the Policy, paragraphs 4(a) - (c), the Panel concludes as follows:

A. Identical or Confusingly Similar

The Panel finds that Complainant has rights in the ELECTROLUX marks acquired through registration. The ELECTROLUX marks have been registered internationally (covering China) since 2004.

The disputed domain name <electrlolux.com> differs from Complainant’s trademark ELECTROLUX by only one letter – Respondent has changed the spelling of “Electrolux” by one letter (inserting an extra “l”). This does not prevent a finding of confusing similarity between Complainant’s registered trademarks and the disputed domain name (*Walgreen Co. v. Lin yanxiao / Linyanxiao*, WIPO Case No. [D2016-1605](#)).

Previous UDRP panels have consistently held that a domain name may be identical or confusingly similar to a trademark for purposes of the Policy “when the domain name includes the trademark, or a confusingly similar approximation, regardless of the other terms in the domain name” (*Wal-Mart Stores, Inc. v. Richard MacLeod d/b/a For Sale*, WIPO Case No. [D2000-0662](#)).

Further, as to “typosquatting”, section 1.9 of the [WIPO Overview 3.0](#) states: “A domain name which consists of a common, obvious, or intentional misspelling of a trademark is considered by panels to be confusingly similar to the relevant mark for purposes of the first element.”

As the disputed domain name is a one letter typographical error of Complainant's ELECTROLUX marks, the Panel finds the disputed domain name must be considered a prototypical example of typosquatting.

Thus, the Panel finds that the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to Complainant's ELECTROLUX marks. The Panel therefore holds that the Complaint fulfils the first condition of paragraph 4(a) of the Policy.

B. Rights or Legitimate Interests

Paragraph 4(c) of the Policy provides a list of circumstances any of which is sufficient to demonstrate that Respondent has rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name:

(i) before any notice to Respondent of the dispute, the use by Respondent of, or demonstrable preparations to use, the disputed domain name or a name corresponding to the disputed domain name in connection with a *bona fide* offering of goods or services; or

(ii) Respondent has been commonly known by the disputed domain name, even if Respondent has acquired no trademark or service mark rights; or

(iii) Respondent is making a legitimate noncommercial or fair use of the disputed domain name, without intent for commercial gain to misleadingly divert consumers or to tarnish Complainant's trademarks at issue.

The overall burden of proof on this element rests with Complainant. However, it is well established by previous UDRP panel decisions that once a complainant establishes a *prima facie* case that the respondent lacks rights or legitimate interests in a domain name, the burden of production shifts to the respondent to rebut the complainant's contentions. If the respondent fails to do so, the complainant is deemed to have satisfied paragraph 4(a)(ii) of the Policy. (*Danzas Holding AG, DHL Operations B.V. v. Ma Shikai*, WIPO Case No. [D2008-0441](#); [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 2.1 and cases cited therein).

According to the Complaint, founded in 1919, Complainant is a world leading producer of appliances and equipment for kitchen and cleaning products and floor care products. According to its annual report in 2021, Complainant had sales of SEK 126 billion and about 52,000 employees internationally. Complainant has rights in the ELECTROLUX marks including in China since at least 2004, which long precedes Respondent's registration of the disputed domain name (in 2022).

Moreover, Respondent is not an authorized dealer of Electrolux-branded products or services. The Panel finds that Complainant has established a *prima facie* case that Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name and thereby shifts the burden to Respondent to produce evidence to rebut this presumption (*The Argento Wine Company Limited v. Argento Beijing Trading Company*, WIPO Case No. [D2009-0610](#); *Do The Hustle, LLC v. Tropic Web*, WIPO Case No. [D2000-0624](#); *Croatia Airlines d.d. v. Modern Empire Internet Ltd.*, WIPO Case No. [D2003-0455](#)).

Based on the following reasons the Panel finds that Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name:

(i) there has been no evidence adduced to show that Respondent is using the disputed domain name in connection with a *bona fide* offering of goods or services. On the contrary, the disputed domain name does not resolve to an active website;

(ii) there has been no evidence adduced to show that Respondent has been commonly known by the disputed domain name. There has been no evidence adduced to show that Respondent has any registered trademark rights with respect to the disputed domain name. Respondent registered the disputed domain name in 2022, long after the ELECTROLUX marks became internationally known. The disputed domain name is confusingly similar to Complainant's ELECTROLUX marks; and

(iii) There has been no evidence adduced to show that Respondent is making a legitimate noncommercial or fair use of the disputed domain name. The disputed domain name does not resolve to an active website. But it is offered for sale as a premium domain name for USD 3,999 at “www.godaddy.com” website.

The Panel finds that Respondent has failed to produce any evidence to rebut Complainant’s *prima facie* showing on Respondent’s lack of rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name. The Panel therefore holds that the Complaint fulfils the second condition of paragraph 4(a) of the Policy.

C. Registered and Used in Bad Faith

Paragraph 4(b) of the Policy sets out four circumstances which, without limitation, shall be evidence of the registration and use of the disputed domain name in bad faith, namely:

(i) circumstances indicating that Respondent has registered or acquired the disputed domain name primarily for the purpose of selling, renting, or otherwise transferring the disputed domain name registration to Complainant who is the owner of the trademark or service mark or to a competitor of Complainant, for valuable consideration in excess of Respondent’s documented out-of-pocket costs directly related to the disputed domain name; or

(ii) Respondent has registered the disputed 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 Respondent has engaged in a pattern of such conduct; or

(iii) Respondent has registered the disputed domain name primarily for the purpose of disrupting the business of a competitor; or

(iv) by using the disputed domain name, Respondent has intentionally attempted to attract, for commercial gain, Internet users to Respondent’s website or other online location, by creating a likelihood of confusion with Complainant’s mark as to the source, sponsorship, affiliation, or endorsement of Respondent’s website or location or of a product or service on the website or location.

Upon the evidence of the circumstances in this case, it is adequate to conclude that Respondent has registered and used the disputed domain name in bad faith.

(a) Registered in Bad Faith

The Panel finds that Complainant has a widespread reputation in the ELECTROLUX marks with regard to its products and services. As mentioned above, Complainant has registered its ELECTROLUX marks internationally (covering China) since 2004. It is not conceivable that Respondent would not have had actual notice of Complainant’s trademark rights at the time of the registration of the disputed domain name (in 2022). Further, UDRP panels have consistently found that the mere registration of a domain name that is confusingly similar (particularly domain names comprising typos) to a famous or widely-known trademark by an unaffiliated entity can by itself create a presumption of bad faith. See 3.1.4 of the [WIPO Overview 3.0](#).

Moreover, Respondent has chosen not to respond to Complainant’s allegations. According to the UDRP panel’s decision in *The Argento Wine Company Limited v. Argento Beijing Trading Company*, *supra*, “the failure of the Respondent to respond to the Complaint further supports an inference of bad faith”. See also *Bayerische Motoren Werke AG v. (This Domain is For Sale) Joshuathan Investments, Inc.*, WIPO Case No. [D2002-0787](#).

Thus, the Panel concludes that the disputed domain name was registered in bad faith.

(b) Used in Bad Faith

Complainant has adduced evidence to show that the disputed domain name does not resolve to an active website. UDRP panels have found that the non-use of a domain name would not prevent a finding of bad faith under the doctrine of passive holding. Section 3.3 of the [WIPO Overview 3.0](#) provides: “While panelists will look at the totality of the circumstances in each case, factors that have been considered relevant in applying the passive holding doctrine include: (i) the degree of distinctiveness or reputation of the complainant’s mark, (ii) the failure of the respondent to submit a response or to provide any evidence of actual or contemplated good-faith use, (iii) the respondent’s concealing its identity or use of false contact details (noted to be in breach of its registration agreement), and (iv) the implausibility of any good faith use to which the domain name may be put.”

As discussed above, Complainant’s ELECTROLUX marks are distinctive and widely known. Further, given the lack of response, the Panel cannot envision any other plausible use of the disputed domain name that would not be in bad faith under the present circumstances. Taking into account all the circumstances of this case, the Panel concludes that the non-use of the disputed domain name by Respondent also constitutes bad faith.

Furthermore, as noted above, the disputed domain name is offered for sale as a premium domain name for USD 3,999 at “www.godaddy.com” website, which may be further evidence of bad faith.

In summary, Respondent, by choosing to register and use the disputed domain name, which is confusingly similar to the ELECTROLUX mark, intended to ride on the goodwill of this trademark. In the absence of evidence to the contrary and rebuttal from Respondent, the choice of the disputed domain name and the use of the disputed domain name are indicative of registration and use of the disputed domain name in bad faith.

The Panel therefore holds that the Complaint fulfils the third condition of paragraph 4(a) of the Policy.

7. Decision

For all the foregoing reasons, in accordance with paragraphs 4(i) of the Policy and 15 of the Rules, the Panel orders that the disputed domain name <electrlolux.com> be transferred to Complainant.

/Yijun Tian /

Yijun Tian

Sole Panelist

Dated: May 25, 2022