

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

LEGRAND FRANCE v. Jisheng Song

Case No. D2023-0603

1. The Parties

The Complainant is LEGRAND FRANCE, France, represented by Ebrand France, France.

The Respondent is Jisheng Song, China.

2. The Domain Names and Registrar

The disputed domain names <outletlegrand.com> and <salelegrand.com> are registered with Name.com, Inc. (the “Registrar”).

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the “Center”) on February 9, 2023. On February 9, 2023, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain names. On February 9, 2023, 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 (Whois Agent, Domain Protection Services, Inc.) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on February 20, 2023, providing the registrant and contact information disclosed by the Registrar, and inviting the Complainant to submit an amendment to the Complaint. The Complainant filed an amendment to the Complaint on February 23, 2023.

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 the Respondent of the Complaint, and the proceedings commenced on February 27, 2023. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was March 19, 2023. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent’s default on March 20, 2023.

The Center appointed Tuukka Airaksinen as the sole panelist in this matter on March 27, 2023. 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

The Complainant is a global specialist in electrical and digital building infrastructure. It was established in 1904 as a porcelain producer and now employs more than 38,000 people in 90 countries with a turnover of over EUR 6 billion in 2022. The Complainant is the owner of the trademark LEGRAND, registered in several countries, for example as a European Union trademark No. 004130861 as of January 4, 2006.

The disputed domain name <salelegrand.com> was registered on October 12, 2022, and resolves to a website selling electrical switches for buildings.

The disputed domain name <outletlegrand.com> was registered on October 12, 2022, and resolves to a similar website selling electrical switches for buildings.

5. Parties' Contentions

A. Complainant

The disputed domain names include the Complainant's trademark in its entirety, with the addition of the terms "sale" and "outlet", respectively, which is not sufficient to remove confusing similarity of the disputed domain names and the Complainant's trademark.

The Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain names. The Respondent is not commonly known by the disputed domain names and the Complainant has not licensed or otherwise authorized the Respondent to use the Complainant's trademark in the disputed domain names. Furthermore, the Respondent's websites mirror the look and feel of the Complainant's website and replicate the Complainant's logo identically.

The Respondent's websites pretend to be official Complainant's websites by reproducing the Complainant's trademark, copyrighted images and selling potentially counterfeit products under the Complainant's trademark. The Respondent is therefore confusing Internet users to its websites by creating confusion with the Complainant's trademark.

B. Respondent

The Respondent did not reply to the Complainant's contentions.

6. Discussion and Findings

In order to obtain the transfer of a domain name, a complainant must prove the three elements of paragraph 4(a) of the Policy, regardless of whether the respondent files a response to the complaint or not. The first element is that the domain name is identical or confusingly similar to a trademark or service mark in which the complainant has rights. The second element a complainant must prove is that the respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the domain name. The third element a complainant must establish is that the domain name has been registered and is being used in bad faith.

A. Identical or Confusingly Similar

Paragraph 4(a)(i) of the Policy requires that the Complainant establish that the disputed domain names are identical or confusingly similar to a trademark or service mark in which the Complainant has rights. Consequently, the Complainant must prove that it has rights to a trademark, and that the disputed domain names are identical or confusingly similar to this trademark.

According to section 1.11 of the WIPO Overview of WIPO Panel Views on Selected UDRP Questions, Third Edition (["WIPO Overview 3.0"](#)), "[t]he applicable Top Level Domain ('TLD') in a domain name (e.g., '.com',

‘.club’, ‘.nyc’) is viewed as a standard registration requirement and as such is disregarded under the first element confusing similarity test”.

Furthermore, “where the relevant trademark is recognizable within the disputed domain name, the addition of other terms (whether descriptive, geographical, pejorative, meaningless, or otherwise) would not prevent a finding of confusing similarity under the first element. The nature of such additional term(s) may however bear on assessment of the second and third elements”. See section 1.8 of the [WIPO Overview 3.0](#).

The disputed domain names are confusingly similar to the Complainant’s trademark as they include the Complainant’s trademark in its entirety combined with the terms “sale” and “outlet”, respectively. These additions do not prevent confusing similarity between the Complainant’s trademark and the disputed domain names.

This means that the disputed domain names are confusingly similar to the Complainant’s trademark and hence the first element of the Policy has been fulfilled.

B. Rights or Legitimate Interests

Paragraph 4(a)(ii) of the Policy requires that the Complainant establish that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain names.

It is widely accepted among UDRP panels that once a complainant has made a *prima facie* showing indicating the absence of the respondent’s rights or legitimate interests in a disputed domain name the burden of production shifts to the respondent to come forward with evidence of such rights or legitimate interests. If the respondent fails to do so, the complainant is deemed to have satisfied the second element of the Policy. See, e.g., *Document Technologies, Inc. v. International Electronic Communications Inc.*, WIPO Case No. [D2000-0270](#), and section 2.1 of the [WIPO Overview 3.0](#).

The Complainant has credibly submitted that the Respondent is neither affiliated with the Complainant in any way nor has it been authorized by the Complainant to use and register the disputed domain names, that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain names, and that the Respondent has not made and is not making a legitimate noncommercial or fair use of the disputed domain names and is not commonly known by the disputed domain names in accordance with paragraph 4(c)(ii) of the Policy.

Moreover, the Panel finds that the nature of the disputed domain names carries a risk of implied affiliation with the Complainant’s trademark. See section 2.5.1 of the [WIPO Overview 3.0](#).

Accordingly, the Panel finds that the Complainant has made a *prima facie* case that has not been rebutted by the Respondent. Considering the Panel’s findings below, the Panel finds that there are no other circumstances that provide the Respondent with any rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain names. Therefore, the Panel finds that the second element of the Policy is fulfilled.

C. Registered and Used in Bad Faith

Paragraph 4(a)(iii) of the Policy requires that the Complainant establish that the disputed domain names have been registered and are being used in bad faith. Paragraph 4(b) of the Policy provides that the following circumstances, in particular but without limitation, if found by the Panel to be present, shall be evidence of the registration and use of a domain name in bad faith:

“(i) circumstances indicating that [the respondent has] registered or has 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 [the respondent’s] documented out-of-pocket costs directly related to the domain name; or

(ii) [the respondent has] 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 [the respondent has] engaged in a pattern of such conduct; or

(iii) [the respondent has] registered the domain name primarily for the purpose of disrupting the business or competitor; or

(iv) by using the domain name, [the respondent has] intentionally attempted to attract, for commercial gain, Internet users to [the respondent's] 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 [the respondent's] website or location or of a product or service on [the respondent's] website or location."

Considering that the Complainant has been using and registering its trademark for several decades before the disputed domain names were registered, and taking into account the activity to which the disputed domain names have been put, the Respondent must have been aware of the Complainant and its trademark when registering the disputed domain names. See section 3.1.4 of the [WIPO Overview 3.0](#).

The disputed domain names resolve to websites offering products competing with the Complainant's products and reproducing the Complainant's logo and images from the Complainant's official website without a disclaimer. Therefore, the Panel finds that the Respondent has intentionally attempted to attract, for commercial gain, Internet users to the Respondent's website by creating a likelihood of confusion with the Complainant's trademark as to the source of the products on the Respondent's website.

Therefore, the Panel finds that the third element of the Policy is fulfilled.

7. Decision

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

/Tuukka Airaksinen/

Tuukka Airaksinen

Sole Panelist

Date: April 11, 2023