ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

ENGIE v. Cane Krer
Case No. D2026-1527

1. The Parties

The Complainant is ENGIE, France, represented by Cabinet Germain & Maureau, France.

The Respondent is Cane Krer, United States of America ("United States").

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <engie-eu.com> (the "Disputed Domain Name") is registered with NameSilo, LLC (the "Registrar").

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the "Center") on April 10, 2026. On April 10, 2026, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the Disputed Domain Name. On April 13, 2026, 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 (PrivacyGuardian.org) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on April 15, 2026, 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 amended Complaint on April 15, 2026.

The Center verified that the Complaint together with the amended 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 April 21, 2026. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was May 11, 2026. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent's default on May 28, 2026.

The Center appointed Michael D. Cover as the sole panelist in this matter on June 3, 2026. 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 French public limited liability company (société anonyme), having its registered office at La Garenne-Colombes, France, registered with the Nanterre Trade and Companies Register.

The Complainant previously had its registered office at Paris La Defense Cedex, France and the corresponding update of the Complainant’s address is currently in the process of being recorded with the relevant trademark offices.

The Complainant is a global industrial group operating in the fields of energy, energy services and the energy transition. The Complainant’s group is present in more than 31 countries and is actively engaged in the production of low carbon energy, the decarbonization of energy uses and the development of sustainable energy infrastructure. The origins of ENGIE date back to 1946 with the creation of Gaz de France (GDF), a state-owned entity established to manage the natural gas sector in France. Following the separation of EDF and GDF in 2004, GDF merged with Suez in 2008 to form GDF Suez. In 2015, the group was rebranded as ENGIE to reflect its international positioning and its strategic shift towards renewable energy and energy services. The Complainant currently employs more than 90,000 people worldwide and has reported revenues of Euro 73.8 billion (annually).

The Complainant is the proprietor of numerous word and figurative trademarks consisting of or incorporating the mark ENGIE, registered in France and internationally, notably in connection with goods and services related to energy, industry, technology and associated fields.

The Complainant's registered trademarks include the following:

France No 4169708 ENGE, registered on March 31, 2015	Classes 1, 4, 7, 9, 11, 35, 42, 45.
European Union No 014337133 ENGIE, registered on February 20, 2016	Classes 1, 4, 7, 9, 11, 35, 42, 45
International No 1282376 ENGIE (device), registered on October 09, 2015	Classes 1, 4, 1 1, 35, 37, 40, 42, 45

The Complainant has also registered several domain names, which include the mark ENGIE, including the following:

<engie.com> registered September 30, 2003,
<engie.fr> registered February 23, 2015,
<engie.sk> registered April 16, 2015.

The ENGIE mark has been used continuously by the Complainant in connection with its business activities.

The Disputed Domain Name was registered on December 15, 2025.

The Disputed Domain Name resolves to a registrar-provided parking page containing Pay-Per-Click (“PPC”) advertising links directly-related to the Complainant’s industry and products.

5. Parties' Contentions

A. Complainant

The Complainant contends that it has satisfied each of the elements required under the Policy for a transfer of the Disputed Domain Name.

Identical or Confusingly Similar

Notably, the Complainant contends that the Disputed Domain Name fully and identically reproduces the Complainant's brand and company ENGIE, with the mere addition of a geographic term "eu" and also the generic Top- Level Domain ("gTLD") ".com". The Complainant submits that the addition of the geographic term "eu" in the Disputed Domain Name is not sufficient to avoid confusing similarity with the ENGIE trademark in which the Complainant has rights.

The Complainant notes that "engie" is a coined and inherently distinctive term, with no generic or descriptive meaning, and that its incorporation as the dominant element of the Disputed Domain Name remains immediately recognizable and that the mere addition of the geographic suffix "eu" does not alter this perception.

The Complainant states that it has consistently and successfully enforced its rights in previous domain name disputes and, for the aforementioned reasons in the Complaint, concludes that the Disputed Domain Name is confusingly similar to the earlier rights of ENGIE.

Rights or Legitimate Interests

The Complainant submits the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interest in the Disputed Domain Name and states that there is no business affiliation between the Complainant and the Respondent nor any permission or license given to the Respondent by the Complainant to use the Complainant's ENGIE trademark in any manner. The Complainant also states the prior rights in its ENGIE trademark date back prior to the Respondent's registration of the Disputed Domain Name, leading to the likelihood that consumers may mistakenly believe that the Disputed Domain Name comes from the same undertaking or from affiliated companies. The Complainant also submits that the ENGIE trademark is notorious.

The Complainant continues that the term ENGIE is inherently distinctive and does not correspond to any generic or descriptive meaning and that a simple search on commonly-used search engines would have been sufficient to for the Respondent to ascertain the legal unavailability of the term ENGIE and its exclusive association with the Complainant. The Complainant also notes that the Registrar provided the registrant information following the UDRP Complaint and that the Respondent is Cane Krer, who is unknown to the Complainant and has never been affiliated with nor authorized by the Complainant to act on its behalf or register the Disputed Domain Name.

Registered and Used in Bad Faith

The Complainant states that its ENGIE mark is inherently distinctive and widely recognized in the energy sector and that it is protected by numerous trademark registrations worldwide and has been extensively used in connection with the Complainant's activities on a global scale. The Complainant submits that, in the light of the reputation and visibility of the ENGIE mark, it is inconceivable that the Respondent registered the Disputed Domain Name without prior knowledge of the Complainant and its rights.

The Complainant submits that the combination of the reproduction of the ENGIE trademark and the mere addition of the geographic abbreviation "eu" creates a direct association with the Complainant's European activities and is likely to be perceived by Internet users as designating an official or regional website operated by the Complainant.

The Complainant continues that the Respondent therefore knew or, at the very least, should have known of the Complainant’s rights at the time of registration of the Disputed Domain Name.

The Complainant then moves to say that the Respondent’s bad faith is further evidenced by the manner in which the Disputed Domain Name has been used and configured, which, in particular in the circumstances of the case reveal both a direct exploitation of the Disputed Domain Name through PPC advertising and clear indications for email-based fraudulent use. The Complainant submits that this use capitalizes on the Complainant’s reputation by diverting Internet users seeking the Complainant’s products to sponsored content from which the Respondent or the registrar derives revenue.

The Complainant states that the PPC content is specifically targeted to the Complainant’s sector, which reinforces the conclusion that the Respondent’s purpose in registering the Disputed Domain Name was to exploit the association with the Complainant's brand. The Complainant concludes that this unauthorized use of the Complainant’s rights clearly shows that the Respondent intentionally attempted to attract, for commercial gain, Internet users to the Respondent’s website or other on-line 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 by virtue of paragraph 4(b) of the Policy.

The Complainant then turns to what it calls preparations for email-based fraudulent use. The Complainant submits that the Respondent has undertaken deliberate technical steps that indicate preparation for fraudulent activities.

The Complainant submits that the Respondent’s contact details further support a finding of bad faith, in that the Respondent is identified as Cane Krer, which, the Complainant says, does not correspond to any verifiable individual and bears the hallmarks of a fictitious or fabricated identity. At the same time, the email address provided, says the Complainant, seems to be associated with the domain name of a legitimate United States based executive search firm, and that there is no evidence that the Respondent is authorized to use an email address linked to that entity. Taking all this into account, submits the Complainant, the use of a non-existent email account, combined with the appropriation of a third party identity, demonstrates a deliberate attempt by the Respondent to conceal its true identity and mislead third parties. The Complainant concludes that previous panels have consistently held the provision of false WhoIs details, particularly coupled with elements of impersonation or identity theft, constitutes compelling evidence of bad faith registration and use.

The Complainant then submits that these indications show that the Respondent does not have legitimate interest in the Disputed Domain Name, which it has registered and used in bad faith.

The Complainant requests that, for the reasons described, the Administrative Panel appointed in this administrative proceeding decide that the Disputed Domain Name be transferred to the Complainant.

B. Respondent

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

6. Discussion and Findings

A. 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 its ENGIE trademark for the purposes of the Policy. WIPO Overview 3.1, section 1.2.1.

The entirety of the mark is reproduced within the Disputed Domain Name. Accordingly, the Disputed Domain Name is confusingly similar to the ENIGIE trademark for the purposes of the Policy. WIPO Overview 3.1, section 1.7.

Although the addition of other terms, (here "eu"), may bear on assessment of the second and third elements, the Panel finds the addition of such term does not prevent a finding of confusing similarity between the Disputed Domain Name and the ENGIE trademark for the purposes of the Policy. WIPO Overview 3.1, section 1.8.

Further, it is well-established in UDRP decisions that the applicable gTLD, in this case, ".com", is a standard registration requirement and is typically ignored in considering confusing similarity.

The Panel finds the first element of the Policy has been established.

B. Rights or 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 recognized that proving that a respondent lacks rights or legitimate interests in a disputed 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.

The Respondent has not demonstrated, before notice of the dispute, use or demonstrable preparations to use the Disputed Domain Name in connection with a bona fide offering of goods or services, that the Respondent has been commonly-known by the Disputed Domain Name or that the Respondent is making legitimate noncommercial or fair use of the Disputed Domain Name, without intent for commercial gain misleadingly to divert consumers or to tarnish the reputation of the Complainant's ENGIE trademark.

The Panel further notes that the Disputed Domain Name resolves to a website featuring PPC links related to the Complainant's business. Under these circumstances, the Panel finds that such use does not establish rights or legitimate interests. WIPO Overview 3.1, section 2.9.

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

C. Registered and Used in Bad Faith

The Panel notes that, for the purposes of paragraph 4(a)(iii) of the Policy, paragraph 4(b) of the Policy establishes circumstances, in particular, but without limitation, that, if found by the Panel to be present, shall be evidence of the registration and use of a domain name in bad faith.

In the present case, the Panel notes that the Respondent has intentionally attempted to attract, for commercial gain, Internet users by creating a likelihood of confusion with the Complainant’s ENGIE trademark, through the PPC site, as set out already in this Decision. The Complainant established rights in its ENGIE mark prior to the registration of the disputed domain name.

Having reviewed the record, the Panel finds the Respondent’s registration and use of the Disputed Domain Name constitutes bad faith under the Policy.

The Panel finds that the Complainant has established the third element of the Policy.

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 Name <engie-eu.com> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Michael D. Cover/
Michael D. Cover
Sole Panelist
Date: June 17, 2026