

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

Société de Négoce et de Participation v. Chubin Huang
Case No. D2026-2466

1. The Parties

The Complainant is Société de Négoce et de Participation, France, represented by Dreyfus & associés, France.

The Respondent is Chubin Huang, China.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <sonepar.website> is registered with Porkbun LLC (the “Registrar”).

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the “Center”) on June 8, 2026. On June 8, 2026, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On June 9, 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 (Whois Privacy, Private by Design, LLC) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on June 10, 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 June 11, 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 June 15, 2026. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was July 5, 2026. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent’s default on July 7, 2026.

The Center appointed Eric Macramalla as the sole panelist in this matter on July 14, 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 the holding company of the Sonepar group of companies (collectively “Sonepar”).

Founded in 1969, Sonepar is an independent family-owned company with global market leadership in B-to-B distribution of electrical products, solutions and related services. Sonepar operates in over 40 countries worldwide. Sonepar generated over USD 23 billion in sales in 2020.

The Complainant is the owner of several trademark registrations comprised of, or containing, SONEPAR (the “SONEPAR Trademarks”), including the following:

(a) SONEPAR & Design, France Registration No. 4815909, filed for use in association with Classes 7, 9, 11, 16, 19, 35, 37, 38, 39, 41 and 42, and issued to registration as of November 9, 2021;

(b) SONEPAR & Design, International Registration No. 1654996, filed for use in association with Classes 7, 9, 11, 35, 37, 38, 39, 41 and 42, and with protections granted in the United States of America, the European Union, the United Kingdom and China, and registered as of December 3, 2021; and

(c) SONEPAR, International Registration No. 736078, filed for use in association with Classes 9, 11, 37 and 39, and with protections granted in Austria, China, Estonia, Norway and Spain, and registered as of February 3, 2000.

The Complainant registered the domain name <sonepar.com> on April 17, 1997, and has actively used this domain name for decades for its official website.

The disputed domain name was registered on September 2, 2025.

At the time of the filing of the Complaint and at the time of the Decision, the disputed domain name was inactive.

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.

The Complainant has alleged that the disputed domain name is identical, or at least, confusingly similar to the SONEPAR Trademarks in which it has rights. The disputed domain name is comprised of the SONEPAR Trademarks.

The Complainant further argued that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name as contemplated by paragraph 4(c) of the Policy. The Complainant has not authorized the Respondent to use SONEPAR Trademarks and is not otherwise connected to the Respondent. The disputed domain name was registered long after the Complainant established rights in its marks. The Respondent’s activities do not indicate demonstrable preparations to use the disputed domain name, the Respondent is not commonly known by the disputed domain name, and the Respondent is not making any legitimate noncommercial or fair use of the disputed domain name.

The disputed domain name was registered and is used in bad faith as per paragraph 4(a)(iii). The Respondent is intentionally attempting to attract, for commercial gain, Internet users to its website by creating a likelihood of confusion with the Complainant's trademarks as to the source or sponsorship. The Respondent's passive holding of the disputed domain name also supports a finding of bad faith as does the Respondent's likely knowledge of the SONEPAR Trademarks.

B. Respondent

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

6. Discussion and Findings

As per paragraph 4(a) of the Policy, to succeed a complainant must establish the following:

- (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 respect of the disputed domain name; and
- (iii) the disputed domain name was registered and is being used in bad faith.

These elements are discussed in turn below. In considering these elements, paragraph 15(a) of the Rules provides that the Panel shall decide the Complaint on the basis of statements and documents submitted and in accordance with the Policy, the Rules and any other rules or principles of law that the Panel deems applicable.

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.

A respondent may not avoid a finding of identity or confusing similarity by appropriating another's entire mark in a disputed domain name. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.7.

The generic Top-Level Domain is typically disregarded in determining the issue of confusing similarity. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.11.

The Complainant has established rights in respect of a trademark for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.2.1. The Complainant has established longstanding rights in the SONEPAR Trademarks in numerous jurisdictions worldwide.

Furthermore, the Panel finds the mark is recognizable within the disputed domain name. The disputed domain name is solely comprised of the SONEPAR trademark. Under the circumstances, the Respondent cannot avoid a finding of identity between the disputed domain name and the Complainant's trademark.

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 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, on a balance of probabilities, that 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 Complainant has not authorized, licensed, or otherwise permitted, the Respondent to use the SONEPAR Trademarks in any manner, including as part of a domain name. There is also no evidence that the Respondent is commonly known by the disputed domain name. There is also no basis to conclude that the Respondent is making legitimate noncommercial or fair use of the disputed domain name, without intent for commercial gain to misleadingly divert consumers or to tarnish the trademark or service mark at issue. Further, prior UDRP panels have found that domain names identical to a complainant’s trademark carry a high risk of implied affiliation. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 2.5.1.

There is also no evidence that the Respondent has used, or made demonstrable preparations to use, the disputed domain name in connection with a bona fide offering of goods or services.

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.

While paragraph 4(b) of the Policy sets out a list of non-exhaustive circumstances that may indicate that a domain name was registered and used in bad faith, other circumstances may also be relevant in assessing whether a respondent’s registration and use of a domain name is in bad faith. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 3.2.1.

Panels have found that the non-use of a domain name (including a blank or “coming soon” page) would not by itself prevent a finding of bad faith under the doctrine of passive holding. To the contrary, in looking at the totality of circumstances in each case, panels have found that the registration and non-use of a domain name can still constitute bad faith for purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 3.3.

In the present case, the disputed domain name, which was registered years after the Complainant registered its trademark, is identical to the Complainant’s registered SONEPAR trademark and, if ever put to use, is likely to cause confusion among Internet users as to the source, affiliation, or sponsorship of the associated website. The foregoing supports a finding of bad faith registration pursuant to paragraph 4(b)(iv) of the Policy.

Furthermore, the passive holding of the disputed domain name contributes to a finding of bad faith for purposes of the Policy.

The SONEPAR trademark is a coined term, is inherently distinctive, has been in use for decades, and is the subject of many trademark registrations worldwide. The disputed domain name is comprised exclusively of the SONEPAR trademark. The Panel therefore concludes that the Respondent knew, or should have known, that the disputed domain name would be identical to, the Complainant's trademark. Any claim to the contrary would strain credulity. The foregoing further supports a finding of bad faith use.

Therefore, having reviewed the record, the Panel finds the registration and use of the disputed domain name constitutes bad faith under the Policy.

The Panel therefore 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 <sonepar.website> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Eric Macramalla/

Eric Macramalla

Sole Panelist

Date: July 28, 2026