

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

SEB S.A. v. Dorothy Ahearne
Case No. D2025-0722

1. The Parties

The Complainant is SEB S.A., France, represented by CSC Digital Brand Services Group AB, Sweden.

The Respondent is Dorothy Ahearne, Germany.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <groupesebb.com> is registered with NameCheap, Inc. (the “Registrar”).

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the “Center”) on February 21, 2025. On February 21, 2025, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On the same day, 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 (Redacted for Privacy, Privacy service provided by Withheld for Privacy ehf) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on February 24, 2025, 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 February 28, 2025.

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 March 3, 2025. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was March 23, 2025. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent’s default on March 24, 2025.

The Center appointed Daniel Peña as the sole panelist in this matter on March 28, 2025. 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 parent company of the French consortium, Groupe SEB.

Groupe SEB produces small appliances and is one of the largest manufacturers of cookware. The brands in its portfolio include WMF, Tefal, Krups, and Moulinex.

The Complainant, based in France, is a worldwide reference in small domestic appliances, including kitchen electric goods, home and personal care together with cookware products. The Complainant claims to have 31,000 employees and a presence across 150 countries, maintaining 44 industrial sites along with 1,200 retail stores, and holding over 400 patents. In 2023, the Complainant reported sales of EUR 8,006 million and net income of EUR 386 million.

The Complainant holds numerous registrations of GROUPE SEB trademark, including No. 3374966 French trademark, registered on February 8, 2005; No. 894757 International trademark, registered on January 26, 2006; No. 00800894757 the United Kingdom ("UK") trademark, registered on August 6, 2007; No. 37043768 Chinese trademark, registered on April 21, 2020.

The Complainant also owns the domain name <groupeseb.com> incorporating its GROUPE SEB trademark, registered on May 1, 1996, and has been resolving the domain name as its official website.

The disputed domain name was registered on February 11, 2025. It resolves to a website with pay-per-click ("PPC") links and it was used to send fraudulent emails.

5. Parties' Contentions

A. Complainant

The Complainant asserts that it has met all the criteria outlined in the Policy for the transfer of the disputed domain name. Specifically, the Complainant argues that the disputed domain name is a deliberate misspelling of its GROUPE SEB trademark, differing only by the addition of the letter "b." This minor alteration makes the disputed domain name confusingly similar to the Complainant's trademark, demonstrating a clear case of typosquatting.

The generic Top-Level Domain ("gTLD") ".com" is disregarded under the first element confusing similarity test. Thus, the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to the Complainant's GROUPE SEB trademark. The Complainant further contends that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the disputed domain name.

The Respondent has no relationship with the Complainant, and the Complainant has not licensed or otherwise permitted the Respondent to use the GROUPE SEB trademark or to register a domain name incorporating this trademark. The Respondent is not commonly known by the disputed domain name. The disputed domain name redirects to a website with PPC links, which serves as further evidence of the Respondent's lack of rights and legitimate interests.

The Complainant finally contends that the disputed domain name was registered and is being used in bad faith. The Complainant and its GROUPE SEB trademark has gained a high reputation worldwide. The Respondent should have awareness of the Complainant and its GROUPE SEB trademark when registering the disputed domain name. Moreover, the Respondent is using the disputed domain name as part of a fraudulent scheme targeting the Complainant's customers. The Respondent impersonates the Complainant to attempt to obtain fraudulent payments, sensitive financial and/or business information from the Complainant's customer.

B. Respondent

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

6. Discussion and Findings

To succeed, the Complainant must demonstrate that all of the elements listed in paragraph 4(a) of the Policy have been satisfied: (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 has been registered and is being used in bad faith. Considering these requirements, the Panel rules as follows:

A. Identical or Confusingly Similar

The Panel holds that the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to the Complainant's trademarks GROUPE SEB. The Respondent's incorporation of a typo-variant of the Complainant's trademarks in the disputed domain name is evidence that the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to the Complainant's marks. Mere inclusion of letter "b" at the end does not prevent a finding of confusing similarity between the disputed domain name and the Complainant's marks.

The Complainant has provided evidence of its rights in the trademarks on the basis of its multiple GROUPE SEB trademark registrations in the United States of America and the UK, France, China as well as International registrations. A trademark registration provides a clear indication that the Complainant has trademark rights for purposes of standing to file a UDRP case (see WIPO Overview of WIPO Panel Views on Selected UDRP Questions, Third Edition ("[WIPO Overview 3.0](#)"), section 1.2.1). It has also been established by prior UDRP panels that when a trademark is sufficiently recognizable in a domain name it will be considered confusingly similar to the trademark. Such findings were confirmed, for example, within sections 1.7 and 1.9 of the [WIPO Overview 3.0](#). Further, the addition of the gTLD ".com" to the disputed domain name is a standard registration requirement and as such is disregarded.

The Panel is satisfied that the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to the Complainant's mark and the Complainant has satisfied the requirement of paragraph 4(a)(i) of the Policy.

B. Rights or Legitimate Interests

While the overall burden of proof in UDRP proceedings is on the complainant, panels have recognized that proving a respondent lacks rights or legitimate interests in a domain name may result in the often impossible 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. If the respondent fails to come forward with such relevant evidence, the complainant is deemed to have satisfied the second element (see section 2.1 of the [WIPO Overview 3.0](#)).

The Complainant has made a prima facie showing that the Respondent does not have any rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name, including by asserting that the Respondent is not affiliated with it in any way and that it never authorized the Respondent to use its trademark as part of the disputed domain name. There is no evidence that the Respondent is commonly known by the disputed domain name.

The Panel notes that the Respondent has not filed any response and thus did not deny the Complainant's assertions, nor brought any information or evidence demonstrating any rights or legitimate interests.

Accordingly, the Panel finds that the Complainant satisfied the requirements of paragraph 4(a)(ii) of the Policy.

C. Registered and Used in Bad Faith

Paragraph 4(b) of the Policy stipulates that any of the following circumstances, inter alia, shall be considered as evidence of the registration and use of a domain name in bad faith: (i) circumstances indicating that the respondent registered or 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) circumstances indicating that the respondent 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) circumstances indicating that the respondent registered the domain name primarily for the purpose of disrupting the business of a competitor; or (iv) circumstances indicating that the respondent is using the domain name to intentionally attempt to attract, for commercial gain, Internet users to its 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 its website or location.

With regard to the bad faith at the time of registration, the Panel notes that it is not likely that the Respondent was not aware of the Complainant and its trademark. On the contrary, the Panel finds that it is likely that the Respondent was aware of the Complainant and its rights and reputation in the GROUP SEB mark at the time the disputed domain name was registered. Bad faith can be presumed based on the widely evidenced recognition of the Complainant's marks and typosquatting nature of the disputed domain name (discussed further below), such that the Respondent was most likely aware of the Complainant's well-known marks and related rights.

The Panel finds that the Respondent has registered the disputed domain name that contains the Complainant's trademark GROUP SEB, with mere inclusion of letter "b" at the end. This kind of conduct is considered as an act of typosquatting or registering a domain name that is a common misspelling of a mark in which a party has rights and has often been recognized as evidence of bad faith registration. See *Paragon Gifts, Inc. v. Domain.Contact*, WIPO Case No. [D2004-0107](#) (citing *National Association of Professional Baseball Leagues, Inc., d/b/a Minor League Baseball v. John Zuccarini*, WIPO Case No. [D2002-1011](#)); and *ESPN, Inc. v. XC2*, WIPO Case No. [D2005-0444](#) (finding that the practice of typosquatting is evidence of bad faith).

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, but other circumstances also may be relevant in assessing whether a respondent's registration and use of a domain name is in bad faith.

[WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 3.2.1.

The disputed domain name, which is a typosquatted version of the Complainant's trademark, resolves to a website with PPC links. The evidence provided by the Complainant also demonstrates that the disputed domain name was still actively used for email services, i.e., for sending emails which impersonate the Complainant. Moreover, the Respondent's fraudulent emails included some of the details of the Complainant to obtain fraudulent payments. Such use of the disputed domain name can only be observed as clear evidence of the Respondent's bad faith (see, in particular, [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 3.4).

Considering the above circumstances, the Panel concludes that the Respondent has used the disputed domain name in an unlawful attempt to impersonate the Complainant, by way of an email fraud. This clearly constitutes evidence of bad faith registration and use. Accordingly, the Panel finds, based on the evidence presented, that the Respondent registered and is using the disputed domain name in bad faith. Therefore, the Complainant has satisfied paragraph 4(a)(iii) 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 <groupesebb.com> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Daniel Peña/

Daniel Peña

Sole Panelist

Date: April 14, 2025