

## **ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION**

Schneider Electric SE v. Luther Vandross  
Case No. D2025-1647

### **1. The Parties**

The Complainant is Schneider Electric SE, France, represented by Nameshield, France.

The Respondent is Luther Vandross, Nigeria.

### **2. The Domain Name and Registrar**

The disputed domain name <schneider-electrlc.com> is registered with GMO Internet, Inc. d/b/a Discount-Domain.com and Onamae.com (the “Registrar”).

### **3. Procedural History**

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the “Center”) on April 24, 2025. On April 24, 2025, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On April 25, 2025, the Registrar transmitted by email to the Center its verification response confirming that the Respondent is listed as the registrant and providing the contact details.

The Center verified that 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 May 2, 2025. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was May 22, 2025. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent’s default on May 30, 2025.

The Center appointed Saisunder Nedungal Vidhya Bhaskar as the sole panelist in this matter on June 10, 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 a French industrial business trading internationally and was founded in 1871, which manufactures and offers products for power management, automation, and related solutions.

The Complainant owns several trademarks containing the term “Schneider Electric”, including the following:

- International trademark for SCHNEIDER ELECTRIC bearing registration No.715395 registered since March 15, 1999, designating various jurisdictions and
- European Union trademark for SCHNEIDER ELECTRIC bearing No. 001103803 registered since September 9, 2005.

The Complainant is the owner of the domain name <schneiderelectric.com> registered since April 4, 1996.

The disputed domain name <schnelder-electrlc.com> was registered on April 14, 2025, and does not resolve to an active webpage but Mail Exchange (“MX”) servers are configured.

#### **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.

Notably, the Complainant contends that:

- the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to its trademark SCHNEIDER ELECTRIC and its associated domain names. The obvious misspelling of the Complainant’s trademark SCHNEIDER ELECTRIC (i.e. the substitution of the letters “i” by the letters “l”) is characteristic of a typosquatting practice intended to create confusing similarity between the Complainant’s trademark and the disputed domain name.
- that the disputed domain name is a typosquatted version of the trademark SCHNEIDER ELECTRIC, in an attempt to take advantage of Internet users’ typographical errors and thereby lacking rights and legitimate interests in the disputed domain name. Also, the disputed domain name is not put to use by the Respondent.
- The disputed domain name incorporates misspelled well-known trademark of the Complainant with an intention to be confusingly similar to the Complainant’s mark. The Complainant has relied on previous UDRP panel decisions inferring bad faith from incorporation of famous trademark in domain names coupled with inactive webpage. Furthermore, MX servers have been configured with the disputed domain name which suggests that it could be used for emailing purposes.

##### **B. Respondent**

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

#### **6. Discussion and Findings**

For this Complaint to succeed in relation to the disputed domain name the Complainant must prove that:

- (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.

## **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 Selected UDRP Questions, Third Edition, (["WIPO Overview 3.0"](#)), section 1.7.

The Complainant has shown rights in respect of a trademark or service mark for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 1.2.1. The Panel finds that the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to the Complainant's registered trademark for following reasons:

- the disputed domain name includes the Complainant's mark, with only replacement of the letter "i" by "l" in the trademark constituting an obvious misspelling of the Complainant's trademark SCHNEIDER ELECTRIC which does not prevent a finding of confusing similarity (see section 1.9 of the [WIPO Overview 3.0](#)); and
- the disputed domain name merely contains hyphen between the two words, which does nothing to prevent the registered trademark of the Complainant be recognized within the disputed domain name.

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 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 3.0](#), 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, since it has never assigned, granted, licensed, or in any way authorized the Respondent to use the SCHNEIDER ELECTRIC trademark in any manner. 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.

Furthermore, the Panel notes that the disputed domain name incorporates the Complainant's SCHNEIDER ELECTRIC trademark with only a hyphen in between the words and replacement of the letter "i" by "l" in the trademark constituting an obvious misspelling of the Complainant's trademark SCHNEIDER ELECTRIC that can cause confusion among Internet users and accordingly cannot constitute a fair use in these circumstances.

Having reviewed the record, the Panel finds the Complainant has established a prima facie case that the Respondent lacks rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain names.

### **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 deliberately chosen the well-known trademark of the Complainant with obvious misspelling amounting to typo-squatting which itself amounts to bad faith. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 3.1.4. The Complainant's trademark was registered well before the registration of the disputed domain name, and it is inconceivable that the Respondent was not aware of the well-known trademark. On the contrary the fact that the letter "i" has been replaced with "l" shows the intention of the Respondent to mislead the Internet users looking for the Complainant, which amounts to confusion amongst the public. It is also pertinent to note that MX servers have been activated which means that the Respondent may use the email address associated with the disputed domain name and hence the Panel is aware and acknowledges the risk to the reputation and goodwill of the Complainant through such actions.

Accordingly, the Panel finds that the third element of the Policy is established by the Complainant.

### **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 <schneider-electrlc.com> be transferred to the Complainant.

*/Saisunder Nedungal Vidhya Bhaskar/*

**Saisunder Nedungal Vidhya Bhaskar**

Sole Panelist

Date: June 18, 2025