

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

Lincoln Global, Inc., The Lincoln Electric Company v. Debi Draft, Name Redacted¹

Case No. D2025-2165

1. The Parties

The Complainants are Lincoln Global, Inc., and The Lincoln Electric Company, United States of America ("United States"), represented by CSC Digital Brand Services Group AB, Sweden. Unless otherwise specified, the Complainants shall be herein referred to jointly as "the Complainant".

The Respondent is Debi Draft, Name Redacted, United States.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <lincolnelectrcs.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 June 3, 2025. On June 3, 2025, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On June 3, 2025, 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 June 4, 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 the same date.

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

¹ The Respondent appears to have used the name of a third party as its organization when registering the disputed domain name. In light of the potential identity theft, the Panel has redacted the organization name of Respondent from this decision. However, the Panel has attached as Annex 1 to this decision an instruction to the Registrar regarding transfer of the disputed domain names, which includes the name of the organization of Respondent. The Panel has authorized the Center to transmit Annex 1 to the Registrar as part of the order in this proceeding and has indicated Annex 1 to this decision shall not be published due to the exceptional circumstances of this case. See *Banco Bradesco S.A. v. FAST-12785241 Attn. Bradescourgente.net / Name Redacted*, WIPO Case No. [D2009-1788](#).

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 5, 2025. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was June 25, 2025. On June 16, 2025, the Center received an email communication from a third party.

The Center appointed Colin T. O’Brien as the sole panelist in this matter on July 1, 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 was founded in 1895 to sell electric motors. Currently the Complainant designs, develops and manufactures arc welding products, robotic arc welding systems, plasma and oxy-fuel cutting equipment and has top five leading global position in the brazing and soldering alloys market.

The Complainant operates 71 manufacturing and automation system integration locations across 21 countries and maintains a worldwide network of distributors and sales offices serving customers in over 160 countries. The Complainant employs over 12,000 employees worldwide and in 2023 reported sales of USD 4.2 billion.

The Complainant’s primary domain name <lincolnelectric.com> has received an average of 462,000 hits per month in the period ranging October 2024 to December 2024.

The Complainant also owns numerous registrations for LINCOLN ELECTRIC globally, including:

LINCOLN ELECTRIC European Union Reg. No. 004725941 registered November 27, 2006, in Classes 6, 9, and 35;

LINCOLN ELECTRIC European Union Reg. No. 015346935 registered August 31, 2016, in Classes 1, 7, and 8;

LINCOLN ELECTRIC European Union Reg. No. 004982468 registered January 15, 2008, in Classes 6, 7, 9, and 35;

LINCOLN ELECTRIC United States Reg. No. 2350082 registered May 16, 2000, in Class 9;

LINCOLN ELECTRIC United States Reg. No. 2420805 registered January 16, 2001, in Class 35;

LINCOLN ELECTRIC United States Reg. No. 3114157 registered July 11, 2006, in Class 6;

LINCOLN ELECTRIC Canada Reg. No. TMA573494 registered January 13, 2003, in Class 1;

LINCOLN ELECTRIC Canada Reg. No. TMA574202 registered January 22, 2003, in Classes 7, and 9.

The disputed domain name was registered on April 10, 2025. The Complainant has provided evidence that the disputed domain name resolved to a parked page displaying pay-per click (“PPC”) links.

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 a purposeful misspelling of the Complainant’s LINCOLN ELECTRIC trademark and must be considered confusingly similar to the Complainant’s trademark. The disputed domain name varies from the Complainant’s trademark by two

letters – the Respondent has removed the letter “i” from and added the letter “s” to the term “electrics”. The Respondent’s disputed domain name must be considered a prototypical example of typosquatting – which intentionally takes advantage of Internet users that inadvertently type an incorrect address – often a misspelling of a complainant’s trademark – when seeking to access the trademark owner’s website.

The Respondent is not sponsored by or affiliated with the Complainant in any way. Furthermore, the Complainant has not given the Respondent permission to use the Complainant’s trademarks in any manner, including in domain names. The Respondent is not commonly known by the disputed domain name, which evinces a lack of rights or legitimate interests. The Complainant has not licensed, authorized, or permitted the Respondent to register domain names incorporating the Complainant’s trademark.

The Respondent is using the disputed domain name to redirect Internet users to a website featuring links to third-party websites, some of which directly compete with the Complainant’s business. The disputed domain name has been set up by the Respondent with an email enabling mail-exchange (“MX”) records. The Respondent is likely to use or intends to use the email addresses hosted by the disputed domain name, to confuse Internet users into believing they are dealing with the Complainant when they are not. The Respondent’s likely intent to use emails from the disputed domain name to pass itself off as the Complainant and/or for fraudulent purposes is neither a bona fide offering of goods or services.

The Complainant and its LINCOLN ELECTRIC trademark are known internationally, with trademark registrations in Europe, United States, and Canada. The Complainant has marketed and sold its goods and services using this trademark since 1915, which is well before the Respondent’s registration of the disputed domain name on April 10, 2025.

By registering a domain name that is a two letter-typo of the Complainant’s trademark, the Respondent has created a domain name that is confusingly similar to the Complainant’s trademark, as well as its domain name. As such, the Respondent has demonstrated a knowledge of and familiarity with the Complainant’s brand and business. Furthermore, the very composition of the disputed domain name makes it illogical to believe that the Respondent registered the disputed domain name without specifically targeting the Complainant.

The Respondent creates a likelihood of confusion with the Complainant and its trademarks by registering a domain name that misspells the Complainant’s trademark by one letter, which demonstrates that the Respondent is using the disputed domain name to confuse unsuspecting Internet users looking for the Complainant’s services, and to mislead Internet users as to the source of the disputed domain name and website. By creating this likelihood of confusion between the Complainant’s trademarks and the disputed domain name, leading to misperceptions as to the source, sponsorship, affiliation, or endorsement of the disputed domain name, the Respondent has demonstrated a nefarious intent to capitalize on the fame and goodwill of the Complainant’s trademarks in order to increase traffic to the disputed domain name’s website for the Respondent’s own pecuniary gain, as evidenced by the presence of multiple PPC links posted to the Respondent’s website.

B. Respondent

The Respondent did not reply to the Complainant’s contentions. However, on June 16, 2025, the Center received submission from a third party indicating no relation to the disputed domain name.

6. Discussion and Findings

A. Identical or Confusingly Similar

The Complainant has demonstrated it owns registered trademark rights in the LINCOLN ELECTRIC mark. The disputed domain name differs from the Complainant’s LINCOLN ELECTRIC mark by removing the letter “i” from and adding the letter “s” to the term “electrics” which does not prevent a finding of confusing similarity

between the mark and the disputed domain name. See section 1.9 of the WIPO Overview of WIPO Panel Views on Selected UDRP Questions, Third Edition ("[WIPO Overview 3.0](#)").

Accordingly, the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to the mark in which the Complainant has rights.

B. Rights or Legitimate Interests

The Complainant has presented a prima facie case that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the disputed domain name and has not been commonly known by the disputed domain name. The fact that the Respondent obtained the disputed domain name which is a typo of the Complainant's primary domain name <lincolnelectric.com> indicates that the Respondent likely sought to piggyback on the Complainant's mark for illegitimate reasons.

After a complainant has made a prima facie case, the burden of production shifts to a respondent to present evidence demonstrating rights or legitimate interests in the domain name. See, e.g., *Croatia Airlines d.d. v. Modern Empire Internet Ltd.*, WIPO Case No. [D2003-0455](#).

Here, the Respondent has provided no evidence of any rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name. In the absence of any evidence rebutting the Complainant's prima facie case indicating the Respondent's lack of rights or legitimate interests in respect of the disputed domain name, the Panel finds that the Complainant has satisfied paragraph 4(a)(ii) of the Policy.

The Panel also notes that the Respondent's use of the disputed domain name to host a page with PPC links related to the Complainant's activity does not represent a finding of rights or legitimate interests on behalf of the Respondent. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 2.9.

C. Registered and Used in Bad Faith

The disputed domain name was registered years after the Complainant first used and registered its LINCOLN ELECTRIC mark. The evidence provided by the Complainant makes it clear that the Respondent undoubtedly knew of the Complainant's LINCOLN ELECTRIC mark and knew that it had no rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name when it was registered.

There is no apparent benign reason for the Respondent to have registered the disputed domain name that is a typo variant of the Complainant's mark.

The disputed domain name previously resolved to a parking page displaying PPC links to third-party goods and services including those in direct competition with those offered by the Complainant. Internet users seeking the Complainant online, including via the Complainant's domain name, were likely to be misled to the parking page to which the disputed domain name resolved. The Complainant infers that the Respondent derived click-through revenue from the presence of such links on the web page to which the disputed domain name resolved. Particularly with respect to "automatically" generated PPC links, panels have held that a respondent cannot disclaim responsibility for content appearing on the website associated with its domain name (nor would such links ipso facto vest the respondent with rights or legitimate interests). Neither the fact that such links are generated by a third party such as a registrar or auction platform (or their affiliate), nor the fact that the respondent itself may not have directly profited, would by itself prevent a finding of bad faith.

Using the disputed domain name in such a manner, the Respondent sought to obtain financial gain derived from the goodwill and reputation attached to the Complainant's trademarks, in bad faith. The presence of the disputed domain name in the hands of the Respondent represents an abusive threat hanging over the head of the Complainant (i.e., an abuse capable of being triggered by the Respondent at any time). There is clear potential for the disputed domain name to be used in a manner that could easily mislead the Complainant's clients into disclosing their confidential account information, which may in turn be used to commit acts of fraud.

Accordingly, the Panel finds that the disputed domain name has been registered and is being used in bad faith.

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 <lincolnelectrcs.com> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Colin T. O'Brien/

Colin T. O'Brien

Sole Panelist

Date: July 15, 2025