

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

Tyco International Services GmbH v. Jullian Sotirov, Hermes Engineering
Case No. D2025-2773

1. The Parties

The Complainant is Tyco International Services GmbH, Switzerland, represented by Neal & McDevitt, United States of America ("United States").

The Respondent is Jullian Sotirov, Hermes Engineering, Bulgaria.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <te-connectors.com> is registered with Tucows Domains Inc. (the "Registrar").

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the "Center") on July 15, 2025. On July 15, 2025, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On July 15, 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") and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on July 16, 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 July 18, 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 July 30, 2025. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was August 19, 2025. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent's default on August 20, 2025.

The Center appointed Eva Fiammenghi as the sole panelist in this matter on August 29, 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 company organized under the laws of Switzerland, with its principal place of business in Schaffhausen, Switzerland. The TE Connectivity family of companies ("TE Connectivity"), the Complainant's exclusive licensee for the TE and TE CONNECTIVITY trademarks, is a global technology leader that designs and manufactures connectors, sensors, relays, contactors, and application tooling used across a wide range of industries, including automotive, industrial equipment, data communication systems, aerospace, defense, medical, oil and gas, consumer electronics, and energy.

TE Connectivity employs approximately 90,000 people worldwide, including nearly 10,000 engineers, and serves customers in over 140 countries. Through the Complainant's (via TE Connectivity) continuous and extensive use of the trademarks since at least 2011, the Complainant has built a strong reputation globally. The Complainant's trademarks are widely recognized as distinctive identifiers of the high-quality products and services.

The Complainant owns multiple registrations for the TE and TE CONNECTIVITY trademarks in numerous jurisdictions worldwide, including but not limited to the following:

- United States Trademark Registration No. 3963946 for TE, registered on May 24, 2011, in classes 8, 9, and 17.
- United States Trademark Registration No. 4538111 for TE CONNECTIVITY, registered on May 27, 2014, in classes 7, 8, 9, 17, and 37.
- United States Trademark Registration No. 4538110 for TE, registered on May 27, 2014, in classes 7, 8, 9, 17, and 37.

The Complainant also, through TE Connectivity, owns and operates domain names incorporating its trademarks, including <te.com>, <teconnectivity.com>, and <teconnectivity.org>. The website at the domain name <te.com> provides product information, marketing, and support services to customers worldwide.

The disputed domain name, <te-connectors.com>, was registered on May 7, 2020. The disputed domain name directs Internet users to a fraudulent website impersonating the Complainant by displaying the Complainant's TE CONNECTIVITY trademark and logo and presenting itself as the Complainant under the "Home" section, with links redirecting to a third party website purportedly offering competing 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.

Notably, the Complainant contends that the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to its well-known and distinctive trademarks. The Complainant emphasizes that the disputed domain name wholly incorporates its trademarks, combined with the descriptive term "connectors", which directly refers to the Complainant's core business activities in the field of electronic components and connectivity solutions. The addition of this descriptive term does not prevent a finding of confusing similarity but instead reinforces the association with the Complainant's products.

The Complainant further asserts that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name. The Complainant has never authorized the Respondent to use its trademarks, nor is there any evidence that the Respondent is commonly known by the disputed domain name. Additionally, the Respondent has not demonstrated any bona fide offering of goods or services or a legitimate noncommercial use of the disputed domain name. Instead, the Respondent's website misuses the Complainant's branding and product information in a manner intended to mislead Internet users.

The Complainant argues that the Respondent registered and is using the disputed domain name in bad faith. The disputed domain name resolves to a website impersonating the Complainant.

Based on these contentions, the Complainant requests the transfer of the disputed domain name.

B. Respondent

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

6. Discussion and Findings

Under paragraph 4(a) of the Policy, to succeed 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; and
- (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 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 the TE mark is recognizable within the disputed domain name. Accordingly, the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to the mark for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 1.7.

Although the addition of other terms, here the descriptive word "connectors", 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 Complainant's marks for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 1.8.

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. 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.

Panels have held that the use of a domain name for illegitimate activity, here impersonation and passing off, by displaying the Complainant’s TE CONNECTIVITY trademark and logo and presenting itself as the Complainant under the “Home” section on the website of the disputed domain name and redirecting Internet users to third-party competing products, can never confer rights or legitimate interests on a respondent. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 2.13.1.

The Respondent is not an authorized distributor of the Complainant and has no connection or affiliation with the Complainant that would justify its registration or use of the disputed domain name. Nor has the Respondent been commonly known by the disputed domain name or demonstrated any 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.

In the present case, the Panel finds that the Respondent registered and used the disputed domain name in bad faith under paragraph 4(b)(iv) of the Policy.

The disputed domain name incorporates the Complainant’s well-known trademark TE in its entirety, adding only the descriptive word “connectors”, which directly relates to the Complainant’s core business. Such composition increases the likelihood of confusion, as Internet users may believe the disputed domain name is affiliated with or endorsed by the Complainant.

The Respondent has used the disputed domain name to impersonate the Complainant by prominently displaying the Complainant’s TE CONNECTIVITY trademark and logo and presenting itself as the Complainant under the “Home” section, while displaying links that will redirect Internet users to a third party website purportedly selling competing products. Such conduct evidences an intent to mislead Internet users for commercial gain, which constitutes bad faith registration and use under the Policy.

Panels have consistently held that the use of a domain name for fraudulent impersonation, passing off, or diversion of customers constitutes bad faith. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 3.4.

Moreover, the Respondent has engaged in a pattern of registering domain names incorporating trademarks of third parties, as shown by its involvement in the case concerning <elobau-connectors.com> (*elobau GmbH & Co. KG v. Jullian Sotirov, Hermes Engineering*, WIPO Case No. [D2024-4604](#)). Such conduct demonstrates bad faith registration and use under paragraph 4(b)(ii) of the Policy.

The Respondent's failure to reply to the Complaint further supports the finding of bad faith.

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 <te-connectors.com> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Eva Fiammenghi/

Eva Fiammenghi

Sole Panelist

Date: September 12, 2025