

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

General Electric Company v. Fruiy Centurion
Case No. D2025-2774

1. The Parties

The Complainant is General Electric Company, United States of America (“United States”), represented by Faegre Drinker Biddle & Reath LLP, United States.

The Respondent is Fruiy Centurion, Germany.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <geaearospace.com> (the “Domain Name”) is registered with NameSilo, LLC (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 Domain Name. On the same day, the Registrar transmitted by email to the Center its verification response disclosing registrant and contact information for the Domain Name which differed from the named Respondent (Domain Administrator, See PrivacyGuardian.org) 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 amendment to the Complaint on the same day.

The Center verified that the Complaint together with the amendment to 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 July 17, 2025. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was August 6, 2025. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent’s default on August 8, 2025.

The Center appointed Piotr Nowaczyk as the sole panelist in this matter on August 15, 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 multinational corporation established in 1892. It is engaged in the manufacture, distribution, and sale of goods and services in various industries, including aerospace, energy, healthcare, lighting, appliances, and renewable energy.

The Complainant's GE Aerospace company is a multinational aerospace technology and industrial enterprise with approximately 53,000 employees operating in about 170 countries. It provides jet and turboprop engines, components, and integrated systems for commercial, military, business, and general aviation, as well as avionics, flight management systems, and electrical power systems. GE Aerospace also operates manufacturing, overhaul, and repair facilities worldwide.

The Complainant is the owner of numerous GE AEROSPACE trademark registrations, including:

- the European Union Trade Mark Registration for GE AEROSPACE (word) No. 018738125, registered on December 3, 2022;
- the European Union Trade Mark Registration for GE AEROSPACE (figurative) No. 018919099, registered on March 27, 2024;
- the Chinese Trademark Registration for GE AEROSPACE No. 73809920, registered on March 14, 2024.

The Complainant also owns the domain name <geaerospace.com>, which incorporates its GE AEROSPACE trademark and serves as the official website of the GE Aerospace company.

The Domain Name was registered on May 30, 2025.

At the time of filing the Complaint, the Domain Name resolved to a website consisting of a landing page with Pay-Per-Click ("PPC") links. Furthermore, evidence provided by the Complainant indicates that email addresses associated with the Domain Name have been used to impersonate the Complainant's employees and to send fraudulent payment requests to the Complainant's customers.

As of the date of this Decision, the Domain Name does not resolve to any active website.

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 Domain Name.

First, the Complainant contends that the Domain Name is confusingly similar to the trademark in which the Complainant has rights.

Second, the Complainant argues that the Respondent has neither rights nor legitimate interests in the Domain Name.

Third, the Complainant submits that the Domain Name was registered and is being used in bad faith.

B. Respondent

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

6. Discussion and Findings

Paragraph 4(a) of the Policy places a burden on the Complainant to prove the presence of three separate elements, which can be summarized as follows:

- (i) the 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 the Domain Name; and
- (iii) the Domain Name has been registered and is being used in bad faith.

The requested remedy may only be granted if the above criteria are met. At the outset, the Panel notes that the applicable standard of proof in UDRP cases is the "balance of probabilities" or "preponderance of the evidence". See section 4.2 of the WIPO Overview of WIPO Panel Views on Selected UDRP Questions, Third Edition ("[WIPO Overview 3.0](#)").

A. Identical or Confusingly Similar

Under the first element, the Complainant must establish that the Domain Name is identical or confusingly similar to the trademark in which the Complainant has rights.

The Complainant holds valid registrations for the GE AEROSPACE trademark. The Domain Name consists of a misspelling of this trademark by adding an extra "a" in the "aerospace" portion. It is well established that a domain name which consists of a common, obvious, or intentional misspelling of a trademark is considered by panels to be confusingly similar to the relevant mark for purposes of the first element. This stems from the fact that the domain name contains sufficiently recognizable aspects of the relevant mark. See section 1.9 of the [WIPO Overview 3.0](#).

The generic Top-Level Domain ".com" in the Domain Name is viewed as a standard registration requirement and as such is typically disregarded under the first element test. See section 1.11.1 of the [WIPO Overview 3.0](#).

Given the above, the Panel finds that the Domain Name is confusingly similar to the Complainant's GE AEROSPACE trademark for purposes of the Policy. In sum, the Panel finds the first element of the Policy has been established.

B. Rights or Legitimate Interests

Under the second element, the Complainant must prove that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in the Domain Name.

A right or legitimate interest in the Domain Name may be established, in accordance with paragraph 4(c) of the Policy, if the Panel finds any of the following circumstances:

- (i) that the Respondent has used or made preparations to use the Domain Name or a name corresponding to the Domain Name in connection with a bona fide offering of goods or services prior to the dispute; or
- (ii) that the Respondent is commonly known by the Domain Name, even if the Respondent has not acquired any trademark rights; or
- (iii) that the Respondent is making a legitimate noncommercial or fair use of the Domain Name without intent for commercial gain to misleadingly divert consumers or to tarnish the trademark.

In the present case, the Complainant's GE AEROSPACE trademark registrations predate the Respondent's registration of the Domain Name. There is no evidence in the case record that the Complainant has licensed or otherwise permitted the Respondent to use the GE AEROSPACE trademark or to register the Domain Name incorporating this trademark.

Moreover, it results from the evidence on record that the Respondent does not make use of the Domain Name in connection with a bona fide offering of goods or services, nor does it make a legitimate noncommercial or fair use of the Domain Name.

On the contrary, at the time the Complaint was submitted, the Domain Name resolved to a landing page with PPC links. While specific case factors have led previous panels to find that fair use need not always be categorically noncommercial in nature, unambiguous evidence that the site is not primarily intended for commercial gain, e.g., the absence of commercial or PPC links, would tend to indicate a lack of intent to unfairly profit from the complainant's reputation. See section 2.5.3, [WIPO Overview 3.0](#). In the present case, the Domain Name resolved to the parking page hosting PPC sponsored links. These links allow the Respondent to profit from the attracted web traffic and collect click-through revenue. Such use demonstrates that the Respondent has used the Domain Name to derive a commercial benefit.

Moreover, evidence provided by the Complainant indicates that email addresses associated with the Domain Name have been used to impersonate the Complainant's employees and to send fraudulent payment requests to the Complainant's customers. As of the date of this Decision, the Domain Name does not resolve to any active website. Such use of the Domain Name further supports the conclusion that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the Domain Name.

Given the above, there are no circumstances in evidence which could demonstrate, pursuant to paragraph 4(c) of the Policy, any rights or legitimate interests of the Respondent in respect of the Domain Name. Thus, there is no evidence in the case record that refutes the Complainant's prima facie case. In sum, the Panel finds the second element of the Policy has been established.

C. Registered and Used in Bad Faith

Under the third element, the Complainant must prove that the Domain Name has been registered and is being used in bad faith.

Bad faith under the UDRP is broadly understood to occur where a respondent takes unfair advantage of or otherwise abuses a complainant's mark. See section 3.1 of the [WIPO Overview 3.0](#).

Under paragraph 4(b) of the Policy, evidence of bad faith registration and use includes, without limitation:

- (i) circumstances indicating the domain name was registered or acquired primarily for the purpose of selling, renting, or otherwise transferring the domain name registration to the owner of a trademark or to a competitor of the trademark owner, for valuable consideration in excess of the documented out-of-pocket costs directly related to the domain name; or
- (ii) circumstances indicating that the domain name was registered in order to prevent the owner of a trademark from reflecting the mark in a corresponding domain name, provided it is a pattern of such conduct; or
- (iii) circumstances indicating that the domain name was registered primarily for the purpose of disrupting the business of a competitor; or
- (iv) circumstances indicating that the domain name has intentionally been used in an attempt to attract, for commercial gain, Internet users to a website or other online location, by creating a likelihood of confusion with a trademark as to the source, sponsorship, affiliation, or endorsement of the website or location or of a product or service on a website or location.

As indicated above, the Complainant's rights in the GE AEROSPACE trademark predate the registration of the Domain Name. This Panel finds that the Respondent was or should have been aware of the Complainant's trademark at the time of registration. This finding is supported by the use of the GE AEROSPACE trademark in the Domain Name, as well as the subsequent use of the Domain Name for a landing page with PPC links and for email addresses impersonating the Complainant's employees, which demonstrates that the Respondent deliberately sought to create an association with the Complainant and its trademark.

Moreover, it has been proven to the Panel's satisfaction that the Complainant's GE AEROSPACE trademark is well-known and unique to the Complainant. Thus, the Respondent could not reasonably ignore the reputation of goods under this trademark. In sum, the Respondent registered the Domain Name with the expectation of taking advantage of the reputation of the Complainant's GE AEROSPACE trademark.

Furthermore, at the time of submitting the Complaint, the Domain Name was used by the Respondent to attract Internet users to the parking page featuring PPC links. 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. 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. See section 3.5, [WIPO Overview 3.0](#).

In addition, the Complainant submitted evidence that the Domain Name has been used in connection with fraudulent email activity. The emails sent from addresses associated with the Domain Name were designed to resemble those of the Complainant's employees and to target the Complainant's customers. This supports the conclusion that the Respondent used the Domain Name in a manner intended to create confusion with the Complainant's GE AEROSPACE trademark and to facilitate deceptive activity. The use of a confusingly similar, deceptive domain name for an email scam has previously been found by panels to be sufficient to establish that a domain name has been registered and is being used in bad faith. See *Samsung Electronics Co., Ltd. v. Albert Daniel Carter*, WIPO Case No. [D2010-1367](#).

Finally, the Respondent's use of a privacy service that concealed registrant information is further evidence of bad faith.

For the reasons discussed above, the Panel finds the third element of the Policy has been established.

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 Domain Name <geaearospace.com> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Piotr Nowaczyk/

Piotr Nowaczyk

Sole Panelist

Date: August 25, 2025