

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

Constellation Energy Corporation v. Name Redacted Case No. D2025-2895

1. The Parties

Complainant is Constellation Energy Corporation, United States of America ("United States" or "U.S."), represented by CSC Digital Brand Services Group AB, Sweden.

Respondent is Name Redacted¹.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <constellattionenergy.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 July 22, 2025. On July 22, 2025, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On July 23, 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 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 Complainant on July 23, 2025, providing the registrant and contact information disclosed by the Registrar, and inviting Complainant to submit an amendment to the Complaint. Complainant filed an amended Complaint on July 24, 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").

¹ The Respondent appears to have used the name and/or contact details of a third party when registering the disputed domain name. In light of the potential identity theft, the Panel has redacted the Respondent's name 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 name, which includes the name of the Respondent. The Panel has authorized the Center to transmit Annex 1 to the Registrar as part of the order in these proceedings and has indicated that Annex 1 to this Decision shall not be published due to the exceptional circumstances of this case.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](#).

In accordance with the Rules, paragraphs 2 and 4, the Center formally notified Respondent of the Complaint, and the proceedings commenced on July 28, 2025. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was August 17, 2025. On July 30, 2025, a third party claimed to have received the Written Notice and stated that it was not the owner of the disputed domain name. Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified Respondent's default on August 20, 2025.

The Center appointed Gabriel F. Leonardos 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

Complainant was founded in 1999 and is a main producer of energy in the United States. It operates in 48 U.S. states, Canada and United Kingdom. Its main segments are Merchant Energy, Regulated Electric and Regulated Gas.

Accordingly, Complainant is the owner of several trademark registrations for the term CONSTELLATION ENERGY and owns domain names incorporating said trademarks, such as <constellation.com> and <constellationenergy.com>.

Some examples of Complainant's trademark registrations can be found below:

Registration	Trademark	Jurisdictions	International Class	Registration Date
2161537	CONSTELLATION ENERGY	United States	40	June 2, 1998
004595252	CONSTELLATION ENERGY	European Union	4, 9, 11, 35, 36, 37, 39, 40 and 42	September 28, 2006
UK00904595252	CONSTELLATION ENERGY	United Kingdom	4, 9, 11, 35, 36, 37, 39, 40 and 42	September 28, 2006
TMA677548	CONSTELLATION ENERGY	Canada	35	November 24, 2006

The disputed domain name <constellattionenergy.com> was registered on March 10, 2025, and currently directs users to an inactive website.

5. Parties' Contentions

A. Complainant

Complainant contends that it has satisfied each of the elements required under the Policy for a transfer of the disputed domain name.

Notably, Complainant contends that the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to its trademarks CONSTELLATION ENERGY and intentionally misspells said trademark by adding a second letter "T", engaging in typosquatting and having the intention to take advantage of users that inadvertently type an incorrect address.

Therefore, according to Complainant, the disputed domain name is confusingly similar with Complainant's trademarks CONSTELLATION ENERGY and owned domain names, fulfilling paragraph 4(a)(i) of the Policy and paragraphs 3(b)(viii) and (b)(ix)(1) of the Rules.

Complainant states that Respondent lacks any rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name. This is supported by the fact that there is no current or past relationship between the parties and that Complainant has not given a license or authorization of any kind for the registration or use of the trademark CONSTELLATION ENERGY as a domain name. Moreover, Complainant affirms that Respondent is not using the disputed domain name in connection with a bona fide offering of goods and services but to facilitate phishing attacks aimed at potential suppliers.

According to Complainant, Respondent attempted to pass off as Complainant's Senior Vice President, by using an e-mail that incorporated the disputed domain name. Therefore, Complainant claims such use does not confer rights or legitimate interests to Respondent.

In this manner, Complainant states that no legitimate use of the disputed domain name could be reasonably claimed by Respondent, fulfilling paragraph 4(a)(ii) of the Policy and paragraph 3(b)(ix)(2) of the Rules.

Complainant argues that by registering the disputed domain name with a purposeful misspell of the trademark CONSTELLATION ENERGY, Respondent demonstrated a knowledge and familiarity with Complainant's brand and business, and thus it is highly unlikely that Respondent was unaware of Complainant's previous rights related to the CONSTELLATION ENERGY trademark.

Moreover, according to Complainant, Respondent's use of the disputed domain name to launch a phishing attack and attempt to impersonate Complainant is evidence of bad faith.

Thus, according to Complainant, the requirements for the identification of a bad faith registration and use of the disputed domain name have been fulfilled, pursuant to paragraphs 4(a)(iii) and 4(b) of the Policy and paragraph 3(b)(ix)(3).

Accordingly, Complainant requests the disputed domain name be transferred to Complainant.

B. Respondent

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

6. Discussion and Findings

To succeed in a UDRP complaint, Complainant must demonstrate that all the elements listed in paragraph 4(a) of the Policy have been satisfied, as following:

- (i) the disputed domain name is identical or confusingly similar to a trademark or service mark in which Complainant has rights; and
- (ii) 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.

The burden of proving these elements is upon Complainant.

Respondent had 20 days to submit a response in accordance with paragraph 5(a) of the Rules and failed to do so. Paragraph 5(f) of the Rules establishes that if a respondent does not respond to the complaint, in the absence of exceptional circumstances, the Panel's decision shall be based upon the complaint.

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

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.

Based on the available record, the Panel finds 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 CONSTELLATION ENERGY 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.

This addition of the letter "t" can be considered typosquatting, as it is only a slight variation of Complainant's trademark in an intentional misspelling. Also, it is consensus in panels that such practice does not prevent the trademark from being recognizable in the domain name. See WIPO Case No. [D2022-4895](#), *Belmont Village, L.P. v. Name Redacted*.

Therefore, based on the available record, 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 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 respondent lacks rights or legitimate interests, the burden of production on this element shifts to respondent to come forward with relevant evidence demonstrating rights or legitimate interests in the domain name (although the burden of proof always remains on complainant). If respondent fails to come forward with such relevant evidence, complainant is deemed to have satisfied the second element. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 2.1.

Having reviewed the available record, the Panel finds Complainant has established a prima facie case that Respondent lacks rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name. Respondent has not rebutted 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 phishing and impersonation can never confer rights or legitimate interests on a respondent. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 2.13.1.

Based on the available record, Respondent is not entitled to any trademark, trade name, or any other right associated with the disputed domain name. Additionally, Respondent has not been authorized by Complainant to use the CONSTELLATION ENERGY trademarks, and there is no commercial relationship between the Parties. Respondent is not recognized by the disputed domain name. In light of these circumstances, the Panel finds that no rights or legitimate interests can be found on behalf of Respondent.

Accordingly, 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 notes that Respondent has registered a domain name that is confusingly similar to Complainant's trademark for CONSTELLATION ENERGY. Also, based on the available record, it is established that Respondent has no affiliation with Complainant and the CONSTELLATION ENERGY trademarks, nor has it sought authorization or a license to utilize the referred trademark. Also, Respondent does not own any trademarks containing the term CONSTELLATION ENERGY or showed any rights over the trademark or any related terms.

Furthermore, considering Complainant's significant reputation in the energy market, Respondent evidently knew or should have known of the existence of Complainant's prior trademark rights and domain names, which were matters of public record, before registering the disputed domain name. Other than this, considering Respondent's documented use of the CONSTELLATION ENERGY trademark, including the intentional misspelling of Complainant's trademark, Respondent evidently had knowledge of Complainant's pre-existing rights to the CONSTELLATION ENERGY trademark.

The Panel notes that Respondent engaged in a phishing attack and targeted Complainant's potential suppliers, passing off as Complainant's own Senior Vice President, and sent fraudulent messages that included contact information incorporating the domain name and the misspelling of the COSTELLATION ENERGY trademark as extension (@constellattionenergy.com).

Panels have held that the use of a domain name for illegal activity (i.e. impersonation/passing off, typosquatting and phishing), constitutes bad faith. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 3.4. Having reviewed the record, the Panel finds Respondent's registration and use of the disputed domain name constitutes bad faith under the Policy. See WIPO Case No. [D2023-1567](#), *Insured Aircraft Title Service, LLC v. Brain Jason, Felix Coker, Marcia Van, Mickey Staleler, Denise Baustert*.

Therefore, the Panel finds that the circumstances of the present case allow for a finding of bad faith in the registration and use of the disputed domain name, considering that Respondent (i) carried out the registration of the domain name as part of a typosquatting scheme; (ii) attempted to impersonate/pass off as Complainant; (iii) engaged in a phishing scheme; and (iv) was most likely aware of Complainant's rights on the trademark CONSTELLATION ENERGY, all with the intention to create a likelihood of confusion within Internet users and benefit from such actions.

Lastly, the Panel finds it is relevant that Respondent has not provided any evidence of good faith registration or use or otherwise participated in this dispute.

Based on the available record, the Panel finds that 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 <constellattionenergy.com> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Gabriel F. Leonardos/

Gabriel F. Leonardos

Sole Panelist

Date: September 12, 2025