

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

SEB S.A. v. Cecile Froemer, Cecile Froemer
Case No. D2025-2904

1. The Parties

The Complainant is SEB S.A., France, represented by CSC Digital Brand Services Group AB, Sweden.

The Respondent is Cecile Froemer, Cecile Froemer, France.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <groupeseb-careers-france.com> is registered with Wix.com Ltd. (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 30, 2025, the Registrar transmitted by email to the Center its verification response is closing registrant and contact information for the disputed domain name which differed from the named Respondent (Statutory Masking Enabled, Cecile Froemer J) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on July 30, 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 August 1, 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 August 4, 2025. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was August 24, 2025. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent's default on August 25, 2025.

The Center appointed Nathalie Dreyfus as the sole panelist in this matter on September 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 SEB S.A. is a French company founded in 1857, specializing in the design and manufacturing of small household appliances. It is particularly well-known for its brands such as Tefal, Moulinex, Rowenta, Krups, and Calor, which cover a wide range of products, from kitchen equipment (food processors, deep fryers, coffee makers) to personal care and cleaning devices.

The Complainant SEB S.A. is one of the major players in the global home appliance sector, with a presence in over 150 countries. The company stands out for its constant innovation and commitment to offering practical, high-quality solutions to consumers.

The Complainant owns numerous trademark registrations protecting the GROUPE SEB brand, including but not limited to:

- French trademark GROUPE SEB No. 3374966, registered on September 16, 2005, duly renewed, and covering goods and services in international classes 06, 07, 08, 09, 10, 11, 16, 20, 21, 35, 37 and 41;
- International trademark GROUPE SEB No. 894757, registered on January 26, 2006, duly renewed, covering international class 06, 07, 08, 09, 10, 11, 16, 20, 21, 35, 37 and 41 and designating inter alia European Union and China;
- United Kingdom trademark GROUPE SEB No. UK00800894757, registered on August 6, 2007, duly renewed, and covering goods and services in international classes 06, 07, 08, 09, 10, 11, 16, 20, 21, 35, 37, 41; and
- Chinese trademark GROUPE SEB No. 37043767, registered on March 7, 2020, and covering services in international class 37.

In addition, the Complainant operates various websites corresponding to or incorporating its trademarks, such as <groupeseb.com> and <groupeseb-careers.com>.

The disputed domain name was registered on June 2, 2025 and points to the hosting provider's default page. MX servers are configured.

Since the Respondent did not participate in the proceeding, nothing is known other than the Registrar-disclosed details of the Respondent.

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 registered trademarks GROUPE SEB. The disputed domain name reproduces the trademark GROUPE SEB in its entirety. The disputed domain name is particularly similar to the Complainant's already registered domain names <groupeseb.com> and <groupeseb-careers.com>, its online recruitment platform.

Secondly, the Complainant alleges that the Respondent has no trademarks or trade names corresponding to the disputed domain name. Nor has the Complainant given the Respondent permission to use the Complainant's trademarks in any manner, including in domain names. Furthermore, the Complainant has not licensed, authorized, or permitted the Respondent to register domain names incorporating the Complainant's trademark.

Third, the Complainant argues that the disputed domain name was registered and is being used in bad faith. According to the Complainant, its GROUPE SEB trademarks enjoy international recognition, supported by registrations in numerous jurisdictions. The Complainant's GROUPE SEB name first established in 1973 and trademarks have been used continuously since that time. Therefore, no third party could have registered the disputed domain name in good faith unless seeking to create a false association with the Complainant.

The Complainant alleges that the Respondent has registered and used the disputed domain name for purposes of launching a phishing attack, which is clear evidence of bad faith registration and use. After first creating a strong likelihood of confusion by misappropriating the Complainant's trademarks in the disputed domain name, the Respondent has used the disputed domain name to send out fraudulent emails to the Complainant's suppliers requesting for a product quote whilst impersonating the Complainant's Director through the use of the email address "[...]@groupeseb-careers-france.com". The Respondent's efforts to masquerade as the Complainant in an attempt to gain financial benefit from unsuspecting people certainly constitute fraud, which must be considered bad faith registration and use of the disputed domain name.

B. Respondent

The Respondent did not reply to the Complainant's contentions and is therefore in default.

6. Discussion and Findings

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 entirety of the mark is reproduced 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.

Indeed, although the addition of other terms, here "career" and "france", and hyphens in between the terms, may bear on assessment of the second and third elements, the Panel finds the addition of such terms does not prevent a finding of confusing similarity between the disputed domain name and the mark for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 1.8.

Accordingly, the Panel finds that the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to the Complainant's registered trademark GROUPE SEB.

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.

Indeed, the Panel finds that the Respondent, identified as “Cecile Froemer”, has no known connection to the Complainant and is not commonly known by the name “GROUPE SEB”. The Respondent has no rights in any corresponding trademark, corporate name, trade name, or domain name that would precede the Complainant’s rights.

Panels have held that the use of a domain name for illegitimate activity here, claimed as phishing and impersonation can never confer rights or legitimate interests on a respondent. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 2.13.1.

As shown by the Complainant and accepted by the Panel, the Respondent has registered and used the disputed domain name to send out fraudulent emails to the Complainant’s suppliers requesting for a product quote whilst impersonating the Complainant’s Director through the use of the email address “[...]@groupe-seb-careers-france.com”. The Respondent’s efforts to masquerade as the Complainant in an attempt to gain financial benefit from unsuspecting people certainly constitute fraud, which can never confer rights or legitimate interests to the Respondent.

Furthermore, the Respondent had the opportunity to provide arguments supporting its rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name. However, by failing to file a response, the Respondent has missed this opportunity, and the Panel is entitled to draw such inferences from the Respondent’s failure.

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.

Paragraph 4(b) of the Policy sets out a list of non-exhaustive circumstances that may indicate that a domain name was registered and used in bad faith, but other circumstances may be relevant in assessing whether a respondent’s registration and use of a domain name is in bad faith. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 3.2.1.

Considering the composition of the disputed domain name, which consists of the Complainant's trademark reproduced in its entirety with the mere addition of the terms "careers" and "france", and hyphens, the Panel finds it implausible that the disputed domain name was registered in good faith. The circumstances indicate that the Respondent had knowledge of the Complainant's rights at the time of the disputed domain name registration.

The Panel finds that the Complainant has provided clear evidence that the Respondent used the disputed domain name to send fraudulent emails to the Complainant's suppliers, requesting product quotations while impersonating the Complainant's Director, through the email address "[...]@groupeseb-careers-france.com". Such conduct demonstrates that the Respondent deliberately sought to impersonate the Complainant for the purpose of obtaining financial gain from unsuspecting third parties.

The Panel finds that this behavior constitutes a fraudulent scheme and is a clear example of bad faith registration and use of the disputed domain name within the meaning of the Policy.

The Panel 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 <groupeseb-careers-france.com> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Nathalie Dreyfus/

Nathalie Dreyfus

Sole Panelist

Date: September 12, 2025