

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

Lincoln Global, Inc., and The Lincoln Electric Company v. Domain

Administrator

Case No. D2025-2924

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.

The Respondent is Domain Administrator, United States.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <lincolnelectriics.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 23, 2025. On July 23, 2025, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the Domain Name. On July 23, 2025, the Registrar transmitted by email to the Center its verification response disclosing registrant and contact information for the Domain Name that differed from the named Respondent (Domain Administrator, See PrivacyGuardian.org) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainants on July 24, 2025, providing the registrant and contact information disclosed by the Registrar, and inviting the Complainants to submit an amendment to the Complaint. The Complainants 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.

In accordance with the Rules, paragraphs 2 and 4, the Center formally notified the Respondent of the Complaint and the amended Complaint, and the proceedings commenced on July 25, 2025. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was August 14, 2025. The Respondent did not submit a response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent's default on August 15, 2025.

The Center appointed A. Justin Ourso III as the panelist in this matter on August 22, 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 Lincoln Electric Company and Lincoln Global, Inc. (collectively, the “Complainant”) are affiliate-subsiidiaries of Lincoln Electric Holdings, Inc. The Complainant, a well-known company in the welding industry, sells a range of welding products, welding systems, cutting equipment, and brazing and soldering alloys through a worldwide network of distributors and sales offices in more than 160 countries. The Complainant was founded in 1895 and has used its LINCOLN ELECTRIC trademark since as early as 1915.

The Complainant owns the United States registration, No. 2,350,082, for its LINCOLN ELECTRIC trademark, issued on May 16, 2000, for welders, component parts, and related equipment in Class 9, and the United States registration, No. 2,420,805, for its LINCOLN ELECTRIC trademark, issued on January 16, 2001, for distributorship services for welders, cutters, and their component parts in Class 35.

The Complainant owns the domain name <lincolnelectric.com>, which it registered on February 24, 1996, and operates its primary website at “www.lincolnelectric.com” on which it offers its welding and related products under its LINCOLN ELECTRIC mark.

The Respondent, using a domain name privacy service, and another privacy service as the underlying Registrant, registered the Domain Name, on July 1, 2025, without any authorization from the Complainant. Prior to and after the filing of the Complaint, the Domain Name resolved to a parked web page that contained pay-per-click (“PPC”) links, some of which offered competing products or referred to competitors of the Complainant. During the preparation of this Decision, the Domain Name resolved to a parked page that contained PPC links, including a link to a competitor of the Complainant. Additionally, the Respondent has configured mail exchanger (“MX”) records for the site, enabling emails using the Domain Name.

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, which it requested.

Notably, the Complainant contends that the Domain Name is an intentional misspelling of its trademark, i.e., typosquatting, that targets the Complainant to attract Internet users seeking the Complainant’s goods and services who mistakenly misspell the Complainant’s trademark and domain name and land on the Respondent’s parked website featuring PPC links to third-party websites, some of which offer competing products or directly refer to the Complainant’s competitors, in a bad faith attempt to deceive them for the Respondent’s pecuniary gain; the Respondent configured MX records enabling emails using the Domain Name to pass itself off as the Complainant or for fraudulent purposes; and the Respondent used a privacy service whose underlying Registrant is another privacy service, sometimes known as the “Russian doll” scenario.

B. Respondent

The Respondent did not submit a response.

6. Discussion and Findings

6.1. Procedural Matter: Multiple Complainant Consolidation

In assessing the propriety of multiple complainants filing against a single respondent, panels examine whether (i) the complainants have a common grievance, or common conduct by a respondent affected the complainants similarly, and (ii) it would be equitable and procedurally efficient to permit the consolidation. Rules, paragraph 10(e); WIPO Overview of WIPO Panel Views on Selected UDRP Questions, Third Edition ([“WIPO Overview 3.0”](#)), section 4.11.1. The Panel finds that the Complainants are affiliates, namely, subsidiaries of the same parent company, one owning the Complainant’s trademark registrations, and the other owning the Complainant’s primary domain name, with a common grievance against the Respondent, arising from a common interest, and that the Respondent’s conduct has adversely affected both. Additionally, consolidation would be equitable and procedurally efficient. Accordingly, the Panel concludes that consolidation in this proceeding is proper.

6.2 Substantive Matters

A complainant must prove three elements to obtain relief: (i) the domain name is identical or confusingly similar to a trademark in which the complainant has rights; (ii) the respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in the domain name; and (iii) the respondent registered and is using the domain name in bad faith. Policy, paragraph 4(a).

A. Identical or Confusingly Similar

On the first element, a complainant must prove that (1) it has rights in a trademark and (2) the Domain Name is identical or confusingly similar to this trademark. Policy, paragraph 4(a)(i).

The Panel finds that the Complainant’s trademark registrations establish the Complainant’s trademark rights. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 1.2.1.

The Domain Name consists of the Complainant’s trademark, but adding a second letter “i” immediately adjacent to the existing letter “l,” and adding an “s” at the end of the second word, essentially making the word plural. The Panel finds that the trademark is sufficiently recognizable within the Domain Name for the Domain Name to be confusingly similar to the trademark. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 1.7. Additionally, a domain name that consists of an intentional misspelling of a trademark is considered confusingly similar to the subject mark for the purposes of the first element. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 1.9. Accordingly, the Panel concludes that the Complainant has proven the first element: the Domain Name is confusingly similar to a trademark in which it has rights.

B. Rights or Legitimate Interests

The Respondent has not claimed the existence of any circumstance under the Policy, paragraph 4(c), that demonstrates that a respondent has rights to, or legitimate interests in, a domain name. The Panel finds that the Complainant has shown that it established its trademark rights before the Respondent registered the Domain Name; the Complainant has not authorized the Respondent to use its trademark or the Domain Name; the Respondent is not commonly known by the Domain Name, indeed, the Registrar identified the Respondent with a name that does not resemble the Domain Name; the record contains no evidence that the Respondent owns a trademark registration for the Domain Name or operates a legitimate business under the Domain Name; and the Respondent has used the Domain Name to trade on the goodwill of the Complainant’s trademark, by attracting Internet users to a web page with competing PPC links, which is not a bona fide commercial use, a noncommercial use, or a fair use of the Domain Name. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), sections 2.5 and 2.9. This record constitutes prima facie a showing that the Respondent lacks any rights or legitimate interests in the Domain Name under the Policy, paragraph 4(a)(ii), shifting the burden of production on this second element to the Respondent to come forward with relevant evidence proving rights

or legitimate interests in the Domain Name. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 2.1. The Respondent has not submitted any evidence to rebut the prima facie showing.

Accordingly, the Panel concludes that the Complainant has proven, and the evidence demonstrates, the second element: the Respondent lacks rights or legitimate interests in the Domain Name.

C. Registered and Used in Bad Faith

The Policy provides that the following circumstance is “evidence of the registration and use of a domain name in bad faith: [. . .] by using the domain name, you have intentionally attempted to attract, for commercial gain, Internet users to your web site . . . , by creating a likelihood of confusion with the complainant’s mark as to the source, sponsorship, affiliation, or endorsement of your web site or location or of a product or service on your web site.” Policy, paragraph 4(b)(iv).

The Panel finds that the composition of the Domain Name, namely, that it is an intentional misspelling of a distinctive mark, is a deliberate attempt confuse Internet users seeking the Complainant and demonstrates that the Respondent was aware of the Complainant and its trademark before the Respondent registered the Domain Name. Additionally, the Panel finds that the Domain Name resolves to a landing page with PPC links, including to competitors, which the Panel finds conclusive evidence that the Respondent is using the Domain Name to attract, misleadingly and deceptively, customers and potential customers of the Complainant to the Respondent’s website for the Respondent’s commercial gain. Policy, paragraph 4(b)(iv); [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), sections 3.1.4, 3.2.1, and 3.2.2.

The Panel finds that the Respondent not only used a privacy service but also used another privacy service as the underlying registrant and failed to respond to the Complaint, which support a conclusion of bad faith. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), sections 3.2.1, 3.6, and 4.4.6.

Lastly, the Complainant has configured MX records for the site, even though the site is merely a passive site hosting PPC links. The configuration of MX records presents the potential for an email scheme impersonating the Complainant. It is common knowledge that owners of websites customarily use email addresses containing the domain name of a website in electronic mail communications. The use of a domain name that is almost indistinguishable from a trademark in emails that do not originate with the trademark owner presents a risk to the reputation of a trademark and its owner. The risk of deceptive emails is significant and continues further supporting a finding of bad faith registration and use. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), sections 3.1.4 and 3.4.

The findings above compel the Panel to conclude that the Respondent intentionally registered the Domain Name in bad faith to take unfair advantage of the Complainant’s trademark and that the Respondent is using the Domain Name in bad faith intentionally to attract Internet users to its site for commercial gain by creating a likelihood of confusion with the Complainant’s trademark as to the source of the goods and services offered through the Domain Name, in violation of the Policy, paragraph 4(b)(iv). Accordingly, the Panel concludes that the Complainant has proven, and the evidence demonstrates, the third element: the Respondent registered and is using the Domain Name 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 Domain Name <lincolnelectrics.com> be transferred to the Complainant.

/A. Justin Ourso III/

A. Justin Ourso III

Panelist

Date: September 4, 2025