

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

SEB S.A. v. Fares Kamil

Case No. D2025-3092

1. The Parties

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

The Respondent is Fares Kamil, Egypt.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <moulinexeg.com> is registered with CloudFlare, Inc. (the “Registrar”).

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the “Center”) on August 4, 2025. On August 5, 2025, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On August 6, 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 (Data Redacted) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on August 7, 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 12, 2025. The Respondent sent an informal email communication to the Center on the same date.

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 21, 2025. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was September 10, 2025. The Respondent sent further email communications to the Center on August 21, August 25 and September 13, 2025. On September 11, 2025, the Center informed the Parties that it would proceed to panel appointment.

The Center appointed Nayiri Boghossian as the sole panelist in this matter on September 17, 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 French manufacturer of home appliances and owns trademark registrations for MOULINEX in numerous jurisdictions such as the following:

1. International Trademark Registration No. 205017, registered on November 22, 1957; and
2. International Trademark Registration No. 388246 (figurative), registered on April 17, 1972.

The Complainant claims it also owns the domain name <moulinex.com.eg>.

The disputed domain name was created on June 15, 2025, and resolves to a website which displays the Complainant's trademark and claims to be the Complainant's official agency for maintenance in Egypt.

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 the Complainant's trademark. The Complainant is the owner of the trademark MOULINEX. The Top-Level Domain ".com" is a standard registration requirement and is as such disregarded under the first element confusing similarity test. The letters "eg" (for Egypt) increase the confusing similarity. The disputed domain name fully incorporates the Complainant's trademark.

The Complainant contends that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name. The Complainant did not authorize the Respondent to use its trademark. The Respondent is not affiliated with the Complainant. The Respondent is not commonly known by the disputed domain name. The disputed domain name resolves to a website which impersonates the Complainant and claims to be its official maintenance agency. This is not a bona fide offering of goods or services nor a legitimate noncommercial or fair use.

The Complainant contends that the disputed domain name was registered and is being used in bad faith. The Complainant's trademark is known internationally and was created in 1956 while the disputed domain name was registered in 2025. The Respondent had knowledge of the Complainant and its trademark as the disputed domain name resolves to a website which impersonates the Complainant.

B. Respondent

On August 12, 2025, the Respondent sent an email stating "We are a maintenance service provider in Egypt with over 30 years of experience repairing a variety of home appliance brands. We are not affiliated with Moulinex, and we always clarify this to our customers". In the same email, the Respondent also stated his willingness to amend the website so that it no longer appears to suggest an affiliation with the Complainant. On August 21, 2025, the Respondent sent an email confirming the necessary steps were being taken to deactivate the disputed domain name. On August 25, 2025, the Respondent sent an email showing that a request to delete the disputed domain name had been made. On September 13, 2025, the Respondent sent

an email proof that the disputed domain name has been deleted from the Respondent's account with the Registrar.

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.

Although the addition of other terms here, "eg" 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 mark 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. Instead, upon notice of the dispute, the Respondent has taken active steps to cancel the disputed domain name and remove all its content. The Panel further notes that the Respondent explicitly states that it is not affiliated with the Complainant. However, the website at the disputed domain name does not disclose its lack of relationship with the Complainant and, on the contrary, states it is an official maintenance agency for the Complainant's products. The Panel infers from this conduct that the Respondent does not have any rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name.

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 the Respondent must have been aware of the Complainant's trademark as the disputed domain name resolves to a website, which displays the Complainant's trademark and states that it is the Complainant's official agent for maintenance in Egypt. Also, the Complainant's trademark was registered decades before the creation of the disputed domain name.

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.

Panels have held that the use of a domain name for illegitimate activity here, claimed, impersonation/passing off, constitutes bad faith. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 3.4. Having reviewed the record, the Panel finds the Respondent's registration and use of the disputed domain name constitutes bad faith under 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 <moulinexeg.com> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Nayiri Boghossian/

Nayiri Boghossian

Sole Panelist

Date: September 26, 2025