

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

SEB S.A. v. RITA FELDER, N A

Case No. D2025-3094

1. The Parties

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

The Respondent is RITA FELDER, N A, Denmark.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <groupseseb.com> is registered with GMO Internet, Inc. d/b/a Discount-Domain.com and Onamae.com (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 (REDACTED FOR PRIVACY) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on August 8, 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 11, 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 14, 2025. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was September 3, 2025. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent’s default on September 4, 2025.

The Center appointed Jonathan Agmon as the sole panelist in this matter on September 12, 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 holding company incorporated in 1973 and is the parent to Groupe SEB. It defines and implements the development strategy of Groupe SEB.

Groupe SEB was founded in 1857 by Antoine Lescure in Selongey, Dijon, France. The Company grew over the next 85 years and was rebranded as Société d'Emboutissage de Bourgogne (S.E.B) in 1944. Today the Complainant is known worldwide for small domestic appliances such as kitchen electric goods, home and personal care together with cookware products. The Complainant's brand portfolio includes 45 of the most well-known brands in their respective industries, including KRUPS, WMF, MOULINEX and Tefal / T-fal, one of the world's most popular cookware brands. In addition, the Complainant employs 31,000 people and has a presence across 150 countries. Groupe SEB also maintains 47 industrial sites along with 1,200 retail stores. In 2024, the Complainant reported sales of EUR 8.266 million and a net profit of EUR 422 million.

The Complainant maintains a strong online presence through its primary domain name, <groupeseb.com> which during the period November 2024 to January 2025, it received an average of around 771,500 visits.

The Complainant is the owner of various trademark registrations for GROUPE SEB, including the following:

- International trademark registration no. 894757, registered on January 26, 2006;
- France trademark registration no. 3374966, registered on February 8, 2005;
- United Kingdom trademark registration no. UK00800894757, registered on August 6, 2007; and
- China trademark registration no. 37043767, registered on March 7, 2020.

The Complainant owns and operates its primary domain name, <groupeseb.com>, registered on May 1, 1996.

The disputed domain name was registered on May 27, 2025, and at the time of filing the Complaint, resolved to an inactive webpage.

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 GROUPE SEB trademark in which the Complainant has rights. The disputed domain name is a purposeful misspelling of the Complainant's GROUPE SEB trademark, with the addition of the letter "s". This is a typical case of typosquatting; a deliberate attempt to confuse Internet users. The generic Top Level Domain is a standard requirement and is disregarded for an analysis under the first element.
- The Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the disputed domain name. The Complainant is the owner of the GROUPE SEB trademark. The Respondent is not sponsored by or affiliated

with the Complainant in any way. The Complainant has not given the Respondent permission to use the Complainant's trademark in any manner, including registering a domain name. The Complainant has not licensed, authorised, or permitted the Respondent to register the disputed domain name. There is no evidence that the Respondent is commonly known by the disputed domain name. The Respondent is using the disputed domain name to direct Internet users to a blank webpage. The Respondent has failed to make use of the disputed domain name, and has not demonstrated any attempt to make legitimate use of it, which is evidence that he lacks rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name. The mail exchange ("MX") records of the disputed domain name have also been configured, which implies that it could be used as part of a phishing or impersonation scheme in the future. The Respondent registered the disputed domain name long after the Complainant registered its GROUPE SEB trademark, and there is a high risk of implied affiliation between the disputed domain name and the Complainant which cannot be considered fair use of the disputed domain name.

- The disputed domain name was registered and is being used in bad faith. The Complainant and its GROUPE SEB trademark are known internationally, and has been in use for many years. By registering a domain name that incorporates a typosquatted version of the Complainant's GROUPE SEB trademark, the Respondent has created a domain name that is visually identical to Complainant's trademark, and its <groupeseb.com> domain name. The Respondent has therefore demonstrated knowledge of the Complainant's brand and business. The GROUPE SEB trademark is so closely linked and associated with the Complainant that the Respondent's use of the GROUPE SEB mark, or any variation of it, strongly implies bad faith. The disputed domain name resolves to an inactive website. The passive holding of the disputed domain name constitutes bad faith under the Policy. The MX records of the disputed domain name are active, which allows the disputed domain name to potentially be used for phishing purposes. Past panels have considered the presence of MX records as indicative of bad faith. The disputed domain name can only be considered to be taken as intending to cause confusion amongst Internet users as to the source of the disputed domain name, and it therefore must be considered as being registered in bad faith. There is no plausible good-faith reason for the Respondent to have registered the disputed domain name. This case is a typical case of cybersquatting, and the Respondent has a past pattern of cybersquatting. The Respondent did not reply to the Complainant's cease and desist letter, which is a sign of bad faith.

B. Respondent

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

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 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.

The addition of the letter "s", 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 1.9.

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.

There is no evidence to suggest that the Respondent is commonly known by the disputed domain name. The Complainant’s registration of its GROUPE SEB trademark long predates the registration of the disputed domain name. The disputed domain name resolved to an inactive website, and there is no evidence that the Respondent is using or preparing to use the disputed domain name for any legitimate purpose.

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 registered the disputed domain name a very long time after the Complainant registered its GROUPE SEB trademark. Given the fame of the Complainant’s GROUPE SEB trademark, it is unlikely that the Respondent was not aware of the Complainant and its trademark prior to the registration 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 found that the non-use of a domain name (including a blank or “coming soon” page) would not prevent a finding of bad faith under the doctrine of passive holding. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 3.3. Having reviewed the available record, the Panel notes the distinctiveness or reputation of the Complainant’s trademark, and the composition of the disputed domain name, and finds that in the circumstances of this case the passive holding of the disputed domain name does not prevent a finding of bad faith under the Policy.

The Complainant provided evidence showing that the Disputed Domain Name has active MX records, which could potentially be used for phishing purposes. Previous Panels have considered the presence of MX records as indicative of bad faith. See *bioMérieux v. Registration Private, Domains By Proxy, LLC / Milton Bardmess*, WIPO Case No. [D2020-3499](#). The Panel concurs that active MX records indicate potential bad faith use.

The Panel notes that the Respondent did not respond to the Complainant's cease and desist letters dated June 23 , 2025, July 4, 2025, and July 11, 2025. This is further evidence of bad faith.

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 <groupseseb.com> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Jonathan Agmon/

Jonathan Agmon

Sole Panelist

Date: September 23, 2025