

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

General Electric Company v. kreardon james
Case No. D2025-3149

1. The Parties

Complainant is General Electric Company, United States of America ("United States"), represented by Faegre Drinker Biddle & Reath, United States.

Respondent is kreardon james, United States.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <gearerospaces.com> is registered with Hostinger Operations, UAB (the "Registrar").

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the "Center") on August 6, 2025. On August 7, 2025, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On August 8, 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 (Domain Administrator, Privacy Protect, LLC (PrivacyProtect.org)) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to Complainant on August 12, 2025, providing the registrant and contact information disclosed by the Registrar, and inviting Complainant to submit an amendment to the Complaint. Complainant filed an amendment to the Complaint on August 13, 2025.

The Center verified that the Complaint together with the amendment to the 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 Respondent of the Complaint, and the proceedings commenced on August 15, 2025. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was September 4, 2025. Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified Respondent's default on September 5, 2025.

The Center appointed Jeffrey D. Steinhardt as sole panelist in this matter on September 15, 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 is a well known, diversified multinational company founded in the late 1800s.

Complainant owns numerous trademark registrations and statutory trademark rights globally for the GE family of trademarks, including for example: United States Registration No. 35,089, GE (figurative), registered in International Class 21 on September 18, 1900; United Kingdom Trade Mark No. 2271563, GE, registered in International Classes 1-4, 6-12, 14, 16-19, 25, 28, and 35-44 on February 8, 2002; and European Union Trade Mark No. 018919099, GE AEROSPACE (figurative), registered in International Classes 1, 7, 9, 35, 37, and 40-42 on March 27, 2024.

Complainant also registered the domain name <geaerospace.com> in 2012, which resolves to a website actively used by Complainant and its customers. Complainant's affiliate GE Aerospace is a multinational aerospace technology and industrial company with approximately 53,000 employees operating in approximately 170 countries worldwide.

The disputed domain name was registered June 20, 2025 and does not resolve to an active webpage. According to the evidence filed by the Complainant, the disputed domain name has been used as part of an email phishing scheme.

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 avers that the disputed domain name resolves to a parking page without content. Complainant also alleges that email addresses associated with the disputed domain name are used to impersonate Complainant's employees and fraudulently seek payments from Complainant's legitimate business partners. Specifically, Complainant avers that "Respondent is using the [disputed domain name] to send emails to accounts receivable representatives of Complainant's business partners regarding negotiation of an 'Engine sales agreement' as part of a fraudulent scheme that almost resulted in a fraudulent transfer of [USD] 800,000 to Respondent's illegitimate bank account". Complainant annexes documentary evidence to supports this allegation.

B. Respondent

Respondent did not reply to 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.

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 textual element of the GE AEROSPACE mark is reproduced within the disputed domain name. Accordingly, the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to the mark for purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 1.7.

The Panel finds the addition of "r" and "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 (intentional misspellings of marks are considered confusingly similar).

The Panel finds that the first element of paragraph 4(a) of the Policy has been established.

B. Rights or Legitimate Interests

Paragraph 4(c) of the Policy provides a list of circumstances in which a 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.

Complainant has provided uncontroverted evidence that by using the disputed domain name, Respondent is impersonating employees of Complainant and attempting to disrupt Complainant's operations and defraud Complainant and Complainant's customers. The Panel agrees with Complainant that this activity does not demonstrate a right or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name.

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 illegitimate activity such as phishing, impersonation/passing off, or other types of fraud (as appears to be occurring in this case) can never confer rights or legitimate interests on a respondent. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 2.13.1.

The Panel finds that the second element of paragraph 4(a) 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.

Complainant's GE marks are undoubtedly famous and have been used continuously for well over 100 years. In the Panel's view, Respondent's registration of a disputed domain name incorporating such a well-established mark coupled with its use in furtherance of a fraudulent phishing scheme constitutes bad faith in the sense of the Policy.

Panels have held that the use of a domain name for illegitimate activity (here, alleged phishing, impersonation/passing off, or other types of fraud) 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.

Under these circumstances, Respondent's failure to respond to the Complaint is further evidence of bad faith.

The Panel finds that Complainant has established the third element of paragraph 4(a) 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 <gearerospaces.com> be transferred to Complainant.

/Jeffrey D. Steinhardt/

Jeffrey D. Steinhardt

Sole Panelist

Date: September 26, 2025