

## **ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION**

Société de Négoce et de Participation v. manpreet kaur  
Case No. D2025-3605

### **1. The Parties**

The Complainant is Société de Négoce et de Participation, France, represented by Dreyfus & associés, France.

The Respondent is manpreet kaur, India.

### **2. The Disputed Domain Name and Registrar**

The Disputed Domain Name <soneaparcana.com> is registered with GoDaddy.com, LLC (the "Registrar").

### **3. Procedural History**

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the "Center") on September 5, 2025. On September 8, 2025, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the Disputed Domain Name. On September 9, 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 (Registration Private Domains By Proxy, LLC) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on September 12, 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 September 15, 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 September 17, 2025. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was October 7, 2025. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent's default on October 13, 2025.

The Center appointed Marilena Comanescu as the sole panelist in this matter on October 16, 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, Société de Négoce et de Participation (“Sonepar”), is the holding of the “Sonepar group”, that includes all companies, corporations and other entities controlled directly or indirectly by Sonepar.

Founded in 1969 in France, the Complainant is an independent family-owned company providing Business-to-Business distribution of electrical products, solutions and related services. Currently the Complainant has about 100 brands, presence in 40 countries (including in Canada since 1984), 45,000 associates, and sales around 23 billion Euros in 2020.

The Complainant owns worldwide trademark registrations for SONEPAR, such as the following:

- the Canadian trademark registration number TMA607109 for SONEPAR (figurative), filed on July 12, 2001, registered on April 6, 2004, covering services in International Class 39;
- the International trademark registration number 1654996 for SONEPAR (figurative), registered on December 3, 2021, designating many jurisdictions worldwide, including India, and covering goods and services in International Classes 7, 9, 11, 35, 37, 38, 39, 41 and 42.

The Complainant holds domain names incorporating the SONEPAR mark, including <sonepar.com>, its primary web portal for global promotion, registered on April 17, 1997.

The Respondent is reportedly located in India.

The Disputed Domain Name was registered on August 30, 2024, and, at the time of filing of the Complaint, it resolves towards a parking page displaying Pay-Per-Click (“PPC”) links of various content. According to evidence annexed to the Complaint, Mail exchange (“MX”) servers have been configured at the Disputed Domain Name, two email servers being configured on the Disputed Domain Name.

On August 1, 2025, the legal counsels of the Complainant sent a blocking request to the Registrar, and several reminders. No reaction was received.

#### **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 alleges it is well known worldwide and its SONEPAR trademark enjoys a worldwide reputation in the world of Business-to-Business distribution of electrical products, solutions and related services.

The Disputed Domain Name is confusingly similar to the Complainant’s mark, since it fully includes a confusingly similar approximation of SONEPAR trademark in combination with the geographical term “Canada”, enhancing the false impression that the Disputed Domain Name is somehow officially related to the Complainant and is tailored for the Canadian market; the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in the Disputed Domain Name; the Respondent registered and is using the Disputed Domain Name

in bad faith mainly because: it is implausible that the Respondent was unaware of the Complainant and its mark when registering the Disputed Domain Name since SONEPAR is well-known throughout the world in its industry and Google or trademark search would have revealed to the Respondent the existence of the Complainant and its trademark; the Respondent uses the Disputed Domain Name to direct Internet users to a webpage displaying PPC links which are likely to generate revenues and thus the Respondent is taking undue advantage of the Complainant's trademark to generate profits.

## **B. Respondent**

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

## **6. Discussion and Findings**

Under the Policy, the Complainant is required to prove on the balance of probabilities that:

- (i) the Disputed Domain Name is identical or confusingly similar to a trademark or service mark in which the Complainant has rights;
- (ii) the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in the Disputed Domain Name; and
- (iii) the Disputed Domain Name has been registered and is being used in bad faith.

### **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 Panel finds the mark SONEPAR 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.

While the obvious misspelling of the Complainant's trademark – the insertion of the letter "a" in the body of the trademark, and the addition of one term - here "canada", may bear on assessment of the second and third elements, the Panel finds such alteration/addition 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](#), sections 1.8. and 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 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.

The Panel notes the composition of the Disputed Domain Name, which combines the Complainant's trademark SONEPAR (slightly altered) with the geographical indication "canada", is intended to confuse Internet users looking for the Complainant.

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 Disputed Domain Name was registered in bad faith, with knowledge of the Complainant and its trademark particularly because the Complainant's trademark predates the registration of the Disputed Domain Name by more than 23 years, has acquired international reputation in its industry and the composition of the Disputed Domain Name itself, comprising the Complainant's mark, slightly altered, together with the name of a country where the Complainant conducts business for 40 years, "Canada".

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.

At the time of filing the Complaint, the Disputed Domain Name resolves to a webpage providing PPC links.

Paragraph 4(b)(iv) of the Policy provides that the use of a domain name to intentionally attempt "to attract, for commercial gain, Internet users to [the respondent's] website or other online location, by creating a likelihood of confusion with the complainant's mark as to the source, sponsorship, affiliation, or endorsement of [the respondent's] website or location or of a product or service on [the respondent's] website or location" is evidence of registration and use in bad faith.

The Respondent was using without permission the Complainant's trademark, in order to get traffic on its web portals and to misleadingly divert Internet users to third parties' websites, and thus to potentially obtain commercial gain from the confusion with the Complainant.

The Respondent chose not to participate in these proceedings, provided an inaccurate/incomplete postal address at the registration of the Disputed Domain Name (because the Written Notice could not be delivered to the Respondent by courier service) and the configuration of MX records, constitute, in the circumstances of this case, further evidence of bad faith. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 3.3.

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, <soneaparcana.com>, be transferred to the Complainant.

*/Marilena Comanescu/*

**Marilena Comanescu**

Sole Panelist

Date: October 27, 2025