

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

Euronics G.E.I.E. v. Iulian Curt
Case No. D2025-4131

1. The Parties

The Complainant is Euronics G.E.I.E., Netherlands (Kingdom of the), represented by NLO Shieldmark B. V., Netherlands (Kingdom of the).

The Respondent is Iulian Curt, France.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <euronics-media.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 October 9, 2025. On October 9, 2025, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On October 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 October 10, 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 October 13, 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 October 17, 2025. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was November 6, 2025. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent's default on November 12, 2025.

The Center appointed Andrea Jaeger-Lenz as the sole panelist in this matter on November 18, 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 belongs to an international group of companies that was founded in 1990 and consists of national retailers operating in the European Union, Middle East Asia, and Commonwealth of Independent States marketing an array of electrical, electronic and household goods to end consumers. Nowadays, the group to which the Complainant belongs disposes of over 7,500 stores in more than 36 countries, generating an annual turnover of 25 EUR billion in 2024 (as per screenshots from the website of the Complainant copied into the Complaint).

The Complainant owns the trademark EURONICS which is protected through several registrations worldwide (as per Annexes 3 to 8 to the Complaint), including the following:

- International Registration ("IR") no. 595048 EURONICS (word), registered on November 5, 1992, for goods and services in Classes 9, 11, 35, 36, and 37 with designations to more than 30 countries around the world including Australia, United Kingdom, France, Germany, Türkiye, and Russian Federation.
- European Union Trademark ("EUTM") no. 016763138 EURONICS (device in white writing on blue background with yellow star), registered on January 30, 2019, for goods and services in Classes 7, 9, 11, 35, 36, and 37.

The Complainant owns the domain name <euronics.com> which resolves to its corporate website.

The disputed domain name was registered on July 1, 2025 (as per Annex 1 to the Complaint). Before the filing of the present Complaint, it resolved to a website in French language purporting to be EURONICS-GERMANY, a German franchise outlet stating an email address "[...]@euronics-germany.com", and offering electronic goods and household appliances for end consumers and making use of the EURONICS trademark including in the blue, yellow and white design as registered by the Complainant (as per Annexes 10 to the Complaint). The Complainant sent a warning letter to the email address stated for contact at the website to which the disputed domain name resolved (as per Annexes 11 to the Complaint) to which the Complainant did not receive a reply.

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 it owns rights in the trademark EURONICS. This trademark, so the Complainant, is identically incorporated into the disputed domain name, with only a hyphen and a further descriptive element added, which is why the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to its trademark.

On the second element, the Complainant states that the disputed domain name was registered long after the Complainant acquired rights in the EURONICS trademark. The Complainant claims that the Respondent does not engage in a bona fide offering of goods and that it does not dispose of the consent of the Complainant to use its trademark. Moreover, so the Complainant, the Respondent does not have a legitimate interest in the disputed domain name as it is being fraudulently used in a way deceiving and misleading the consumer into believing that there is a relation between the Complainant and the Respondent.

On the third element, the Complainant claims that the registration of the disputed domain name infringes the Complainant's prior trademark rights. The disputed domain name was registered in order to prevent the Complainant from reflecting its trademark in the disputed domain name and to disrupt the Complainant's business. The use to which the disputed domain name is put by the Respondent by the website according to Annexes 10 is fraudulent, as consumers will believe that they are ordering from a valid member website of the Complainant. In doing so, the Respondent is intentionally attempting to attract, for commercial gain, Internet users to a website by creating a likelihood of confusion as to the source, sponsorship, affiliation or endorsement by the Complainant. The Complainant contends that this demonstrates bad faith on the part of the Respondent.

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 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 term, here, "-media", 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.

Panels have held that the use of a domain name for illegitimate activity – in the present case, the Respondent's alleged false impersonation as part of the group of the Complainant - can never confer rights or legitimate interests on a respondent. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 2.13.1.

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 has registered the disputed domain name identically including the Complainant's trademark together with a descriptive term in relation to the goods marketed by the Complainant. The disputed domain name was used to resolve to a website using not only the Complainant's trademark as such but also in the same colors and graphics protected on behalf of the Complainant, falsely suggesting to French language consumers that they are ordering from the Complainant's German outlet.

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.

The registration and use of the disputed domain name as demonstrated by the Complainant shows that the Respondent clearly knew about the Complainant's trademark and business and acted in order to make Internet users believe they are ordering from an official member of the Complainant's group which amounts to false impersonation for commercial gain. Panels have held that this 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 <euronics-media.com> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Andrea Jaeger-Lenz/

Andrea Jaeger-Lenz

Sole Panelist

Date: December 2, 2025