

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

Lincoln Global, Inc., The Lincoln Electric Company v. Susan Webbing
Case No. D2025-4357

1. The Parties

Complainants are Lincoln Global, Inc. and The Lincoln Electric Company, United States of America (“United States”), represented by CSC Digital Brand Services Group AB, Sweden.

Respondent is Susan Webbing, United States.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <lincolnelectric.com> is registered with Name SRS AB (the “Registrar”).

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the “Center”) on October 23, 2025. On October 28, 2025, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On October 28, 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 (Protected Protected, Shield Whois) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to Complainant on October 28, 2025, providing the registrant and contact information disclosed by the Registrar, and inviting Complainant to submit an amendment to the Complaint. Complainant filed an amended Complaint on October 31, 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 Respondent of the Complaint, and the proceedings commenced on November 4, 2025. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was November 24, 2025. Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified Respondent’s default on November 26, 2025.

The Center appointed Georges Nahitchevansky as the sole panelist in this matter on December 4, 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

Complainants, Lincoln Global Inc. and The Lincoln Electric Company (collectively “Complainant”), are sister companies owned by Lincoln Electric Holdings Inc., and are involved in the design, development and manufacture of arc welding products, welding systems and related products in the brazing and soldering alloys market. While Complainant is based in the State of Ohio, United States, it operates a number of manufacturing and automation system integration locations across 21 countries. Complainant owns and uses the name and mark LINCOLN ELECTRIC in connection with its products and owns several trademark registrations around the world. These include, inter alia, registrations for LINCOLN ELECTRIC in the United States (Registration Nos. 2350082, 2420805, 3114157, the earliest of which issued to registration in 2000) and the European Union (Registration Nos. 004725941, 015346935 and 004982468, the earliest of which issued to registration in 2006). Complainant owns and uses the domain name <lincolnelectric.com> for a website concerning Complainant and its services.

Respondent appears to be based in the State of Florida, United States. Respondent registered the disputed domain name on September 3, 2025. Since registering the disputed domain name, Respondent does not appear to have used the disputed domain name for an active website or page and none currently appears. The disputed domain name, however, has been set up for email use.

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.

Complainant maintains that it is the world leader in the design, development and manufacture of arc welding products and systems and related products. Complainant also asserts that it has rights in the LINCOLN ELECTRIC name and mark through its use of such and by virtue of its several trademark registrations for the mark.

Complainant argues that the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to its LINCOLN ELECTRIC mark as it is simply a misspelling of the mark by replacing the first letter “c” in “electric” with the letter “e.”

Complainant asserts that Respondent does not have rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name as Respondent (i) is not sponsored or affiliated with Complainant and has no permission to use the LINCOLN ELECTRIC mark, (ii) is not commonly known by the disputed domain name, (iii) has not used the disputed domain name for an active website or page, and (iv) has set up the disputed domain name for email use thus suggesting that it could be used as part of a phishing or impersonation scheme.

Lastly, Complainant contends that Respondent has registered and used the disputed domain name in bad faith given that Complainant and its LINCOLN ELECTRIC name and mark are internationally known and given that Respondent has registered a typo version of that name and mark. Based on such, Complainant argues that Respondent was likely aware of Complainant and opportunistically registered the disputed domain name. Finally, Complainant maintains that Respondent has passively held the disputed domain name in bad faith and by setting up the disputed domain name for email purposes is likewise acting in bad faith as such could potentially be used for phishing purposes.

B. Respondent

Respondent did not reply to Complainant's contentions.

6. Preliminary Consideration: Consolidation of Complainants

In the matter, there are two Complainants. While Complainant has not expressly requested consolidation of the two Complainants, Complainant has treated them collectively as one party in this proceeding. The Panel thus considers whether such consolidation is appropriate here.

Paragraph 10(e) of the UDRP Rules grants a panel the power to consolidate multiple domain name disputes. In assessing whether a complaint filed by multiple complainants may be brought against a single respondent, panels look at whether (i) the complainants have a specific common grievance against the respondent, or the respondent has engaged in common conduct that has affected the complainants in a similar fashion, and (ii) it would be equitable and procedurally efficient to permit the consolidation. WIPO Overview of WIPO Panel Views on Selected UDRP Questions, Third Edition ("[WIPO Overview 3.0](#)"), section 4.11.1.

Here, Complainants are sister companies and both have an interest in the LINCOLN ELECTRIC mark. As the dispute concerns a disputed domain name that is arguably confusingly similar to that mark, and thus Complainants share a common grievance, the Panel finds that it would be equitable and procedurally efficient to permit the consolidation. See, e.g., *Société Générale and Fimat International Banque v. Lebanon Index/La France DN and Elie Khouri*, WIPO Case No. [D2002-0760](#).

7. Discussion and Findings

Under paragraph 4(a) of the Policy, to succeed Complainant must satisfy the Panel that:

- (i) the disputed domain name is identical or confusingly similar to a trademark or service mark in which Complainant has rights;
- (ii) Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of 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

Ownership of a trademark registration is generally sufficient evidence that a complainant has the requisite rights in a mark for purposes of paragraph 4(a)(i) of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#) at section 1.7. Complainant has provided evidence that it owns several trademark registrations for the LINCOLN ELECTRIC mark and that such issued to registration well before Respondent registered the disputed domain name.

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 Complainant's trademark and the disputed domain name. *Id.*

Here, the disputed domain name is nothing more than a typo version of the LINCOLN ELECTRIC mark that merely replaces the first letter "c" in "electric" with the letter "e". Such substitution of one letter in the disputed domain name does not prevent a finding of confusing similarity as the disputed domain name is nothing more than an intentional misspelling of the LINCOLN ELECTRIC mark. Accordingly, the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to Complainant's LINCOLN ELECTRIC mark for purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 1.7.

B. Rights or Legitimate Interests

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

Respondent’s registration of the disputed domain name is clearly based on the LINCOLN ELECTRIC name and mark does not seem coincidental, particularly as it is simply a typo version of that mark. Such typosquatting is, in and of itself, evidence that Respondent lacks rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name. Needless to say, the disputed domain name as constituted carries a high degree of implied affiliation and is likely to be mistakenly seen by consumers as related to Complainant and its products. Additionally, in view of Respondent’s failure to appear in this proceeding to explain its actions, the fact that Respondent has set up the disputed domain name for email purposes together with the typosquatting nature of the disputed domain name suggest that Respondent may be attempting to use the disputed domain that is confusingly similar to the LINCOLN ELECTRIC mark for Respondent’s benefit and possibly a nefarious 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 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 view of Respondent’s actions, and failure to appear in this proceeding, it is easy to infer that Respondent’s registration and use of the disputed domain name, which is clearly based on Complainant’s LINCOLN ELECTRIC mark has been done opportunistically and in bad faith for the benefit or profit of Respondent. The disputed domain name on its face suggests a connection to Complainant and its products and was registered well after Complainant had established rights in its LINCOLN ELECTRIC mark. Respondent’s bad faith is also underscored by Respondent’s registration of a typo version of the LINCOLN ELECTRIC mark. Lastly, the fact that Respondent has set up the disputed domain name for email purposes, and has failed to appear to justify its actions, suggests that the disputed domain name was registered for some purpose to benefit Respondent and perhaps a nefarious purpose.

In all, Respondent’s actions make it more likely than not that Respondent was fully aware of Complainant and its LINCOLN ELECTRIC name and mark when it registered the disputed domain name for Respondent’s benefit.

The Panel thus finds that Complainant has established the third element of the Policy.

8. 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 <lincolnelectric.com> be transferred to Complainant.

/Georges Nahitchevansky/

Georges Nahitchevansky

Sole Panelist

Date: December 16, 2025