

## **ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION**

Schneider Electric SE v. Chow Chin Chong  
Case No. D2025-5140

### **1. The Parties**

The Complainant is Schneider Electric SE, France, represented by Nameshield, France.

The Respondent is Chow Chin Chong, Bangladesh.

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

The disputed domain name <schneider-elcetric.com> is registered with Metaregistrar BV (the “Registrar”).

### **3. Procedural History**

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the “Center”) on December 10, 2025. On December 10, 2025, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On December 11, 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 (Unknown) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on December 11, 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 December 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 December 15, 2025. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was January 4, 2026. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent’s default on January 5, 2026.

The Center appointed Pascal Böhner as the sole panelist in this matter on January 9, 2026. 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, Schneider Electric SE, is a French multinational corporation founded in 1871. The Complainant manufactures and offers products for power management, automation, and related solutions. The Complainant is listed on the NYSE Euronext and is a constituent of the French CAC 40 stock market index. In 2024, the Complainant's revenues amounted to EUR 38 billion.

The Complainant owns numerous trademark registrations for SCHNEIDER ELECTRIC, including:

- International trademark SCHNEIDER ELECTRIC, registration No. 715395, registered on March 15, 1999, in Classes 6, 9, 11, 36, 37, 39, and 42, covering, inter alia, common metals and their alloys; scientific, electrical and electronic apparatus and instruments for conveying, distributing, transforming, and controlling electric current; apparatus for lighting, heating, and ventilating; construction and repair services; and computer programming.
- International trademark SCHNEIDER S ELECTRIC (figurative), registration No. 715396, registered on March 15, 1999, in Classes 6, 9, 11, 36, 37, 39, and 42, covering the same goods and services.
- European Union Trade Mark SCHNEIDER ELECTRIC (figurative), registration No. 001103803, filed on March 12, 1999, and registered on September 9, 2005, in Classes 6, 9, 11, 36, 37, 39, and 42, covering, inter alia, metal building materials; scientific, electric and electronic apparatus and instruments for transporting, distribution, and control of electric current; apparatus for lighting, heating, and ventilating; and computer programming.

The Complainant also owns the domain name <schneiderelectric.com>, which has been registered and used since April 4, 1996, and operates its main corporate website.

The disputed domain name was registered on November 27, 2025. At the time of filing the Complaint, the disputed domain name did not resolve to an active website. The Complainant has provided evidence that the disputed domain name was used in a phishing scheme, whereby emails were sent from addresses using the disputed domain name, impersonating employees of the Complainant in an attempt to obtain undue payments from third parties.

#### **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.

The Complainant submits that the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to its trademark SCHNEIDER ELECTRIC. The Complainant argues that the disputed domain name constitutes a typosquatted version of its trademark, with the letters "c" and "e" inverted in the word "electric" to create "elcetric". The Complainant contends that such minor misspelling does not prevent a finding of confusing similarity.

The Complainant asserts that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name. The Complainant states that it has not granted any license or authorization to the Respondent to use its trademark, and that the Respondent is not commonly known by the disputed domain name. The Complainant further contends that the use of the disputed domain name for phishing cannot constitute a bona fide offering of goods or services or a legitimate noncommercial or fair use.

The Complainant argues that the disputed domain name was registered and is being used in bad faith. Given the worldwide reputation of the SCHNEIDER ELECTRIC trademark, the Complainant submits that the Respondent must have been aware of the Complainant's trademark when registering the disputed domain name. The Complainant provides evidence that the disputed domain name was used in a phishing scheme to impersonate employees of the Complainant, which constitutes clear evidence of bad faith registration and use.

## **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 for the purposes of the Policy. The Complainant has provided evidence of its registered trademark rights in SCHNEIDER ELECTRIC, which predates the registration of the disputed domain name by over 25 years. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 1.2.1.

The disputed domain name incorporates the Complainant's SCHNEIDER ELECTRIC trademark in its entirety, albeit with a minor misspelling consisting of the transposition of the letters "c" and "e" in the word "electric" to form "elcetric". This is a classic example of typosquatting, whereby a domain name is registered with a common or obvious misspelling of a trademark to take advantage of typographical errors made by Internet users. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 1.9, confirms that "[a] domain name which consists of a common, obvious, or intentional misspelling of a trademark is considered by panels to be confusingly similar to the relevant mark for purposes of the first element".

The addition of a hyphen between "schneider" and "elcetric" does not prevent a finding of confusing similarity between the disputed domain name and the Complainant's trademark. Regarding the applicable Top-Level Domain ".com" in the disputed domain name, it is viewed as a standard registration requirement and as such is disregarded under the first element confusing similarity test. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 1.11.1.

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 Complainant has not licensed or otherwise authorized the Respondent to use its SCHNEIDER ELECTRIC trademark. The Respondent is not commonly known by the disputed domain name; the Whois information identifies the Respondent as “Chow Chin Chong”, which bears no resemblance to the disputed domain name. There is no evidence that the Respondent has used, or made demonstrable preparations to use, the disputed domain name in connection with a bona fide offering of goods or services.

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.

Furthermore, the composition of the disputed domain name, being a typosquatted version of the Complainant's well-known trademark, along with the use of the disputed domain name, carries a risk of Internet user confusion, and accordingly cannot constitute a fair use in these circumstances .

Panels have held that the use of a domain name for illegal activity, such as phishing, can never confer rights or legitimate interests on a respondent. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 2.13.1. The evidence provided by the Complainant indicates that the disputed domain name was used to send phishing emails impersonating the Complainant's employees to fraudulently obtain payments. Such use cannot constitute a bona fide offering of goods or services under paragraph 4(c)(i) of the Policy, nor a legitimate noncommercial or fair use under paragraph 4(c)(iii) of the Policy.

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.

#### **Registration in Bad Faith**

The Complainant's SCHNEIDER ELECTRIC trademark is well known internationally, with the Complainant having been in business for over 150 years and generating annual revenues of EUR 38 billion. The Complainant's trademark registrations predate the registration of the disputed domain name by more than 25 years, and the Complainant has operated its website since 1996.

Given the international reputation and distinctiveness of the Complainant's SCHNEIDER ELECTRIC trademark, the Panel finds it inconceivable that the Respondent registered the disputed domain name without knowledge of the Complainant and its trademark. The deliberate misspelling of the Complainant's trademark through the transposition of letters is indicative of a calculated attempt to create a domain name confusingly similar to the Complainant's trademark for illegitimate purposes. See [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 3.2.2.

#### Use in Bad Faith

The evidence submitted by the Complainant demonstrates that the disputed domain name was used in a phishing scheme. Email addresses associated with the disputed domain name were used to impersonate employees of the Complainant to contact third parties and attempt to redirect payments to accounts not controlled by the Complainant. Such fraudulent activity constitutes clear evidence of bad faith use. See [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 3.4.

Panels have consistently held that using a domain name for purposes of phishing or other fraudulent activity constitutes evidence of bad faith registration and use pursuant to paragraph 4(a)(iii) of the Policy. See, e.g., *Accor v. SANGHO HEO / Contact Privacy Inc.*, WIPO Case No. [D2014-1471](#).

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 <schneider-elcetric.com> be transferred to the Complainant.

*/Pascal Böhner/*

**Pascal Böhner**

Sole Panelist

Date: January 23, 2026