

## **ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION**

ENGIE v. Jfjx Nxxkxkx, Hdhf  
Case No. D2026-1558

### **1. The Parties**

The Complainant is ENGIE, France, represented by Cabinet Germain & Maureau, France.

The Respondent is Jfjx Nxxkxkx, Hdhf, France.

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

The disputed domain name <engie-be.com> is registered with Squarespace Domains II LLC (the “Registrar”).

### **3. Procedural History**

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the “Center”) on April 13, 2026. On April 13, 2026, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On April 14, 2026, 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 (REDACTED FOR PRIVACY) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on April 15, 2026, 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 April 15, 2026.

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 April 22, 2026. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was May 12, 2026. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent’s default on May 28, 2026.

The Center appointed Alexandre Nappey as the sole panelist in this matter on June 1, 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 is ENGIE, a French leading global industrial group operating in the fields of energy, energy services, and the energy transition. The group is present in more than 31 countries and is actively engaged in the production of low-carbon energy, the decarbonization of energy uses, and the development of sustainable energy infrastructure.

Today, ENGIE employs more than 90,000 people worldwide and reported revenues of EUR 73.8 billion in 2024.

The Complainant is the owner of numerous trademarks consisting of or incorporating the sign “ENGIE”, among which:

- French word mark ENGIE No. 4169708 registered on July 24, 2015 in classes 1, 4, 7, 9, 11, 35, 36, 37, 38, 39, 40, 41, 42 and 45 and duly renewed;
- European union word mark ENGIE No. 014337133 registered on February 20, 2016 in classes 1, 4, 7, 9, 11, 35, 36, 37, 38, 39, 40, 41, 42 and 45 and duly renewed.

The disputed domain name <engie-be.com> was registered on February 23, 2024.

At the time of the decision the disputed domain name is inactive.

#### **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 the disputed domain name <engie-be.com> is confusingly similar to its trademark ENGIE as it fully and identically reproduces the Complainant's trademark and company name ENGIE with the mere addition of the geographic term BE which is universally understood as the country code for Belgium.

Second, the Complainant asserts that the Complainant has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the disputed domain name. There is no business affiliation between the Parties, nor any permission or license given to the Respondent by the Complainant to use its mark ENGIE in any manner.

There is no known homonymy in with the Complainant's trademark, and any domain name identical or similar to the Complainant's trademark, registered by an unauthorized third party, is considered illegitimate. The Complainant also claims that it has prior rights in a company name, trademarks and domain names, which dates back prior to the Respondent's registration of the disputed domain name, leading to the likelihood that consumers may mistakenly believe that the disputed domain name comes from the same undertaking or from affiliated companies.

Third, the Complainant asserts that the disputed domain name was registered and is being used in bad faith. According to the Complainant, in light of the reputation and visibility of the ENGIE trademark, it is inconceivable that the Respondent registered the disputed domain name <engie-be.com> without prior knowledge of the Complainant and its rights.

In addition, the registrant's contact details provided in the course of this proceeding are manifestly false and further support a finding of bad faith.

This conclusion is reinforced by the historical configuration of the disputed domain name, which was previously associated with Google mail exchange (MX) servers, including "alt4.aspmx.l.google.com". The Complainant claims that the use of such MX records demonstrates that the domain name was not passively held but was configured for active email operations.

## **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 Select UDRP Questions (["WIPO Overview 3.1"](#)), section 1.7.

The Complainant has shown rights in respect of a trademark or service mark for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), 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 3.1](#), section 1.7.

Although the addition of other terms here the suffix "be" which may refer to the geographical ISO Code for "belgium", 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 3.1](#), 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 that 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 3.1](#), 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.

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. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 3.2.1.

In the present case, the Panel notes that the Respondent must have been aware of the Complainant and its trademark rights when he registered the disputed domain names as the ENGIE Complainant's trademark predates it by nearly 10 years. Moreover, the Complainant has demonstrated that its ENGIE trademark enjoys goodwill in the relevant sector.

The Panel also notes that the disputed domain name incorporates the trademark ENGIE in its entirety with the mere addition of the suffix "-be", which may lead the Internet users to think that it resolves to the Complainant's website dedicated to Belgium.

Panels have found that the non-use of a domain name (including a blank or "coming soon" page) would not by itself prevent a finding of bad faith under the doctrine of passive holding. To the contrary, in looking at the totality of circumstances in each case, panels have found that the registration and non-use of a domain name can still constitute bad faith for purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 3.3. Having reviewed the available record, the Panel notes the distinctiveness or reputation of the Complainant's trademark, and the composition of the disputed domain name, and finds that in the circumstances of this case the passive holding of the disputed domain name does not prevent a finding of bad faith under the Policy.

Moreover, the Complainant has demonstrated that MX records used to be configured and that the Respondent deliberately provided false or misleading contact information at the time of registration. In that context, given the reputation of the Complainant's trademark and the composition of the disputed domain name which fully incorporates the Complainant's trademark, the Panel cannot conceive any use that the Respondent could make of the disputed domain name that would not interfere with the Complainant's trademark rights.

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 <engie-be.com> be transferred to the Complainant.

*/Alexandre Nappey/*

**Alexandre Nappey**

Sole Panelist

Date: June 15, 2026