

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

Société de Négoce et de Participation v. Name Redacted
Case No. D2026-2113

1. The Parties

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

The Respondents are Name Redacted¹.

2. The Domain Names and Registrars

The disputed domain names <soneparcorporate.com> and <sonepar-corporate.online> are registered with Hostinger Operations, UAB. The disputed domain name <soneparcorporate.com> is registered with NameCheap, Inc. The disputed domain name <sonepar-corporate.com> is registered with http.net Internet GmbH (collectively, the “Registrars”).

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the “Center”) on May 15, 2026. On May 18, 2026, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrars a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain names. On May 18, 2026, May 19, 2026, and May 20, 2026, the Registrars transmitted by email to the Center their verification responses, disclosing registrant and contact information for the disputed domain names which differed from the named Respondents (“Privacy service provided by Withheld for Privacy ehf”) and contact information in the Complaint.

¹ The Respondents appear to have used the names of third parties when registering the disputed domain names. In light of the potential identity theft, the Panel has redacted the Respondents’ names from this Decision. However, the Panel has attached as Annex 1 to this Decision an instruction to the Registrars regarding transfer of the disputed domain names, which includes the name of the Respondents. The Panel has authorized the Center to transmit Annex 1 to the Registrars as part of the order in these proceedings and has indicated that Annex 1 to this Decision shall not be published due to the exceptional circumstances of this case. See *Banco Bradesco S.A. v. FAST-12785241 Attn. Bradescourgente.net / Name Redacted*, WIPO Case No. [D2009-1788](#).

The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on May 22, 2026 with the registrant and contact information of nominally multiple underlying registrants revealed by the Registrars, requesting the Complainant to either file separate complaint(s) for the disputed domain names associated with different underlying registrants or alternatively, demonstrate that the underlying registrants are in fact the same entity and/or that all domain names are under common control. The Complainant filed amended Complaints on May 26 and May 28, 2026.

The Center verified that the Complaint together with the amended Complaints 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 Respondents of the Complaint, and the proceedings commenced on May 29, 2026. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was June 18, 2026. The Respondents did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondents' default on June 26, 2026.

The Center appointed Benjamin Fontaine as the sole panelist in this matter on July 2, 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 the French company Société de Négoce et de Participation, operating under the trade name Sonepar. Founded in 1969, Sonepar is one of the global leaders in B-to-B distribution of electrical products, solutions and related services. Through a network of approximately 100 brands operating in 40 countries, Sonepar serves professional customers worldwide. In 2020, with 45,000 employees, the group generated sales of around EUR 23 billion.

The Complainant is the owner of numerous SONEPAR trade mark registrations around the world, among which:

-  , French trade mark No. 4815909 registered on June 10, 2022; and
-  , International trade mark No. 1654996, registered on December 3, 2021.

The disputed domain names are:

- <sonepar-corporate.com> registered on February 15, 2026;
- <sonepar-corporate.online> registered on April 28, 2026;
- <soneparcorporate.com> registered on May 5, 2026; and
- <soneparcoporate.com> registered on May 12, 2026.

At the time of drafting the Decision, the four disputed domain names are inactive.

When the Complaint was filed, the disputed domain names <soneparcorporate.com>, <sonepar-corporate.online> and <soneparcoporate.com> resolved to registrar default pages, while <sonepar-corporate.com> displayed an error page.

However, the four disputed domain names had been configured with active mail exchange ("MX") records, and the disputed domain names <soneparcorporate.com> and <sonepar-corporate.com> were used in connection with a phishing scheme whereby the Respondents fraudulently impersonated the Complainant and one of its executives for the purpose of placing orders with third parties.

5. Parties' Contentions

A. Complainant

Preliminarily, the Complainant requests that the disputes be consolidated against the multiple disputed domain name registrants.

On the merits, the Complainant contends that it has satisfied each of the elements required under the Policy for a transfer of the disputed domain names.

Notably, the Complainant contends that the disputed domain names are confusingly similar to its earlier SONEPAR trade mark. Indeed, each of the four disputed domain names identically reproduces the SONEPAR trade mark and the latter remains recognizable within them.

Then, the Complainant claims that the Respondents have no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the disputed domain names. In particular, the Respondents are not affiliated with the Complainant and have never been authorized by the Complainant to register or use its prior SONEPAR trade mark, nor to seek registration of any domain name incorporating that trade mark. Besides, evidence shows that the Respondents deliberately sought to fraudulently impersonate the Complainant and one of its executives, to deceive third parties.

Besides, the Complainant submits that the disputed domain names were registered and have been used in bad faith. The Complainant contends that it enjoys a substantial worldwide reputation under the trade mark SONEPAR. Moreover, the Respondent used the identity of one of the Complainant's executives when registering three of the four disputed domain names, namely <soneparcorporate.com>, <sonepar-corporate.online> and <soneparcoporate.com>. Further, the Respondent used the Complainant's office address when it registered the <soneparcoporate.com> disputed domain name. This demonstrates actual knowledge of the Complainant by the Respondents. Lastly, the Complainant adds that the disputed domain names <sonepar-corporate.com> and <soneparcorporate.com> have been used to operate a phishing scheme intended to deceive third parties.

B. Respondents

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

6. Discussion and Findings

Preliminary Issue - Consolidation: Multiple Respondents

The amended Complaint was filed in relation to nominally different domain name registrants. The Complainant alleges that the domain name registrants are the same entity or mere alter egos of each other, or under common control. The Complainant requests the consolidation of the disputes against the multiple disputed domain name registrants pursuant to paragraph 10(e) of the Rules.

The disputed domain name registrants did not comment on the Complainant's request.

Paragraph 3(c) of the Rules provides that a complaint may relate to more than one domain name, provided that the domain names are registered by the same domain name holder.

In addressing the Complainant's request, the Panel will consider whether (i) the disputed domain names or corresponding websites are subject to common control; and (ii) the consolidation would be fair and equitable to all Parties. See WIPO Overview of WIPO Panel Views on Select UDRP Questions ("[WIPO Overview 3.1](#)"), section 4.11.2.

As regards common control, the Panel notes in particular that the registrants of all four disputed domain names share the same email address and the same telephone number, and three of the disputed domain names are registered under the same registrant.

In the Panel's view, these circumstances support a finding that the disputed domain names are subject to common control.

As regards fairness and equity, the Panel sees no reason why consolidation of the disputes would be unfair or inequitable to any Party.

Accordingly, the Panel decides to consolidate the disputes regarding the nominally different disputed domain name registrants (referred to below as "the Respondent") in a single proceeding.

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 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 SONEPAR trade mark is reproduced within the disputed domain names. Accordingly, the disputed domain names are 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, "corporate" or the typographical misspelling thereof, "coporate", may bear on assessment of the second and third elements, the Panel finds the addition of such terms does not prevent a finding of confusing similarity between the disputed domain names 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 names. 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 names such as those enumerated in the Policy or otherwise.

In particular, the case file shows that the two disputed domain names <soneparcorporate.com> and <sonepar-corporate.com> have been used in a fraudulent scheme, notably involving the impersonation of the Complainant and one of its executives in view of deceiving third parties.

Panels have categorically held that the use of a domain name for illegal activity (e.g., phishing/identity theft, passing off, or other types of fraud) can never confer rights or legitimate interests on a respondent. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 2.13.1.

As regards the two remaining disputed domain names, <sonepar-corporate.online> and <soneparcoporate.com>, while there is no evidence that they have been actively used, the Panel notes that their composition closely resembles the two disputed domain names that were used for phishing purposes. In the overall fraudulent context of this case, the Panel finds no basis upon which the Respondent could have rights or legitimate interests in respect of these domain names.

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 notably finds that the four disputed domain names reproduce the prior trade mark SONEPAR of the Complainant.

Besides, the Respondent used the name of one of the Complainant's executives when registering three of the four disputed domain names, namely <soneparcorporate.com>, <sonepar-corporate.online> and <soneparcoporate.com>. Moreover, the Respondent also used the Complainant's registered office address when it registered the <soneparcoporate.com> disputed domain name.

Further, two of the disputed domain names were used to impersonate the Complainant shortly after their registration, and all four disputed domain names have been registered within a short timeframe of four months.

In these circumstances, the Panel finds that the Respondent must have been aware of the Complainant's trade mark when it registered the disputed domain names.

As regards use, as mentioned above, the two domain names <soneparcorporate.com> and <sonepar-corporate.com> have been used in a fraudulent scheme, whereby the Respondent fraudulently impersonated the Complainant and one of its executives in order to place orders with third parties.

Panels have held that the use of a domain name for illegitimate activity, here, claimed phishing/identity theft constitutes bad faith. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 3.4. Having reviewed the record, the Panel finds the Respondent's registration and use of the disputed domain names constitutes bad faith under the Policy.

Lastly, there is no evidence of active use of the two remaining disputed domain names, <sonepar-corporate.online> and <soneparcoporate.com>.

However, panels have found that the non-use of domain names (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 domain names 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 and reputation of the Complainant’s trademark, the composition of the two disputed domain names, the fact that they are controlled by the Respondent which has used the two other disputed domain names to fraudulently impersonate the Complainant, and finds that in the circumstances of this case the passive holding of the disputed domain names <sonepar-corporate.online> and <soneparcoporate.com> does not prevent a finding of 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 names <soneparcoporate.com>, <sonepar-corporate.com>, <soneparcoporate.com>, <sonepar-corporate.online> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Benjamin Fontaine/

Benjamin Fontaine

Sole Panelist

Date: July 15, 2026