

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

Schneider Electric SE v. Svetlana Zhukova

Case No. D2026-2200

1. The Parties

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

The Respondent is Svetlana Zhukova, Russian Federation.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <se-rus.com> is registered with Registrar of Domain Names REG.RU LLC (the "Registrar").

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed in English with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the "Center") on May 21, 2026. On May 22, 2026, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On May 25, 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 (Personal data, can not be publicly disclosed according to applicable laws) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on May 26, 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 May 26, 2026.

On May 26, 2026, the Center informed the Parties in Russian and English that the language of the registration agreement for the disputed domain name was Russian. On May 26, 2026, the Complainant confirmed its request that English be the language of the proceeding. The Respondent did not submit any comments on the Complainant's request.

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 in English and Russian, and the proceeding commenced on June 3, 2026. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was June 23, 2026. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent's default on June 25, 2026.

The Center appointed Assen Alexiev as the sole panelist in this matter on June 30, 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 was founded in 1871. It is a French manufacturer of products for power management, automation, and related solutions. The Complainant's corporate website is located at the domain name <se.com> with a redirection from <schneider-electric.com>. Its revenue for 2023 amounted to EUR 36 billion.

The Complainant is the owner of the following trademark registrations consisting of or comprising SCHNEIDER ELECTRIC (the "SCHNEIDER ELECTRIC trademark"):

- the International trademark SCHNEIDER ELECTRIC with registration No. 715395, registered on March 15, 1999 for goods and services in International Classes 6, 9, 11, 36, 37, 39, and 42; and
- the International trademark SCHNEIDER S ELECTRIC with registration No. 715396, registered on March 15, 1999 for goods and services in International Classes 6, 9, 11, 36, 37, 39, and 42.

The SCHNEIDER ELECTRIC trademark was ranked at No. 65 in the Interbrand's Best Global Brands 2025.

The Complainant's international consulting unit is named "SE Advisory Services".

The Complainant is the registrant of the domain names <se.com>, registered on June 6, 1997; <se.co>, registered on April 26, 2010; <se.fr>, registered on December 26, 2014; and <se.app>, registered on May 1, 2018.

The disputed domain name was registered on April 18, 2024. It is currently inactive. At the time of filing of the Complaint, it resolved to a Russian language website that offered for sale the Complainant's products and described its operator as an official representative or dealer of the Complainant in the Russian Federation and the Commonwealth of Independent States (the "CIS"), with statements such as "Официальный представитель Schneider Electric в России" (in English, "Official representative of Schneider Electric in Russia") and "Официальный поставщик | Вы получаете поставку от официального дилера Schneider Electric в России и СНГ" (in English, "Official supplier | You receive delivery from an official dealer Schneider Electric in Russia and the CIS"). The website also displayed the copyright notice "©2024, Schneider Electric".

There is no information in the case file about the Respondent apart from the fact that she is purportedly located in the Russian Federation.

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 SCHNEIDER ELECTRIC trademark. The Complainant states that the element "se" in the disputed domain name has become a common acronym for its SCHNEIDER ELECTRIC trademark as a result of the Complainant's publicity campaigns and its long use of the domain name <se.com> and ownership of other domain names that comprise the element "se" which redirect to the Complainant's official website. As to the element "rus", the Complainant states that it is an abbreviation for "russia" and that its inclusion in the disputed domain name does not prevent a finding of confusing similarity between the disputed domain name and the Complainant's SCHNEIDER ELECTRIC trademark.

The Complainant submits that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the disputed domain name, because it is not commonly known under it, and is not related to the Complainant, and the Complainant has not authorised it to use the SCHNEIDER ELECTRIC trademark or to register the disputed domain name.

The Complainant contends that that Respondent has registered with knowledge of the Complainant's SCHNEIDER ELECTRIC trademark and its acronym SE, and is using it in bad faith to pass off as the Complainant. The Complainant points out that the website at the disputed domain name mimics the Complainant's own website and displays the Complainant's copyright-protected images without authorisation.

B. Respondent

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

6. Discussion and Findings

6.1. Procedural Issue – Language of the Proceeding

The language of the Registration Agreement for the disputed domain name is Russian. Pursuant to the Rules, paragraph 11(a), in the absence of an agreement between the parties, or unless specified otherwise in the registration agreement, the language of the administrative proceeding shall be the language of the registration agreement.

The Complaint was filed in English. The Complainant requests that the language of the proceeding be English. In support of its request, the Complainant states that English is the most-widely used language in international relations, and that in order to proceed in Russian, the Complainant would have to retain specialised translation services at a cost that is likely to be higher than the overall cost of the present proceeding. The Complainant also notes that the Center has sent all its communications to the Parties in English and Russian.

The Respondent did not make any submissions with respect to the language of the proceeding.

In exercising its discretion to use a language other than that of the registration agreement, the Panel has to exercise such discretion judicially in the spirit of fairness and justice to both parties, taking into account all relevant circumstances of the case, including matters such as the parties' ability to understand and use the proposed language, time and costs (see WIPO Overview of WIPO Panel Views on Select UDRP Questions (["WIPO Overview 3.1"](#)), section 4.5.1).

Having considered the above, the Panel determines under paragraph 11(a) of the Rules that the language of the proceeding shall be English.

6.2. Substantive Issues

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 the SCHNEIDER ELECTRIC trademark for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.2.1.

The Panel finds the SCHNEIDER ELECTRIC trademark is recognisable within the disputed domain name, because it incorporates the abbreviated form SE of this trademark. The Complainant has submitted evidence which shows that it actively promotes and uses this abbreviated form of the SCHNEIDER ELECTRIC trademark in the name of its international consulting unit and in a number of domain names, including but not limited to <se.com> which resolves to the Complainant's official website. This satisfies the Panel that the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to the SCHNEIDER ELECTRIC trademark for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.7.

Although the addition of other terms (here, "-rus") 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 SCHNEIDER ELECTRIC trademark for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.8.

The Panel also notes that the content of the website associated with the disputed domain name is usually disregarded by panels when assessing confusing similarity under the first element. In some instances, panels have however taken note of the content of the website associated with a domain name to confirm confusing similarity whereby it appears prima facie that the respondent seeks to target a trademark through the disputed domain name.

The evidence in the case shows that the website associated with the disputed domain name prominently displayed the SCHNEIDER ELECTRIC trademark and copyright-protected images from the Complainant's official website, claimed that its provider was an official dealer of the Complainant and included a misleading copyright notice that impersonated the Complainant. This shows that the Respondent's website was designed to target the Complainant's SCHNEIDER ELECTRIC trademark, which further supports the conclusion that the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to a trademark in which the Complainant has rights.

The Panel therefore finds that 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 recognised 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 disputed domain name is confusingly similar to the Complainant's trademark and to its <se.com> domain name, and has been used for a website that featured the Complainant's products and claimed to be an official representative and supplier of the Complainant for the Russian Federation and the CIS, without specifying the name of its operator and without disclosing the absence of relationship between the Parties, while including a copyright notice impersonating the Complainant. This use does not comply with the third requirement of the Oki Data test (the site must accurately and prominently disclose the registrant's relationship with the trademark holder). Section 2.8.1(iii) of the [WIPO Overview 3.1](#). The Respondent has not provided any plausible bona fide explanation for the registration and use of the disputed domain name, and it is obvious that the Respondent's website was not noncommercial in nature.

In view of the above, it appears as more likely than not that the Respondent has registered and used the disputed domain name in an attempt to exploit the reputation of the Complainant's trademark to mislead and attract visitors to its website and to promote its own business. Such conduct cannot give rise to rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name.

The Panel therefore finds that 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.

The Respondent registered the disputed domain name many years after the Complainant established its reputation, and the composition of the disputed domain name makes it appear as the official website of the Complainant for the Russian Federation. The Respondent has associated the disputed domain name to a website that featured the SCHNEIDER ELECTRIC trademark, offered for sale the Complainant's products, falsely claimed to be an official representative and supplier of the Complainant's products for the Russian Federation and the CIS, and included a misleading copyright notice.

In the absence of any allegations or evidence suggesting otherwise, the above leads the Panel to the conclusion that it is more likely than not that by registering and using the disputed domain name, the Respondent has intentionally attempted to attract, for commercial gain, Internet users to its website by creating a likelihood of confusion with the Complainant's SCHNEIDER ELECTRIC trademark as to the source or affiliation of the Respondent's website and as to the endorsement by the Complainant of the services offered on the Respondent's website. This supports a conclusion that the disputed domain name was registered and is being used in bad faith under paragraph 4(b)(iv) of the Policy.

The Panel therefore 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 <se-rus.com> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Assen Alexiev/

Assen Alexiev

Sole Panelist

Date: July 9, 2026