ARBITRATION
AND
MEDIATION CENTER

WIPO
WORLD
INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY
ORGANIZATION

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

Lincoln Global, Inc., The Lincoln Electric Company v. Name Redacted
Case No. D2026-2408

1. The Parties

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

The Respondent is Name Redacted[1].

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <lincolnalectric.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 June 3, 2026. On June 4, 2026, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On the same date, the Registrar transmitted by email to the Center its verification response confirming that the Respondent is listed as the registrant and providing the contact details.

The Center verified that the 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 June 5, 2026. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5,

[1] The Respondent appears to have used one of the Complainants' name when registering the disputed domain name. In light of the potential identity theft, the Panel has redacted the Respondent's name from this Decision. However, the Panel has attached as Annex 1 to this Decision an instruction to the Registrar regarding transfer of the disputed domain name, which includes the name of the Respondent. The Panel has authorized the Center to transmit Annex 1 to the Registrar as part of the order in these proceedings, and has indicated Annex 1 to this Decision shall not be published due to the exceptional circumstances of this case.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 due date for Response was June 25, 2026. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent's default on June 26, 2026.

The Center appointed Elizabeth Ann Morgan 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 Complainants in this matter are The Lincoln Electric Company, and Lincoln Global, Inc., collectively known as "Lincoln Electric," and to be referred as "the Complainant" hereinafter, which are sister companies owned by Lincoln Electric Holdings Inc. The Complainant is the owner of trademark registrations across various jurisdictions including but not limited to: LINCOLN ELECTRIC, US Reg. No. 2350082, registered May 16, 2000 in class 9; LINCOLN ELECTRIC, US Reg. No. 2420805 registered January 16, 2001 in class 35; and LINCOLN ELECTRIC, European Union Reg. No. 004725941 registered November 27, 2006, in classes 6, 9, and 35.

Founded in 1895, the Complainant began selling electric motors and the company's product line expanded to include battery chargers for electric automobiles. In 1911, Lincoln Electric introduced the first variable voltage, single operator, portable welding machine in the world. The company continued to expand in the United States, and in 1936 started to expand globally when it established The Lincoln Electric Company Pty Ltd in Australia.

Today, Lincoln Electric has become a leading company in the design, development and manufacture of arc welding products, robotic arc welding systems, plasma and oxy-fuel cutting equipment and has a global position in the brazing and soldering alloys market. Headquartered in US, the Complainant operates 71 manufacturing and automation system integration locations across 21 countries and maintains a worldwide network of distributors and sales offices serving customers in over 160 countries.

The Complainant has a large Internet presence and is the owner of over 270 domain names which incorporate the LINCOLN ELECTRIC trademark and its variations, including its primary domain name <lincolnelectric.com>.

The disputed domain name was registered on March 23, 2026, and according to the Complaint and at the time of this Decision, it resolves to the Registrar holding page that reads "We're under construction. Please check back for an update soon". The Complainant further submits the disputed domain name has been set up with Mail Exchanger ("MX") records.

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 as the disputed domain name differs from the Complainant's trademark by just one letter, the disputed domain name must be considered a prototypical example of typosquatting – which intentionally takes advantage of Internet users that inadvertently type an incorrect address – often a misspelling of the complainant's trademark – when seeking to access the trademark owner's website. This means that a deliberate misspelling of a trademark registered as a domain name, is intended to confuse Internet users and consequently is confusingly similar by design. Typosquatting itself has been taken as evidence of bad faith registration and use by past panels. The Complainant further contends that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the disputed domain name and that it registered and used the disputed domain name in bad faith.

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 disputed domain name varies from the Complainant's LINCOLN ELECTRIC trademark by one letter – the Respondent has substituted the first letter "e" in the trademark term "ELECTRIC", with the letter "a". The Panel finds the misspelled mark is recognizable 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, sections 1.7 and 1.9.

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 Respondent is not sponsored by or affiliated with the Complainant in any way. Furthermore, the Complainant has not given the Respondent permission to use the Complainant's trademarks in any manner, including in domain names.

The disputed domain name resolves to the Registrar holding page that reads, "We're under construction. Please check back for an update soon". The Respondent has failed to demonstrate any evidence showing an attempt to make use of the disputed domain name in connection with a bona fide offering of goods or services nor has it shown a legitimate noncommercial or fair use of the disputed domain name.

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 finds that the Respondent's deliberate misspelling of the Complainant's mark in the disputed domain name constitutes typosquatting which is the intentional attempt to attract Internet users to the Respondent's website by creating a likelihood of confusion with the Complainant's mark. Numerous panels have found that registering and using a domain name to take advantage of traffic generated by typing errors committed by another's customers, as here, is evidence of bad faith registration and use pursuant to the Policy.

Further, 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.

In addition, although the disputed domain name is not being used to host active content, the Complainant submits that it has been set up with MX records. This shows that the disputed domain name may be actively used for email purposes. Emails deriving from the disputed domain name could not reasonably be used for any good faith purpose given the close similarity of the disputed domain name with the Complainant's trademark that would be difficult to discern in an email. Therefore, it is likely that the disputed domain name may be actively used to facilitate fraudulent activity such as phishing, impersonating or passing off as the Complainant. Previous panel decisions have considered the presence of MX records to be indicative of bad faith registration and use.

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 <lincolnalectric.com> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Elizabeth Ann Morgan/
Elizabeth Ann Morgan
Sole Panelist
Date: July 15, 2026