

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

nVent Electric plc v. Muyingo Muhammad
Case No. D2026-2881

1. The Parties

The Complainant is nVent Electric plc, United Kingdom, represented by CSC Digital Brand Services Group AB, Sweden.

The Respondent is Muyingo Muhammad, United Kingdom.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <nventelectricplc.com> (the “Disputed Domain Name”) is registered with NameSilo, LLC (the “Registrar”).

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the “Center”) on July 1, 2026. On July 2, 2026, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On July 8, 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 (User #7bd4fef5 Privacy, PrivacyGuardian.org llc) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on July 10, 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 July 10, 2026.

The Center verified that the Complaint and 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 July 14, 2026. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was August 3, 2026. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent's default on August 7, 2026.

The Center appointed Michael D. Cover as the sole panelist in this matter on August 10, 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 4. 4.

4. Factual Background

The Complainant comprises a group of companies, including nVent Services GmbH, and is the owner of registrations for its NVENT trademark around the world, including the following:

- United Kingdom Trade Mark Reg. No. UK00003271109 NVENT registered on February 16, 2018 in Classes 6, 7, 8, 9, 11, 17, 19, 20, 37, 39, and 42;
- European Union Trade Mark Reg. No. 017151283 NVENT registered on May 30, 2018 in Classes 6, 7, 8, 9, 11, 17, 19, 20, 37, 39, and 42; and
- United States of America ("United States") Trade Mark Reg No. 5852215 NVENT registered on September 3, 2019 in Classes 6, 7, 8, 9, 11, 17, 19, 20, 37, 39, and 42.

The Complainant registered the domain name <nvent.com> in 2001. The Complainant is a publicly-traded American-British multinational electrical equipment company, specializing in electrical connection, protection and enclosure solutions. The Complainant was formed in 2018, through the combination of nVent and nVent GmbH, following the separation of Pentair plc's Electrical business into a standalone entity.

The Complainant is headquartered in London, United Kingdom, with major operational offices in Minneapolis, Minnesota, United States. The Complainant designs, manufactures, markets and services products used to connect, protect and manage electrical systems and employs more than 11,000 people worldwide. In the first quarter of 2026, the Complainant reported sales of USD1.2 billion.

The Disputed Domain Name was registered on August 27, 2025 and, prior to the Complainant's request for takedown, resolved to a website that resembled the Complainant's own website. It is currently 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.

Identical or Confusingly Similar

The Complainant has set out that the Disputed Domain Name is identical or confusingly similar to a trademark or service mark in which the Complainant has rights.

Notably, the Complainant contends that it is the proprietor of registrations of its trademark and service mark NVENT around the world. The Complainant also submits that it is standard practice when comparing a disputed domain name to a complainant's trademarks to not take the extension into account and that past panels have consistently held that a disputed domain name that consists merely of a complainant's trademark and an additional term that closely relates to and describes that complainant's business is confusingly similar to the complainant's trademarks. The Complainant also sets out that the Disputed Domain Name is confusingly similar to the Complainant's NVENT trademark and fully incorporates the Complainant's full name, nVent Electric plc.

Rights or Legitimate Interests

The Complainant sets out that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the Disputed Domain Name.

The Complainant goes on to state that the Respondent is not sponsored by or affiliated with the Complainant in any way and that the Complainant has not given the Respondent permission to use the Complainant's trademarks in any manner, including in domain names. The Complainant submits that the Respondent is not commonly known by the Disputed Domain Name, which evinces a lack of rights or legitimate interests. The Complainant notes that the Complainant has not licensed, authorized or permitted the Respondent to register domain names incorporating the Complainant's trademarks. Furthermore, says the Complainant, at the time of filing of the Complainant, the Respondent was using a privacy service, which past Panels have found equates to a lack of legitimate interest.

The Complainant also submits that, prior to the Complainant's representatives initiating takedown measures, the Respondent's use of the Disputed Domain Name did not constitute a bona fide offering of goods or services or a legitimate noncommercial or fair use.

Registered and Used in Bad Faith

The Complainant states that the Disputed Domain Name was registered and is being used in bad faith.

The Complainant continues that, prior to the Complainant's takedown request, the Respondent was using the Disputed Domain Name to point to a website that copied the Complainant's own website and that the Respondent was impersonating the Complainant's own employee and sending fraudulent emails to the Complainant's vendors, presumably with the purpose of making fraudulent purchases or the like. The Complainant submits that launching a phishing attack on the Complainant is clear evidence of bad faith registration and use.

The Complainant notes that the Disputed Domain Name currently resolves to an inactive site and is not being used and that previous panels have held that inactivity on its own can constitute a factor in finding of bad faith. Finally, the Complainant submits that, on the balance of the facts set out, it is more likely than not that the Respondent knew of and targeted the Complainant's trademark.

The Remedy Requested by the Complainant

The Complainant requests that the Administrative Panel appointed in this administrative proceeding decide that the Disputed Domain Name be transferred to the Complainant.

B. Respondent

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

6. Discussion and Findings

The Complainant must establish on the balance of probabilities that the Disputed Domain Name is identical or confusingly similar to a trademark or service mark in which the Complainant has rights, that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in the Disputed Domain Name and that the Disputed Domain Name has been registered and is being used in bad faith.

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 its registered trademark and service mark NVENT for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.2.1.

The entirety of the Complainant's mark NVENT is reproduced within the Disputed Domain Name. Accordingly, the Disputed Domain Name is confusingly similar to the Complainant's NVENT trademark for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.7.

Although the addition of other terms, here, "electric" and "plc", 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 Name and the mark for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.8.

In addition, it is well established in prior UDRP decisions that the applicable generic Top-Level-Domain ("gTLD"), in this case, ".com" is a standard registration requirement and may be ignored in considering confusing similarity. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#) 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 that a respondent lacks rights or legitimate interests in a disputed 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 has not demonstrated, before notice of the dispute, use or demonstrable preparations to use the Disputed Domain Name in connection with a bona fide offering of goods or services, that the Respondent is making legitimate noncommercial or fair use of the Disputed Domain Name, without intent for commercial gain misleadingly to divert consumers or to tarnish the reputation of the Complainant's NVENT mark.

Panels have held that the use of a domain name for illegitimate activity, such as, here, to host a copycat website, and by passing off as one of the Complainant's employees by sending fraudulent emails to its vendors, or other types of fraud, can never confer rights or legitimate interests on a respondent.

[WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 2.13.1.

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. Paragraph 4(b) of the Policy sets out a list of non-exhaustive circumstances that may indicate that a domain name was registered and used in bad faith, but other circumstances may be relevant in assessing whether a respondent's registration and use of a domain name is in bad faith. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 3.2.1.

Panels have held that the use of a disputed domain name for illegitimate activity, here phishing and passing off, 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 Name constitutes bad faith under the Policy.

The fact that the Disputed Domain Name does not resolve to an active website does not preclude the Panel's finding of bad faith.

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 <nventelectricplc.com> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Michael D. Cover/

Michael D. Cover

Sole Panelist

Date: August 21, 2026