ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION
Schneider Electric SE v. Hossein Firouzi
Case No. D2026-3024

1. The Parties

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

The Respondent is Hossein Firouzi, United Arab Emirates.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <tehranschneider.com> is registered with 1API GmbH (the "Registrar").

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the "Center") on July 9, 2026. On July 9, 2026, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On July 29, 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 July 29, 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 29, 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 July 30, 2026. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was August 19, 2026. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent's default on August 24, 2026.

The Center appointed Fabrizio Bedarida as the sole panelist in this matter on September 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, which was founded in 1871, is a French industrial business trading internationally. It manufactures and offers products for power management, automation, and related solutions. The Complainant's corporate website can be found at "www.schneiderelectric.com". The Complainant is included in the NYSE Euronext and the French CAC 40 stock market indices. In 2025, the Complainant's revenues amounted to EUR 40 billion.

The Complainant owns several trademarks for SCHNEIDER ELECTRIC, including:

International trademark SCHNEIDER (device) registration No. 461453 registered on May 13, 1981;

International trademark SCHNEIDER (device) registration No. 843403 registered on July 22, 2004; and

International trademark SCHNEIDER ELECTRIC (device) registration No. 715395 registered on March 15, 1999.

The Complainant is also the owner of the domain name <schneiderelectric.com> registered on April 4, 1996.

The Complainant's trademark has been recognized in previous UDRP decisions as a well-known trademark.

The disputed domain name was registered on June 2, 2021, and resolves to a website in the Persian language, displaying the Complainant's SCHNEIDER ELECTRIC trademark and logo and advertising Schneider-branded electrical products. When the Panel visited the website, it presented (in the "About Us" section) the Tehran Schneider store "as one of the largest agencies of Schneider Company in Iran". [1]

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 addition of the geographic term "tehran" does not prevent a finding of confusing similarity between the disputed domain name and the Complainant's SCHNEIDER trademark. The Complainant further asserts that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the disputed domain name; that the Respondent was aware of the Complainant's trademark and activities and registered the disputed domain name with no reasonable motive, in an attempt to pose as the Complainant's subsidiary for commercial gain.

B. Respondent

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

[1] Noting in particular the general powers of a panel articulated inter alia in paragraphs 10 and 12 of the Rules, it has been accepted that a panel may undertake limited factual research into matters of public record. WIPO Overview of WIPO Panel Views on Select UDRP Questions ("WIPO Overview 3.1") section 4.8.

6. Discussion and Findings

In order for the Complainant to obtain a transfer of the disputed domain name, paragraph 4(a) of the Policy requires that the Complainant must demonstrate to the Panel that:

(i) the disputed domain name is identical or confusingly similar to a trademark or service mark in which the Complainant has rights; and

(ii) the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the disputed domain name; and

(iii) 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 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 verbal element of the SCHNEIDER mark is reproduced and 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 1.10.

Although the addition of other term here, "tehran", 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.

Panels have held that the use of a domain name for illegal activity here, claimed as passing off, 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.

In the present case, the Panel notes that the Respondent was aware of the Complainant's trademark registrations and rights to the SCHNEIDER trademark when it registered the disputed domain name.

The disputed domain name contains the Complainant's registered SCHNEIDER trademark in its entirety, without any authorization or approval, combined with the geographical term "tehran".

The disputed domain name was registered many years after the Complainant's trademark had been registered. In addition, owing to the substantial presence established worldwide and on the Internet by the Complainant, and the use of the disputed domain name to sell purported SCHNEIDER-branded goods by presenting itself as "one of the largest agencies of Schneider Company in Iran", it is apparent that the Respondent was aware of the existence of the Complainant's trademark when registering the disputed domain name.

Therefore, it is more likely than not that the Respondent, when registering the disputed domain name, had knowledge of the Complainant's earlier rights to the SCHNEIDER trademark and name and targeted those.

It thus appears that the Respondent registered the disputed domain name to misleadingly attract, for commercial gain, Internet users to its website by creating a likelihood of confusion with the Complainant's trademark as to the source, sponsorship, affiliation or endorsement of the Respondent's website and products, and this shows bad faith registration and use of the disputed domain name.

In addition, panels have consistently found that the mere registration of a domain name that is identical or confusingly similar (particularly domain names comprising typos or incorporating the mark plus a descriptive term) to a famous or widely-known trademark by an unaffiliated entity can by itself create a presumption of bad faith. WIPO Overview 3.1, section 3.1.4.

Panels have held that the use of a domain name for illegal activity here, claimed as 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 bad faith registration and use of the disputed domain name are further supported by the Respondent's failure to deny the Complainant's allegations of bad faith in these proceedings.

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 <tehranschneider.com> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Fabrizio Bedarida/
Fabrizio Bedarida
Sole Panelist
Date: September 8, 2026