ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

SEB S.A. v. Keti MAEK
Case No. D2026-3335

1. The Parties

The Complainant is SEB S.A., France, represented by CSC Digital Brand Services Group AB, Sweden.

The Respondent is Keti MAEK, France.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <groupeseebe.com> is registered with Hostinger Operations, UAB (the "Registrar").

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the "Center") on July 28, 2026. On July 28, 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 / The RDAP server redacted the value) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on August 3, 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 August 4, 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 August 6, 2026. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was August 26, 2026. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent's default on August 28, 2026.

The Center appointed Marie-Emmanuelle Haas as the sole panelist in this matter on September 7, 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, the French company SEB S.A., is a holding company and the parent company of Groupe SEB. The story of Groupe SEB started in 1857, with Antoine Lescure, who opened a tinware workshop in Selongey, near Dijon in Burgundy, France. After 85 years, the company was rebranded as S.E.B. (Société d'Emboutissage de Bourgogne) in 1944. Growing by external acquisitions, Groupe SEB was incorporated in 1973 including SEB S.A. as its holding company together with many affiliate companies.

Today the Complainant is a worldwide reference in small domestic appliances (including kitchen electric goods, home and personal care together with cookware products). The Complainant's brand portfolio includes 45 well-known brands in their respective industries, including KRUPS, WMF, MOULINEX, and TEFAL.

The Complainant employs over 30,000 people and is present in 150 countries. Groupe SEB also maintains 47 industrial sites along with 1,300 retail stores. In 2024, the Complainant reported sales of EUR 8.2 billion and net profit of EUR 245 million.

It maintains a strong online presence and promotes its brands through the use of its various domain names, mainly of the domain name <groupeseb.com>. The website "www.groupeseb.com" received an average of 601,009 visits in February 2026.

The Complainant relies on its GROUPE SEB trademarks, and notably on the following trademarks:

- International trademark registration GROUPE SEB No. 894757 registered on January 26, 2006 in classes 6 to 11, 16, 20, 21, 35, 37, and 41, duly renewed; and
- French trademark registration GROUPE SEB No. 3374966 registered on August 2, 2005, duly renewed.

The disputed domain name was created on March 12, 2026, by an individual reportedly domiciled in France.

The disputed domain name has been used to set up an email account and to create the email address "[...]@groupeseebe.com". This email address was used in June 2026 to impersonate the Complainant, including through the reproduction of the GROUPE SEB word and device trademark. The sender claimed to work for the Complainant and sought to purchase air-conditioning units from a third party, allegedly on behalf of the Groupe SEB.

The disputed domain name does not resolve to any website, as a result of the Complainant's takedown action but it previously redirected to the Complainant's website.

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 the following.

On confusing similarity:

The disputed domain name is a visual representation and a purposeful misspelling of the Complainant's GROUPE SEB well-known trademark and must be considered confusingly similar to the Complainant's trademark. With the Respondent's addition of two letters of "e" in the "SEB" portion of the Complainant's trademark, 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.

On absence of rights or legitimate interest:

The Respondent is not sponsored by or affiliated with the Complainant in any way. Nor has the Complainant given the Respondent permission to use the Complainant's trademarks in any manner, including in domain names. Furthermore, the Complainant has not licensed, authorized, or permitted the Respondent to register domain names incorporating the Complainant's trademark.

The Respondent is not commonly known by the disputed domain name.

By sending emails from the disputed domain name, the Respondent was attempting to pass itself off as the Complainant. Panels have categorically held that the use of a domain name for illegal activity can never confer rights or legitimate interests.

On bad faith registration and use:

By registering a domain name that incorporates a typosquatted version of the Complainant's GROUPE SEB trademark, the Respondent has created a domain name that is visually identical to the Complainant's trademark, as well as its <groupeseb.com> domain name.

As such, the Respondent has demonstrated a knowledge of and familiarity with the Complainant's brand and business. The fact that the Respondent used the disputed domain name for fraudulent email purposes to impersonate the Complainant proves that the Respondent targeted the Complainant when it registered the disputed domain name.

The Respondent has registered and used the disputed domain name for purposes of launching a phishing attack, which is clear evidence of bad faith registration and use of the disputed domain name.

Using the disputed domain name to create an email address and send emails impersonating the Complainant in order to divert benefits for its own gain constitutes fraud must be considered bad faith registration and use of the disputed domain name.

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 Panel finds that the disputed domain name is merely a misspelling of the GROUPE SEB trademark, which is recognizable within the disputed domain name. Accordingly, the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to the GROUPE SEB trademark 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.

Panels have held that the use of a domain name for an illegal activity, like here impersonating the Complainant for fraudulent purposes can never confer rights or legitimate interests on a respondent. WIPO Overview 3.1, section 2.13.1.

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 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 notes that the Respondent, who claims to be domiciled in France, could not ignore the well-known GROUPE SEB trademark, when it registered the disputed domain name. The misspelling nature of the disputed domain name and its subsequent fraudulent use supports the Panel's finding of the Respondent's 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 domain name for an illegal activity, here, claimed as impersonating the Complainant for a commercial fraudulent purpose, and phishing, 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 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 <groupeseebe.com> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Marie-Emmanuelle Haas/
Marie-Emmanuelle Haas
Sole Panelist
Date: September 21, 2026