

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

Ecotricity Group Ltd v. Name Redacted

Case No. D2026-3842

1. The Parties

The Complainant is Ecotricity Group Ltd, United Kingdom, represented by Haseltine Lake Kempner LLP, United Kingdom.

The Respondent is Name Redacted¹, represented by The Legal Group, Netherlands (Kingdom of the).

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <ecotricity.city> (the “Disputed Domain Name”) is registered with NameCheap, Inc. (the “Registrar”).

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the “Center”) on August 27, 2026. On August 27, 2026, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the Disputed Domain Name. On August 27, 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 (Privacy service provided by Withheld for Privacy ehf) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on August 28, 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 amendment to the Complaint on September 2, 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

¹ The Respondent appears to have used the name of a third party 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 Respondent. The Panel has authorized the Center to transmit Annex 1 to the Registrar as part of the order in this proceeding, and has indicated Annex 1 to this Decision shall not be published due to the exceptional circumstances of this case.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](#).

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 September 8, 2026. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was September 28, 2026. The Respondent’s Representative sent email communications to the Center on September 17, 21, 22, 29, and 30 2026.

The Center appointed Marilena Comanescu as the sole panelist in this matter on October 12, 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 is part of the Green Britain Group founded in 1995 in the United Kingdom, specialising in selling green energy to consumers.

Through its official website at “www.ecotricity.co.uk”, the Complainant’s customers can compare and switch energy tariffs, manage their accounts and energy usage and access services such as smart meters, EV tariffs and energy-saving support.

The Complainant holds trademark rights for ECOTRICITY, such as the following:

- the European Union Trademark Registration number 001127984 for ECOTRICITY (word), filed on May 10, 1999, registered on May 10, 2000, covering goods and services in International Classes 1, 39, and 40; and
- the United Kingdom Trademark Registration number UK00909214073 for ECOTRICITY (word), filed on June 30, 2010, registered on April 12, 2016, covering goods and services in International Classes 4, 7, 9, 12, 25, 36, 37, 39, 40, 41 and 42.

The Disputed Domain Name was registered on May 6, 2026, and, according to evidence in the file, it was used for a website that mimicked the appearance and content of the Complainant’s official website, displayed the ECOTRICITY mark, promoted identical services, used the copyrighted imagery of the Complainant, listed the Complainant’s official address and social media accounts.

Before commencing the proceeding, on August 21 and 24, 2026 the Complainant sent notice letters to the Registrar regarding the Disputed Domain Name and related website. Based on the available record, no response was received, however the website was suspended and, at the time of filing the Complaint, the Disputed Domain Name resolved to an error page.

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 a result of its activities, the Complainant has built up substantial goodwill and gained a valuable reputation in the ECOTRICITY mark in relation to the goods and services for which it is registered;
- the Disputed Domain Name is identical to the ECOTRICITY mark as it incorporates it in its entirety, with no additional word;
- the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in the Disputed Domain Name: (i) the Complainant has never authorised, licensed, or otherwise permitted the Respondent to register or use a domain name incorporating the ECOTRICITY trademark; (ii) in fact, the Disputed Domain Name was used to host a website which impersonates the Complainant and its official website and is done in order to take advantage of the Complainant and its marks and disrupt the Complainant's business, and potentially carry out unlawful activities;
- the Respondent registered and is using the Disputed Domain Name in bad faith mainly because: (i) the Complainant's marks are highly distinctive; (ii) the Respondent has incorporated the Complainant's mark into the Disputed Domain Name in its entirety; (iii) at the time of registering the Disputed Domain Name, all the Complainant's ECOTRICITY marks were registered; (iv) the website associated with the Disputed Domain Name reproduces the Complainant's official website across each of its pages and appears to have been copied in its entirety, without a single amendment. This includes the website descriptions, imagery, videos, layout, fonts, the name of the Complainant and its contact details as the party responsible for the website, including links to the Complainant's official social media accounts. This clearly shows that the Respondent is impersonating the Complainant and its official website; and (v) the registration and use of the Disputed Domain Name evidently disrupts the Complainant's business and may be used to obtain and misuse customer data from visitors who believe they are dealing with the Complainant, and use such data for further criminal purposes, thus causing damage to the Complainant's business and reputation.

B. Respondent

The Respondent did not formally respond to the Complaint, but its representative sent several email communications to the Center on September 17, 21, 22, 29, and 30, 2026, stating mainly that the Registrar-revealed registrant is neither the registrant of, nor otherwise involved with, the Disputed Domain Name, nor uses, or is otherwise connected with, the email address revealed by the Registrar for the Disputed Domain Name. Therefore, the Registrar-revealed registrant has no control over the Disputed Domain Name and there is nothing it can do in order to help the Complainant solve this matter.

6. Discussion and Findings

In accordance with paragraph 4(a) of the Policy, in order to decide on the remedy sought by the Complainant, each of the following three elements will be examined:

- (i) the Disputed Domain Name is identical or confusingly similar to a trademark or service mark in which the Complainant has rights;
- (ii) the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in 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. See 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 the entirety of the ECOTRICITY mark is reproduced within the Disputed Domain Name. Accordingly, the Disputed Domain Name is identical to the mark for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.7.

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 the Disputed Domain Name.

Although the overall burden of proof in UDRP proceedings is on the complainant, panels have recognized that proving 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.

According to the evidence provided in the Complaint, the Respondent has used the Disputed Domain Name in connection with a website that mimics the appearance and the content of the Complainant’s official website. Panels have held that the use of a domain name for illegal activity (e.g., copycat sites, impersonation/passing off, 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 further notes the composition of the Disputed Domain Name which reproduces identically the Complainant’s trademark. Such fact, together with the other circumstances in this case, including the claimed identity theft, prevents a finding of a bona fide offering or legitimate noncommercial or fair use.

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 Disputed Domain Name was registered in bad faith, with knowledge of the Complainant and its ECOTRICITY trademark, because it fully incorporates the mark which predates the registration of the Disputed Domain Name for about 26 years, and the website at the Disputed Domain Name is also very similar to the Complainant’s website. The use of the Disputed Domain Name reinforces such finding.

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.

Paragraph 4(b)(iv) of the Policy provides that the use of a domain name to intentionally attempt "to attract, for commercial gain, Internet users to [the respondent's] website or other online location, by creating a likelihood of confusion with the complainant's mark as to the source, sponsorship, affiliation, or endorsement of [the respondent's] website or location or of a product or service on [the respondent's] website or location" is evidence of registration and use in bad faith.

By creating a copycat version of the Complainant's official website by displaying the Complainant's mark, providing identical descriptions, imagery, videos, layout, fonts, name, and official address, in this Panel's view, the Respondent has intended to attract Internet users accessing the website corresponding to the Disputed Domain Name who may be confused and believe that the website is held, controlled by, or somehow affiliated or related to the Complainant, for its commercial gain.

The use of a domain name for illegal activity such as claimed impersonation/passing off/copycat sites can never confer rights or legitimate interests on a respondent and it is considered evidence of bad faith. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 3.4.

The Panel finds the third element of the Policy has been established.

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, <ecotricity.city>, be transferred to the Complainant.

/Marilena Comanescu/

Marilena Comanescu

Sole Panelist

Date: October 21, 2026