

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

AB Electrolux v. Ken David, Kems Ltd.

Case No. D2022-1671

1. The Parties

The Complainant is AB Electrolux, Sweden, represented by SILKA AB, Sweden.

The Respondent is Ken David, Kems Ltd., United States of America (“USA”).

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <electroluxprofessionals.com> is registered with PDR Ltd. d/b/a PublicDomainRegistry.com (the “Registrar”).

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the “Center”) on May 9, 2022. On May 9, 2022, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On May 10, 2022, 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 May 17, 2022. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was June 6, 2022. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent’s default on June 7, 2022.

The Center appointed William Lobelson as the sole panelist in this matter on June 13, 2022. 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 AB Electrolux, a Swedish company founded in 1901 and one of the world's leading producers of appliances and equipment for kitchen and cleaning products and floor care products. The ELECTROLUX brand is the Complainant's flagship brand for kitchen and cleaning appliances for both consumers and professional users. Electrolux Professional is one of the Complainant's subsidiaries and one of the leading global providers of food service, beverage and laundry solutions.

The Complainant owns numerous trademark and domain registrations formed with ELECTROLUX and ELECTROLUX PROFESSIONAL, on a worldwide basis:

- International trademark for ELECTROLUX (device) No. 836605, registered on March 17, 2004;
- International trademark for ELECTROLUX (device) No. 1260775, registered on January 27, 2015;
- European Union Trade Mark for GRAND CUISINE BY ELECTROLUX PROFESSIONAL No. 010010353, registered on November 4, 2011;
- International trademark for ELECTROLUX SERVICE (device) No. 854121, registered on October 8, 2004;
- USA trademark for THE RESEARCH HUB BY ELECTROLUX PROFESSIONAL (device) No. 87021035, registered on June 4, 2019.

The disputed domain name is <electroluxprofessionals.com>, registered on April 18, 2022. It resolves to an inactive webpage, while a MX email server was set up therewith.

The Complainant filed the present Complaint on May 9, 2022.

5. Parties' Contentions

A. Complainant

The Complainant claims that the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to its earlier trademarks, that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name, and that the disputed domain name was registered and is being used in bad faith. The Complainant requests the transfer of the disputed domain name.

B. Respondent

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

6. Discussion and Findings

Notwithstanding the default of the Respondent, it remains incumbent on the Complainant to make out its case in all respects under the Rules set out in paragraph 4(a) of the Policy. Namely, the Complainant must prove that:

- (i) the disputed domain name is identical or confusingly similar to a trademark or service mark in which the Complainant has rights (paragraph 4(a)(i));
- (ii) the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the disputed domain name (paragraph 4(a)(ii)); and
- (iii) the disputed domain name has been registered and is being used in bad faith (paragraph 4(a)(iii)).

A. Identical or Confusingly Similar

The Complainant is the owner of a number of ELECTROLUX formative trademarks, including ELECTROLUX PROFESSIONAL, all registered and used before the date when the disputed domain name was registered.

The Complainant is also the owner of the domain name <electroluxprofessional.com>, registered in 2004.

The disputed domain name is <electroluxprofessionals.com>. It reproduces the Complainant's trademark ELECTROLUX in its entirety.

Where the relevant trademark is recognizable within the disputed domain name, the addition of other terms (whether descriptive, geographical, pejorative, meaningless, or otherwise), in this case the term "PROFESSIONALS" would not prevent a finding of confusing similarity under the first element; see section 1.8 of the WIPO Overview of WIPO Panel Views on Selected UDRP Questions, Third Edition ("[WIPO Overview 3.0](#)").

Furthermore, the addition of the generic Top-Level Domain ("gTLD") ".com" does not prevent a finding of confusing similarity.

The disputed domain name therefore appears confusingly similar to the Complainant's earlier registered trademarks ELECTROLUX.

Consequently, the Panel finds that the Complainant has satisfied the requirements of paragraph 4(a)(i) of the Policy.

B. Rights or Legitimate Interests

To demonstrate rights or legitimate interests in a domain name, non-exclusive respondent defenses under UDRP paragraph 4(c) include the following:

- (i) before any notice of the dispute, the Respondent's use of, or demonstrable preparations to use, the disputed domain name or a name corresponding to the disputed domain name in connection with a *bona fide* offering of goods and services;
- (ii) the Respondent (as an individual, business or other organization) has been commonly known by the disputed domain name, even if the Respondent has acquired no trademark or service mark rights; or
- (iii) the Respondent is making a legitimate noncommercial or fair use of the disputed domain name, without intent for commercial gain to misleadingly divert consumers or to tarnish the trademark or service mark at issue.

The Panel notes that the Respondent has not filed a response and thus did not deny the Complainant's assertions, nor brought any information or evidence for demonstrating any rights or legitimate interests.

The Complainant has made a *prima facie* showing that the Respondent does not have any rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name, particularly by asserting that the Respondent is not affiliated with it in any way and that it never authorized the Respondent to use its trademark as part of the disputed domain name.

The Complainant further contends that the Respondent is not commonly known under the disputed domain name, does not own any proprietary rights in the name "Electrolux Professionals", and does not make any *bona fide* use – neither commercial nor noncommercial, of the same.

The Panel finds that the Complainant has met the requirement under the Policy of showing that the Respondent does not have any rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name.

Accordingly, the Complainant has satisfied paragraph 4(a)(ii) of the Policy.

C. Registered and Used in Bad Faith

The Complainant has substantiated the fact that its trademark ELECTROLUX, which has been registered and used for years, now benefits from a high level of public awareness, including in the USA.

Due to the longstanding use of the Complainant's mark worldwide and in the USA, where the Respondent has declared a place of residence, the Respondent could not reasonably be unaware of the Complainant's rights when it registered the disputed domain name.

The Panel infers from the above that the Respondent acted in bad faith when it registered the disputed domain name.

It is further noted by the Panel that the disputed domain name is not being actively used by the Respondent, and does not resolve to any active web page with substantive content.

It is a consensus view among UDRP panels that, with comparative reference to the circumstances set out in paragraph 4(b) of the UDRP deemed to establish bad faith registration and use, the apparent lack of so-called active use (e.g., to resolve to a website) of the domain name, does not prevent a finding of bad faith.

The Panel must examine all the circumstances of the case to determine whether the Respondent is acting in bad faith.

Examples of what may be cumulative circumstances found to be indicative of bad faith include the Complainant having a well-known trademark and no response to the Complaint having been filed. UDRP panels may draw inferences about whether a domain name is used in bad faith, given the circumstances surrounding registration.

As stated in [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 3.3, there is a consensus view about "passive holding":

"From the inception of the UDRP, panelists have found that the non-use of a domain name (including a blank or 'coming soon' page) would not prevent a finding of bad faith under the doctrine of passive holding. While panelists will look at the totality of the circumstances in each case, factors that have been considered relevant in applying the passive holding doctrine include: (i) the degree of distinctiveness or reputation of the complainant's mark, (ii) the failure of the respondent to submit a response or to provide any evidence of actual or contemplated good-faith use, (iii) the respondent's concealing its identity or use of false contact details (noted to be in breach of its registration agreement), and (iv) the implausibility of any good faith use to which the domain name may be put."

Such passive holding is to be regarded as use in bad faith (*Telstra Corporation Limited v. Nuclear Marshmallows*, WIPO Case No. [D2000-0003](#); *Jupiters Limited v. Aaron Hall*, WIPO Case No. [D2000-0574](#); *Ladbroke Group Plc v. Sonoma International LDC*, WIPO Case No. [D2002-0131](#); *Westdev Limited v. Private Data*, WIPO Case No. [D2007-1903](#); *Malayan Banking Berhad v. Beauty, Success & Truth International*, WIPO Case No. [D2008-1393](#); *Intel Corporation v. The Pentium Group*, WIPO Case No. [D2009-0273](#)).

See also *AB Electrolux v. Simon Gavrels*, WIPO Case No. [D2021-3470](#): "First, the Panel considers that it is established that the Complainant's ELECTROLUX trademark was registered before the registration of the disputed domain name and must be considered as well known, so that, given the fact that the disputed domain name wholly reproduces the ELECTROLUX trademark, along with the descriptive term "professional" written as a slight typo version, which can clearly be considered as referring to the Complainant's subsidiary Electrolux Professional, it is unlikely that the Respondent was unaware of its existence."[...] Finally, the Panel finds that the disputed domain name is not currently used, given that it points to the hosting platform page, and reminds that such "passive holding" does not prevent a finding of bad faith, since according to prior UDRP panel decisions the panel must examine all the circumstances of the case to determine whether the respondent is acting in bad faith (See section 3.3 of the [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), and *Telstra Corporation*

Limited v. Nuclear Marshmallows, WIPO Case No. [D2000-0003](#)). Indeed, the Panel believes that the passive holding of the disputed domain name proves that the Respondent acts in bad faith.”

The Panel finds, therefore, that the passive holding of the disputed domain name in this case does not prevent a finding of bad faith.

In addition to the above, the Complainant has established that an email server had been configured on the disputed domain name, thus inducing a likelihood that the Respondent might have contemplated to use the disputed domain name for potential fraudulent use of an email address incorporating the Complainant’s trademark and/or phishing purposes (*Statoil ASA v. Domain Admin, Privacy Protection Service Inc D/B/A PrivacyProtect.org / Nicolas Kerry, WIPO Case No. [D2017-0046](#)*).

Consequently, in view of all the above circumstances, the Panel finds that the requirements of paragraph 4(a)(iii) of the Policy are satisfied.

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 <electroluxprofessionals.com> be transferred to the Complainant.

/William Lobelson/

William Lobelson

Sole Panelist

Date: June 27, 2022