

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

AB Electrolux v. Electrolux Service

Case No. D2018-0447

1. The Parties

The Complainant is AB Electrolux of Stockholm, Sweden, represented by SILKA Law AB, Sweden.

The Respondent is Electrolux Service of Hyderabad, Telangana, India, internally-represented.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <electroluxhyderabadservice.com> is registered with GoDaddy.com, LLC (the "Registrar").

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the "Center") on February 26, 2018. On February 27, 2018, the Center transmitted, by email, to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On February 28, 2018, 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 of the registrant.

The Center verified that the Complaint satisfied the formal requirements of the Uniform Domain Name Dispute Resolution Policy (the "Policy"), 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 that the proceedings commenced on March 5, 2018. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was set to March 25, 2018. On March 17, 2018, the Respondent submitted an informal communication to the Center. The Respondent did not submit any substantive response. Accordingly, on March 26, 2018, the Center informed the Parties that it would proceed to panel appointment.

The Center appointed Peter L. Michaelson as the sole panelist in this matter on April 4, 2018. 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

As reflected in the registration record for the disputed domain name in the public Whois database (a copy of a portion of that record appears in Annex 3 to the Complaint), the disputed domain name was registered on April 11, 2017.

A. The Complainant's ELECTROLUX marks (collectively the "ELECTROLUX Marks")

As indicated in the Complaint, the Complainant owns numerous international, regional and national trademark registrations for the term "ELECTROLUX" in block letters and stylized forms and with or without a design element. The Complainant has provided, in Annexes 5.1 – 5.4 to the Complaint, copies of the registration records for four illustrative ones of its international trademark registrations, the pertinent details of two of them are as follows:

1. Electrolux (stylized and with design)
International registration: 1260775; Registered: January 27, 2015
Designations include India

This mark is registered for use in connection with: "Washing machines; combined washing and drying machines; ironing machines; ironing presses; spin driers; tumble driers for laundry use; dishwashers; food processors, mixers, slicers, grinders for household purposes; coffee grinders; fruit juicers; milk foamers; electric tin openers; vacuum cleaners including battery driven vacuum cleaners and parts to vacuum cleaners namely hoses, nozzles, tubes, dust bags and filters" all in international class 7; "Electric irons" in international class 8; "Data processing devices; data storage media for domestic appliances" in international class 9; "Refrigerators; wine coolers; freezers; cookers; grills; ovens; microwave ovens; air conditioning installations and apparatus; fans; cooker hoods; built-in hobs; water purifying apparatus; drying cabinets; electric coffee brewing machines; espresso machines; egg boilers; household air cleaners; humidifiers; toasters; electric waffle irons; hot plates; electrical water kettles; yoghurt preparing apparatus; electric cooking pans; hair dryers; electric and heating tumble driers for laundry use" all in international class 11; "Household and kitchen appliances such as manual grinders for household purposes; glassware; porcelain; earthenware; non-electric dusting and cleaning apparatus; dusting cloths; dusters; non-electric saucepans; ironing tables" all in international class 21; "Electric hair curlers" in international class 26; "Information to customers in connection with sales of washing machines, combined washing and drying machines, ironing machines, ironing presses, spin driers, tumble driers, dishwashers, food processors, mixers, slicers, grinders for household purposes, coffee grinders, fruit juicers, milk foamers, electric tin openers, vacuum cleaners including battery driven vacuum cleaners and parts to vacuum cleaners namely hoses, nozzles, tubes, dust bags and filters; electronic irons, electric hair curlers, data processing devices; data storage media for domestic appliances, domestic appliances, refrigerators; wine coolers, freezers, cookers, grills, ovens, microwave ovens, air conditioning installations and apparatus, fans, cooker hoods, built-in hobs, water purifying apparatus, drying cabinets, electric coffee brewing machines, espresso machines, egg boilers, air cleaners, humidifiers, toasters, electric waffle irons, hot plates, electrical water kettles, yoghurt preparing apparatus, electric cooking pans, hair dryers, household and kitchen appliances; manual grinders for household purposes; glassware; porcelain; earthenware; nonelectric dusting and cleaning apparatus; dusting cloths; dusters; non-electric saucepans; ironing tables; advertising in industry and commerce; shop window dressing" all in international class 35; and "Maintenance and repair services of white goods and household products" in international class 37.

2. Electrolux (stylized and with design)
International registration: 836605; Registered: March 17, 2004

This mark is registered for use in connection with: "Cleaning, polishing, scouring and abrasive preparations" in international class 3; "Washing machines, spin driers, mangles, ironing machines, spotting tables, dishwashers, food mixing machines, food processors, slicers, grinders, vacuum packing machines, rack and tray conveyers, waste disposal machines, compressors for refrigerators and freezers; machines for high pressure cleaning, floor polishing machines, vacuum cleaners and parts to vacuum cleaners namely hoses,

nozzles, dust bags and filters; power operated saws, chainsaws, clearing saws, crosscutting saws, shredders, rotary cultivators, lawn mowing machines, ride on lawn mowers, hedge shears, trimming machines, brush cutters, blowers, snow blowers, garden vacuums, water pumps, lawn aerators, scarifiers, sod cutters, stump grinders, saw mills; core drilling machines, drill stands, floor saws, wall saws, wire saws, tile and masonry saws, handheld saws, diamond equipped polishing machines” all in international class 7; “Hand tools and hand implements for use in forestry and horticulture; garden tools sets, including handsaws, pruning shears, rakes; trowels; ice augers, diamond saw blades, laser welded blades for dry cutting, diamond core bits, diamond wire, diamond chains, grinding tools, diamond polishing tools and abrasive tools” all in international class 8; “Irons, apparatus and instruments for controlling the washing process in laundries; clothing for protection against accidents, protective helmets, measuring instruments, power packs; protective clothing for forestry workers, namely gloves” in international class 9; “Refrigerators, freezers, cookers, grills, ovens, microwave ovens, air conditioning installations and apparatus, fans, cooker hoods, built in hobs, water purifying apparatus, drying cabinets, electric coffee brewing machines, air cleaners, humidifiers, toasters, electric waffle irons, thawing cabinets, bainmaries, blast chillers, blast freezers, refrigerated counters, food service display cases for heating or refrigerating of food, radiators, electrical tumble driers and electrical water heaters” all in international class 11; “Garden tractors” in international class 12; “Household and kitchen appliances, glassware, porcelain, earthenware, nonelectric dusting and cleaning apparatus, dusting cloths, dusters, nonelectric saucepans” all in international class 21; “Clothing for forestry workers, namely rainproof clothing, underclothing, boots, socks” in international class 25; “Information to customers in connection with sales of all the goods mentioned in classes 3, 7, 8, 9, 11, 12, 21 and 25; advertising in industry and commerce, shop window dressing” in international class 35; “Maintenance and repair services of all the goods mentioned in classes 7, 8, 9, 11, 12 and 21” in international class 37; and “Transport, packaging and storage of goods”, in international class 39.

B. The Parties and their activities

The Complainant, a Swedish joint stock company founded in 1901, manufactures and sells worldwide kitchen appliances and equipment, and cleaning and floor care products. The Complainant, having started with selling a single vacuum cleaner, has grown over the past 90 years or so to a global enterprise having approximately 55,000 employees with 2016 sales of approximately SEK 121 billion. The ELECTROLUX brand is the Complainant’s flagship brand for kitchen and cleaning appliances for both consumers and professional users.

The Complainant has registered various domain names, including those with generic Top-Level Domains (“gTLD”) and country-code Top-Level Domains (“ccTLD”), containing the term “electrolux”. These names, of pertinence here, include: <electrolux.com> (registered on June 1, 2006) and <electrolux.in> (registered on February 16, 2005). Copies of the registration records for these two names in the Whois database appear in Annex 6 to the Complaint.

Complainant uses the “.in” ccTLD for its “www.electrolux.in” website through which it informs potential customers in India about its ELECTROLUX branded products and services, and provides a tool for locating its authorized service centers within India. Print-outs of the home page and various lower-level pages from that site appear in Annex 8 to the Complaint.

The Respondent, through its website to which the disputed domain name resolves, offers repair and maintenance services for ELECTROLUX products.

The Complainant has an agreement with all its authorized partners which strictly forbids its licensees/distributors from registering a domain name which incorporates any of the Complainant’s marks. A copy of the salient provisions (note provision 3.5) from such an agreement appears in Annex 7 to the Complaint. The Complainant has no such agreement in place with the Respondent as the Respondent is not an authorized dealer or authorized service center for the Complainant. As shown in a print-out from the Complainant’s website at “www.electrolux.in”, which provides results from a search of authorized dealers in Hyderabad, five dealers are shown, but the Respondent is not one of them. A copy of the print-out appears in Annex 8 to the Complaint.

The Respondent's website, which prominently displays the Complainant's mark ELECTROLUX in several locations, does not contain any information stating that the Complainant and the Respondent are unrelated.

On June 12, 2017, the Complainant attempted to contact the Respondent by sending it a cease and desist e-mail message to the Respondent's email address as then listed in the Whois record for the disputed domain name. A copy of this message appears in Annex 9 to the Complaint. Through that message, the Complainant sought a voluntary transfer of the name. As no response was received, the Complainant sent a reminder message to the Respondent on July 31, 2017. The Complainant did not receive any response to the July 31st message.

5. Parties' Contentions

A. Complainant

(i) Identical or Confusingly Similar

The Complainant contends that the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to its mark ELECTROLUX.

Specifically, the disputed domain name contains this mark to which the words "hyderabad service" have been appended. Hyderabad is a name of a city in India. The word "service" is a generic term. Consequently, the addition of these words is incapable of adding sufficient distinctiveness whatsoever to the mark to mitigate any resulting user confusion between the disputed domain name and the Complainant's mark ELECTROLUX.

Hence, the Complainant believes that it has satisfied the confusing similarity/identity requirement in paragraph 4(a)(i) of the Policy.

(ii) Rights or Legitimate Interests

The Complainant contends that, for any of several reasons, the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name pursuant to paragraphs 4(a)(ii) and 4(c) of the Policy.

Specifically, the Respondent, by having incorporated the Complainant's mark ELECTROLUX in the disputed domain name and frequently and prominently displaying that mark throughout its website in connection with Complainant's ELECTROLUX branded products, strongly suggests that the Parties are connected or related in some fashion and specifically that the Respondent is authorized by the Complainant to provide repair and other services for those products within India – when, in fact, the Parties are unrelated and the Respondent is not so authorized. Moreover, the Respondent cannot develop any association with the Complainant's mark ELECTROLUX without infringing on the Complainant's exclusive trademark rights. Such use of the mark in connection with offering repair services is illicit. Consequently, the Respondent's use of the disputed domain name, which contains that mark, in connection with its website is not *bona fide* and thus fails to satisfy paragraph 4(c)(i) of the Policy. Also, as a result of the Complainant's exclusive trademark rights and its reputation, the Respondent is not commonly known by the disputed domain name and thus fails to qualify under paragraph 4(c)(ii) of the Policy.

Additionally, the Respondent's use of the disputed domain name, which is clearly commercial and designed to economically benefit the Respondent by driving more traffic to its website and generating more sales of its repair services, fails to qualify as a legitimate noncommercial or fair use of the disputed domain name under paragraph 4(c)(iii) of the Policy.

(iii) Registered and Used in Bad Faith

The Complainant also contends that, for various reasons, the Respondent has registered and is using the

disputed domain name in bad faith in violation of paragraph 4(a)(iii) of the Policy.

Specifically, the Complainant's trademark registrations all predate the registration of the disputed domain name. Hence, it seems highly likely that the Respondent was well aware of the existence of the mark ELECTROLUX when it registered the disputed domain name. Further, it is similarly likely that the Respondent intentionally chose the name for its potential to exploit, for the Respondent's own commercial benefit, user confusion that would likely arise between the disputed domain name and the Complainant's mark ELECTROLUX by increasing Internet traffic to the Respondent's website and thus increase its business over what would otherwise occur. Moreover, the Respondent's inclusion of the words "hyderabad service" in the disputed domain name heightens the likelihood that confusion will occur as Internet users who seek information on Complainant's authorized service centers in Hyderabad will likely think that the Respondent's website is associated with such a center or at the least is affiliated with or related, in some fashion, to the Complainant when in fact it is neither authorized nor related. This reflects bad faith registration.

As the Respondent actually uses the disputed domain name in this fashion in conjunction with its website, the Respondent engages in bad faith use. Bad faith use is exacerbated here by the Respondent prominently and frequently displaying the mark ELECTROLUX throughout its website, in the same stylized form as in Complainant's ELECTROLUX marks and failing to include any statement on its site – let alone one that is sufficiently conspicuous – disclaiming any relationship with the Complainant. These actions only accentuate the misimpression – Internet users will likely acquire from the website that the Parties are related, when they are not.

B. Respondent

In response to the March 5, 2018 notification which the Center sent to the Respondent, the Respondent replied on March 17, 2018 by sending an informal communication by email to the Center. In that communication, the Respondent asserted that, upon describing its business to staff members at the Registrar and its desire to improve its business: (a) those members suggested the disputed domain name to the Respondent who, in turn, registered that name, and (b) the Registrar would take responsibility of any intellectual property issue arising from the name, stating:

"I am a affiliate mechanic to the Electrolux i was looking to improve my business and have contacted Godaddy and explained about my business to then Godaddy staff ... suggested this domain name to me and forced me to buy this domain name.

When I talk about copyright issue or any intellectual property with Godaddy team then they have convince me to by telling that Godaddy is going take responsibility of them, and if I face any copyright problem Godaddy is going to give me back my money which I have paid to them and Godaddy is going to take responsible for those issues."

As this communication did not contest any of the factual allegations set forth in the Complaint, the Panel proceeded on the basis of those allegations which the Panel finds are not inherently implausible. The Panel will not address any alleged actions of the Registrar described by the Respondent in its March 17th communication as any such review lies outside the rather limited purview of an UDRP panel.

6. Discussion and Findings

A. Identical or Confusingly Similar

The Panel finds that the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to the Complainant's mark ELECTROLUX.

From a simple comparison of the disputed domain name to the Complainant's mark ELECTROLUX, no

doubt exists that the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to the mark. The disputed domain name <electroluxhyderabadservice.com> consists of the term “electrolux” followed by the words “hyderabad service”, with the first word being a city name and the second being a dictionary word. The name also contains the gTLD “.com”. The addition of the gTLD is generally irrelevant in assessing confusing similarity or identity under paragraph 4(a)(i) of the Policy and thus ignored.

It has become very well-established in UDRP precedent, including numerous decisions previously rendered by this Panel, that a minor variation to a mark, such as, e.g., misspelling of the mark itself or addition of a geographic or descriptive term to the mark, is usually insufficient in and of itself, when used in forming a domain name, particularly a resulting Second-Level Domain (SLD), to confer requisite and sufficient distinctiveness to the resulting domain name to avoid a finding of confusing similarity. Here, the Respondent’s incorporation of the words “hyderabad service” to form each SLD clearly constitutes such a minor variation. See, e.g., *Covestro Deutschland AG v. Kay Mone / KMN INC.*, WIPO Case No. D2018-0145; *ZB, N.A. dba Amegy Bank v. Above.com Domain Privacy / Host Master, Transure Enterprise Ltd*, WIPO Case No. D2017-1268; *SAP SE v. Lakshmi Reddy Bhumireddy and P. Hareesh*, WIPO Case No. D2017-0396; *Compagnie Générale des Etablissements Michelin v. Cameron Jackson*, WIPO Case No. D2016-2392; *Kumfs Brand Limited v. George*, WIPO Case No. D2016-1272; *Dubizzle Limited BVI v. Rana Anabtawi*, WIPO Case No. D2016-0843; *Chicago Mercantile Exchange Inc. and CME Group Inc. v. Domains By Proxy, LLC / Phupinder Gill*, WIPO Case No. D2015-1842; *Cummins Inc. v. Jamie Lent*, WIPO Case No. D2015-0188; *Staatliche Porzellan-Manufaktur Meissen GmbH v. Buy Meissen*, WIPO Case No. D2013-1687; *Forideas Pty Limited v. Movember Organization*, WIPO Case No. D2013-1385; *AlgaeCal Inc. v. AlgaeCal Fraud*, WIPO Case No. D2013-1248; *Tommy Bahama Group, Inc. v. Berno Group International*, WIPO Case No. D2012-0531; *National Association of Realtors v. Hammerberg & Associates, Inc.*, WIPO Case No. D2012-0075; and *Space Needle LLC v. Erik Olson*, WIPO Case No. D2011-0931.

Therefore, the Panel finds that the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to the Complainant’s mark ELECTROLUX. Hence, the Complainant has satisfied its burden under paragraph 4(a)(i) of the Policy.

B. Rights or Legitimate Interests

Based on the evidence of record here, the Panel finds that no basis exists which would appear to legitimize a claim of rights or legitimate interests by the Respondent to the disputed domain name under paragraph 4(c) of the Policy.

With respect to paragraph 4(c)(i) of the Policy, the Respondent does not use the disputed domain name in conjunction with a *bona fide* offering of any goods or services. The Complainant has never authorized the Respondent to utilize any of the Complainant’s ELECTROLUX Marks and does not have any relationship, affiliation or connection whatsoever with the Respondent. Consequently, the Respondent has no authority from the Complainant to use its mark ELECTROLUX in a domain name or in conjunction with commercial activity. Even if the Respondent were an authorized licensee for the Complainant – which it is not, it would still have been prohibited from using the mark in a domain name as the Complainant’s licensing agreement, which it would have necessarily executed, expressly prohibits that use. Hence, any commercial use of the mark by the Respondent in a domain name would be illicit and thus its offering of repair services through a domain name which includes the mark ELECTROLUX does not qualify as *bona fide*. There was nothing on the website to clarify the Respondent’s status as a non-authorized repair service provider.

As to paragraph 4(c)(ii) of the Policy, the record is entirely devoid of any evidence which reflects that the Respondent is currently or has ever been commonly known by the disputed domain name or any of the Complainant’s ELECTROLUX Marks. Given the reputation that the Complainant has acquired since it first used its mark at least 100 years prior to the date (April 11, 2017) on which the Respondent registered the disputed domain name, the Respondent could not legitimately acquire such a public association or even an association with any mark similar to any of those of the Complainant – at least for the goods and services, the latter including repair services, provided by the Complainant or any of its authorized licensees under any of the Complainant’s ELECTROLUX Marks – without interfering with the exclusive trademark rights of the Complainant. See, e.g., *Covestro Deutschland AG v. Kay Mone / KMN INC.*, WIPO Case No. D2018-0145;

Alstom v. Zahir Khan, Palki Event Inc., WIPO Case No. D2017-1124; *Compagnie Générale des Etablissements Michelin v. Cameron Jackson, supra*; *Philip Morris USA Inc. v. Daniele Kanai, iKiss LLC*, WIPO Case No. D2015-1527; *Valero Energy Corporation and Valero Marketing and Supply Company v. Lisa Katz, Domain Protection LLC / Domain Hostmaster, Customer ID: 62520014085963*, WIPO Case No. D2015-0787; and *Chicago Mercantile Exchange Inc. and CME Group Inc; Cummins*; and *Staatliche Porzellan-Manufaktur Meissen*, all cited *supra*.

Furthermore, as the Respondent uses the disputed domain name for its own commercial gain, its use does not qualify as either a noncommercial or fair use pursuant to paragraph 4(c)(iii) of the Policy.

Consequently, the Respondent does not satisfy any element of paragraph 4(c) of the Policy and thus has no rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name under paragraphs 4(a)(ii) and 4(c) of the Policy.

C. Registered and Used in Bad Faith

The Panel finds that the Respondent's actions, with respect to the disputed domain name, constitute bad faith registration and use.

By including the words "hyderabad service" with the Complainant's mark ELECTROLUX to form the disputed domain name, the potential for user confusion is likely to be exacerbated, not reduced. It is quite possible that an Internet user in Hyderabad, India, who needs repair service on an ELECTROLUX product may very well not know the authorized dealers in that geographic area at which s/he could obtain such service. Consequently, given the ubiquity of merchant websites these days, that user will very likely first turn to the Internet for pertinent information. If that user is uncertain of an appropriate domain name to use in accessing an appropriate website that might provide this information, s/he may simply form a domain name for that site by appending the words "hyderabad service" to the mark ELECTROLUX to form a composite name and then add the common gTLD ".com" to yield a resulting domain name <electroluxhyderabadservice.com>. The user would then insert that domain name into his/her browser with a reasonable expectation that doing so would direct that browser to either the Complainant's website or a website authorized by the Complainant from which that user could learn of those authorized dealers which could provide the desired repair service. However, here the Respondent, not the Complainant, registered that domain name. Consequently, the user's action would cause that person not to be taken to the Complainant's website (or one authorized by the Complainant), but rather, and without that user realizing the diversion, to the Respondent's website instead. This, in turn, would not only confuse the user as the Respondent is not an authorized dealer or repair center but also deceive the user into thinking that the Respondent can act as an authorized repair center when it cannot. Hence, adding the words "hyderabad service" to the mark ELECTROLUX, as the Respondent did, only heightens the likelihood of the Respondent causing confusion and deception to the Respondent's ultimate benefit and the detriment of Complainant and its authorized dealers. See, e.g., *Krispy Kreme Doughnuts, Inc. v. John Sharp*, WIPO Case No. D2009-0099; and *Tommy Bahama Group, Cummins*, and *Space Needle*, all cited *supra*.

The Respondent was well aware not only of the Complainant and its mark ELECTROLUX, and the reputation and goodwill which that mark acquired and the exclusive rights which the Complainant held in that mark when the Respondent selected and then registered the disputed domain name, but also the significant potential which that domain name had to cause confusion of Internet users as to whether some association, affiliation or relationship existed between the Respondent's website and the Complainant. There is simply no question that the Respondent registered the disputed domain name to benefit from that confusion by using it to drive increased traffic to its website and thus increase its business and ultimately its profits. By repeatedly and prominently displaying the Complainant's ELECTROLUX Marks, in the same stylized fashion as those marks are registered, the Respondent purposefully intended to create a false impression in the minds of Internet users that the Respondent is authorized by the Complainant to provide repair services for the Complainant's ELECTROLUX branded products, when, in actuality, the Respondent is not and moreover has no relationship or connection whatsoever with the Complainant. As such, by registering the name, the Respondent intended to deliberately misappropriate the goodwill and reputation in the Complainant's ELECTROLUX Marks for its own pecuniary benefit. Thus, there is simply no question that the registration is

abusive and the Respondent exhibited bad faith in both registering the disputed domain name and then using as it did.

A very similar situation to the present dispute arose in *AB Electrolux v. Ferhat TUNALI, FBS (DI_4010121)/SENOL KARAKAYA/PrivacyProtect.org*, WIPO Case No. D2010-1791. There a respondent, located in Turkey, registered three domain names <electrolux-servisi.net>, <electrolux-servis.net> and <electroluxservisleri.org>. The respondent used these names to resolve to three websites which provided identical content and through which the respondent offered original parts and repair services for Electrolux-branded products in Turkey. The respondent was not authorized by the complainant (the same Complainant as here) to do so. The terms “servi”, “servisi” and “servisler” when translated to English from Turkish mean “service”, “service for” and “services”. In finding bad faith registration and use, the panel's reasoning is quite instructive – and every bit as valid and correct if applied to the present dispute as it was there: “The Panel is well aware of the reputation and recognition of the Complainant's trademark ELECTROLUX. The Panel is convinced that the Respondent must have known of this trademark when registered the disputed domain names. This is in particular likely as the disputed domain names have been registered well after the Complainant's trademark ELECTROLUX has become recognized in the world. This is in particularly likely as the mark ELECTROLUX is also well-known in Turkey, where the Respondent is apparently located.

It rather appears that the Respondent has registered the disputed domain names solely for the purpose of creating an association with the Complainant, in particular with its products and services. According to the print-outs of the websites linked to the disputed domain names provided as Annexes to the Complaint, the Panel is convinced that the Respondent has intentionally registered the disputed domain names to offer services for Electrolux products by creating the false impression that the Respondent is an authorized repair and service center for the Complainant's products. Not only the disputed domain names but also the content and the design of the websites linked to these domain names give the impression that the Respondent intended to mislead Internet users who may search for official repair services for their Electrolux branded products. The Panel therefore concludes that the disputed domain names were registered and used in bad faith.”

Consequently, the Panel finds that the Respondent's conduct constitutes bad faith registration and use in violation of paragraph 4(b)(iv) of the Policy.

Thus, the Panel concludes that the Complainant has provided sufficient evidence of its allegations, with respect to the disputed domain name to establish a case under paragraph 4(a) of the Policy upon which the relief it now seeks can be granted.

7. Decision

Accordingly, under paragraphs 4(i) of the Policy and 15 of the Rules, the Panel grants the relief sought by the Complainant.

The disputed domain name <electroluxhyderabadservice.com> is to be transferred to the Complainant.

Peter L. Michaelson

Sole Panelist

Date: April 16, 2018