

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

Accenture Global Services Limited v. Terri Webb
Case No. D2023-1477

1. The Parties

The Complainant is Accenture Global Services Limited, Ireland, represented by McDermott Will & Emery LLP, United States of America ("United States").

The Respondent is Terri Webb, United States.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <accenture-sso.support> (the "Domain Name") is registered with NameSilo, LLC (the "Registrar").

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the "Center") on April 5, 2023. On April 5, 2023, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the Domain Name. On April 5, 2023, the Registrar transmitted by email to the Center its verification response disclosing registrant and contact information for the Domain Name which differed from the named Respondent (Redacted for Privacy, PrivacyGuardian.org llc,) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on April 13, 2023, 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 April 15, 2023.

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 April 17, 2023. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was April 7, 2023. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent's default on April 8, 2023.

The Center appointed Ian Lowe as the sole panelist in this matter on May 16, 2023. 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 an international business that has provided a broad range of services and solutions in strategy, consulting, digital, technology, and operations under the name ACCENTURE since January 2001. It has nearly 740,000 employees worldwide across offices and operations in more than 200 cities in 50 countries.

The Complainant is the proprietor of more than 1,000 registered trademarks comprising ACCENTURE in more than 140 countries, including United States trademark number 3,091,811 ACCENTURE registered on May 16, 2006 and India trademark number 967046 registered on October 30, 2000.

The Complainant promotes its services from a website at the domain name <accenture.com> that it registered on August 30, 2000.

The Domain Name was registered on March 29, 2023. It does not resolve to an active website but to a web page with a Deceptive Website Warning, stating that “the website may try to trick you into doing something dangerous, like installing software or disclosing personal or financial information, like passwords, phone numbers or credit cards”. At least one employee of the Complainant has received a text message purporting to be from “Accenture SMS Dispatch” suggesting there had been a change of employment status and inviting the employee to log in at a sub-URL of the Domain Name, presumably with their employment credentials.

5. Parties’ Contentions

A. Complainant

The Complainant contends that the Domain Name is confusingly similar to its ACCENTURE trademark (the “Mark”), that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the Domain Name, and that the Respondent registered and is using the Domain Name in bad faith within the meaning of the Policy.

B. Respondent

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

6. Discussion and Findings

For this Complaint to succeed in relation to the Domain Name the Complainant must prove that:

- (i) the 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 Domain Name; and
- (iii) the Domain Name has been registered and is being used in bad faith.

A. Identical or Confusingly Similar

The Complainant has uncontested rights in the Mark, both by virtue of its numerous trademark registrations and as a result of the substantial goodwill and reputation acquired through its widespread use of the Mark over more than 20 years. Ignoring the generic Top-Level Domain (“gTLD”) “.support”, the Domain Name

comprises the entirety of the Mark with the addition of the term “-sso”. “sso” is commonly held to be a reference to Single Sign-On, a facility enabling authorised access to corporate networks. In the view of the Panel, the addition of this term does not prevent a finding of confusing similarity between the Mark and the Domain Name. Accordingly, the Panel finds that the Domain Name is confusingly similar to a trademark in which the Complainant has rights.

B. Rights or Legitimate Interests

The Complainant has made out a strong *prima facie* case that the Respondent could have no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the Domain Name. The Domain Name is not being used for an active website. In the Panel's view, it is difficult to conceive a legitimate purpose for registering a domain name comprising the entirety of the Complainant's ACCENTURE trademark. There is however evidence that the Respondent has used the Domain Name to solicit employees of the Complainant to enter log in details to a website at a sub-URL of the Domain Name.

The legitimate inference is that the Respondent has registered the Domain Name with a view to phishing for personal information. Such activity cannot give rise to rights or legitimate interests.

The Respondent has chosen not to respond to the Complaint or to take any steps to counter the *prima facie* case established by the Complainant. In the circumstances, the Panel finds that the Respondent does not have any rights or legitimate interests in respect of the Domain Name.

C. Registered and Used in Bad Faith

In light of the notoriety of the Mark and the text message sent to an employee of the Complainant, the Panel is in no doubt that the Respondent had the Complainant and its rights in the Mark in mind when it registered the Domain Name. The Panel considers that the Respondent has registered and used the Domain Name to deceive Internet users into believing that the Domain Name is operated or authorized by the Complainant, and to attract Internet users by creating a likelihood of confusion with the Mark, with a view to phishing for personal information or other fraudulent purposes, no doubt for commercial gain.

While the Domain Name may not currently resolve to an active website, passive holding of a domain name does not prevent a finding of bad faith, as noted in section 3.3 of the [WIPO Overview of WIPO Panel Views on Selected UDRP Questions, Third Edition](#).

In the circumstances, the Panel finds that the Domain Name has been registered and is being used in bad faith.

7. Decision

For the foregoing reasons, in accordance with paragraphs 4(l) of the Policy and 15 of the Rules, the Panel orders that the Domain Name <accenture-sso.support> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Ian Lowe/

Ian Lowe

Sole Panelist

Date: May 30, 2023