

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

Bureau Veritas v. Privacy Service Provided by Withheld for Privacy ehf /
Narmatha Manokaran
Case No. D2022-0703

1. The Parties

Complainant is Bureau Veritas, France, represented by Novagraaf France, France.

Respondent is Privacy Service Provided by Withheld for Privacy ehf, Iceland / Narmatha Manokaran, India.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <researchbureauveritas.com> is registered with NameCheap, Inc. (the “Registrar”).

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the “Center”) on March 1, 2022. On March 1, 2022, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On March 1, 2022, 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 and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to Complainant on March 2, 2022, providing the registrant and contact information disclosed by the Registrar, and inviting Complainant to submit an amendment to the Complaint. Complainant filed an amendment to the Complaint on March 7, 2022.

The Center verified that the Complaint together with the amendment to 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 Respondent of the Complaint, and the proceedings commenced on March 8, 2022. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was March 28, 2022. Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified Respondent’s default on March 30, 2022.

The Center appointed Brian J. Winterfeldt as the sole panelist in this matter on April 11, 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

Complainant Bureau Veritas is a French company registered on the French Trade and Company Name Registrar under number 775 690 621. Founded in 1828, Complainant offers tracking information about shipments and equipment to underwriters, as well as testing, inspection, and certification services for manufacturing and process industries. In 2018, Complainant's revenue amounted to EUR 4.8 billion. Complainant has more than 400,000 clients, over 77,000 employees, more than 1,500 offices, and laboratories in 140 countries.

Complainant owns several trademark registrations for the BUREAU VERITAS mark (the "Mark") in numerous jurisdictions, with sample registration details as follows:

- BUREAU VERITAS, United States of America Trademark Reg. No. 2,871,545, registered on August 10, 2004;
- BUREAU VERITAS, United States of America Trademark Reg. No. 3,214,422, registered on March 6, 2007;
- BUREAU VERITAS, European Union Trademark Reg. No. 4,518,544, registered on June 1, 2006.

The disputed domain name was registered on January 20, 2022. Currently, <researchbureauveritas.com> resolves to a website that claims to offer a variety of services, including technical consultancy through finance, security, media management and safety, and which prominently display the BUREAU VERITAS mark throughout.

5. Parties' Contentions

A. Complainant

According to Complainant, the disputed domain name is identical or confusingly similar to Complainant's BUREAU VERITAS trademark in which Complainant has rights as demonstrated through its cited registrations. The Mark was adopted and has been continuously used since at least as early as 1829 in connection with providing information related to shipping and equipment. Complainant maintains its online presence through the websites hosted at its domain names, <bureauveritas.com>, which it registered on June 20, 1996, and <bureauveritas.fr>, which it registered on February 12, 2001.

Complainant argues that the disputed domain name fully incorporates the Mark and is confusingly similar to Complainant's Mark and domain names. Complainant also argues that the addition of the word "research" to BUREAU VERITAS is clearly not sufficient to avoid a likelihood of confusion with Complainant's prior rights. Complainant argues that, due to the complete reproduction of Complainant's company name, prior well-known trademarks, and domain names, Internet users will wrongly think that the disputed domain name belongs to Complainant or has been registered in its name or for its account. Complainant argues that a likelihood of confusion is therefore undeniable and is reinforced by the high notoriety enjoyed by Complainant in France and all over the world in relation to inspection services, quality control, and certification.

Complainant asserts that Respondent lacks any rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name. According to Complainant, Respondent does not have any trademark rights to the Mark or any of Complainant's trademarks used throughout the website to which the disputed domain name resolves. Complainant also claims that it has not granted Respondent, by license or otherwise, permission to operate such a website, let alone make use of Complainant's trademarks and/or trade name. Complainant argues

that the disputed domain name was registered by Respondent without Complainant's consent and directs to a website which is confusingly similar to Complainant website.

Complainant argues that Respondent both registered and is using the disputed domain name in bad faith. According to Complainant, Respondent registered and used the disputed domain name intentionally in an attempt to attract Internet users to his website for financial gain by creating a likelihood of confusion with Complainant's trademark. Complainant argues that Respondent reproduces Complainant's trademarks with a similar logo and uses the same colors as those used by Complainant with the aim to mislead consumers. Complainant argues that Respondent could not have been unaware of the existence of Complainant's numerous trademarks, company name, and domain names when registering the disputed domain name. Complainant argues that such actions clearly show the disputed domain name was registered and is being used in bad faith.

B. Respondent

Respondent did not reply to Complainant's contentions.

6. Discussion and Findings

Under paragraphs 5(f) and 14(a) of the Rules, the effect of a default by a respondent is that, in the absence of exceptional circumstances, the panel shall proceed to a decision on the basis of the complaint.

Under paragraph 4(a) of the Policy, to succeed Complainant must satisfy the Panel that:

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

A respondent's default does not by itself satisfy a complainant's burden of proof and is not necessarily an admission that the complainant's allegations are true. See section 4.3 of the WIPO Overview of WIPO Panel Views on Selected UDRP Questions, Third Edition ("[WIPO Overview 3.0](#)"). Thus, even though Respondent has failed to address Complainant's contentions, the burden remains with Complainant to establish the three elements of paragraph 4(a) of the Policy by a preponderance of the evidence. See, e.g., *The Knot, Inc. v. In Knot We Trust LTD*, WIPO Case No. [D2006-0340](#).

A. Identical or Confusingly Similar

A national or international trademark registration is *prima facie* evidence that the holder has the requisite rights in the registered mark for purposes of paragraph 4(a)(i) of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 1.2.1. Complainant has provided evidence that it owns multiple trademark registrations for the BUREAU VERITAS trademark as referenced above. Therefore, Complainant has established that it has rights in the Mark.

The remaining question under the first element of the Policy is whether the disputed domain name (typically disregarding the Top-Level Domain ("TLD") in which the domain name is registered) is identical or confusingly similar to Complainant's Mark. It is well accepted that the first element functions primarily as a standing requirement and that the threshold test for confusing similarity involves a "reasoned but relatively straightforward comparison between the complainant's trademark and the disputed domain name". [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 1.7. This test typically involves a side-by-side comparison of the domain name and the textual components of the relevant trademark to assess whether the mark is recognizable within the disputed domain name. *Id.*

Here, the disputed domain name incorporates the entirety of the Mark, adding only the word “research,” which does not prevent a finding of confusing similarity between the disputed domain name and the Mark. A side-by-side comparison of the Mark and the disputed domain name reveals that the Mark is easily identifiable within the disputed domain name.

Therefore, the Panel finds that Complainant has satisfied the requirements of paragraph 4(a)(i) of the Policy in establishing its trademark rights and showing that the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to its BUREAU VERITAS mark.

B. Rights or Legitimate Interests

Under paragraph 4(a)(ii) of the Policy, Complainant must make at least a *prima facie* showing that Respondent possesses no rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name. See [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 2.1. Once Complainant makes such a *prima facie* showing, the burden of production shifts to Respondent, though the burden of proof always remains on Complainant. If Respondent fails to come forward with evidence showing rights or legitimate interests, Complainant will have sustained its burden under the second element of the UDRP.

Paragraph 4(c) of the Policy lists the ways that Respondent may demonstrate rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name:

- (i) before any notice of the dispute, 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 or services; or
- (ii) Respondent (as an individual, business or other organization) has been commonly known by the disputed domain name, even if it has acquired no trademark or service mark rights; or
- (iii) 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.

Here, Complainant has alleged that Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name. Respondent has failed to come forward with any evidence showing rights or legitimate interests. Respondent has not submitted any arguments or evidence to rebut Complainant’s contention that Respondent is not an assignee or licensee of Complainant and that Respondent has no other business relationship with Complainant. Complainant has contended that Respondent is not commonly known by the disputed domain name and that there is no evidence that Respondent has established trademark rights in the disputed domain name. Again, Respondent has not provided any evidence or arguments to demonstrate that it has such rights.

Accordingly, the Panel finds that Respondent does not have any rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name.

C. Registered and Used in Bad Faith

Bad faith is broadly understood to occur where a respondent takes unfair advantage of or otherwise abuses a complainant’s mark. Paragraph 4(b) of the Policy provides that any one of the following non-exclusive scenarios constitutes evidence of a respondent’s bad faith:

- (i) circumstances indicating that the respondent has registered or acquired the domain name primarily for the purpose of selling, renting, or otherwise transferring the domain name to the complainant who is the owner of the trademark or service mark or to a competitor of that complainant, for valuable consideration in excess of the respondent’s documented out-of-pocket costs directly related to the domain name; or
- (ii) the respondent has registered the domain name in order to prevent the owner of the trademark or service

mark from reflecting the mark in a corresponding domain name, provided that the respondent has engaged in a pattern of such conduct; or

(iii) the respondent has registered the domain name primarily for the purpose of disrupting the business of a competitor; or

(iv) by using the domain name, the respondent has intentionally attempted to attract, for commercial gain, Internet users to its 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.

Here, Respondent's actions align with 4(b)(iv) of the Policy. The disputed domain name contains the entirety of the BUREAU VERITAS mark, with the addition of the word "research." Due to the well-known and online nature of Complainant's brand, evidenced by its numerous trademark registrations for BUREAU VERITAS as well as industry-wide recognition provided by Complainant, along with the unauthorized use of the Mark and claims offering similar services to Complainant's throughout the website to which the disputed domain name resolves, Respondent was undoubtedly aware of Complainant and the Mark when it registered the disputed domain name. Respondent's impersonation of Complainant and use of the Mark and language throughout the website imitating Complainant's services clearly evidences bad faith on the part of Respondent in the registration and use of the disputed domain name.

This Panel therefore finds that Respondent acted in bad faith by its registration and use of the disputed domain name, intentionally creating a likelihood of confusion as to the source, sponsorship, affiliation, or endorsement of Respondent's website with the purpose of attracting Internet users for commercial gain as per paragraph 4(b)(iv) 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 <researchbureauveritas.com> be transferred to Complainant.

/Brian J. Winterfeldt/
Brian J. Winterfeldt
Sole Panelist
Date: April 22, 2022