

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

Accenture Global Services Limited v. Domain Administrator, Fundacion
Privacy Services LTD
Case No. D2025-0107

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 Domain Administrator, Fundacion Privacy Services LTD, Panama.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <accenature.com> is registered with Media Elite Holdings Limited (the “Registrar”).

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the “Center”) on January 11, 2025. On January 13, 2025, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On January 21, 2025, 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 January 23, 2025. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was February 12, 2025. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent’s default on February 13, 2025.

The Center appointed Yuri Chumak as the sole panelist in this matter on February 25, 2025. 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 providing consulting, digital, technology, and operational services. Founded in 2001, the Complainant has established itself as a leading professional services company, with operations in over 200 cities across 49 countries. The Complainant operates under the well-known ACCENTURE trademark and owns various domain names, including <accenture.com>, which serves as its primary online presence.

The Complainant holds numerous trademark registrations for the ACCENTURE mark worldwide, including:

- ACCENTURE – United States Patent and Trademark Office (“USPTO”), Reg. No. 3,091,811, registered May 16, 2006, covering a range of goods and services in Classes 9, 16, 35, 36, 37, 41, and 42.
- ACCENTURE & Design – USPTO, Reg. No. 2,665,373, registered December 24, 2002, covering services in Classes 35, 36, 41, and 42.
- ACCENTURE & Design – USPTO, Reg. No. 7,258,092, registered January 2, 2024, covering goods and services in Classes 9, 35, 36, 37, 41, and 42.

The Complainant led evidence of worldwide recognition of the ACCENTURE mark, including ranking in global brand valuation reports and being listed in Fortune 500 rankings.

The disputed domain name was registered on November 19, 2010, after the Complainant’s first use and registration of its ACCENTURE trademarks. The disputed domain name resolves to a website that has triggered security warnings.

The Respondent, identified as “Domain Administrator, Fundacion Privacy Services LTD”, has concealed its identity using a privacy protection service. The WhoIS records indicate a Panama-based contact address.

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.

The Complainant argues that the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to its ACCENTURE trademark. The minor typographical difference (insertion of “u”) constitutes a case of typosquatting, which does not prevent a finding of confusing similarity. The Complainant asserts that the ACCENTURE mark is highly distinctive and widely recognized, increasing the likelihood of confusion.

The Complainant argues that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name. The Respondent is not affiliated with the Complainant, has never been authorized to use the ACCENTURE trademark, and is not commonly known by the disputed domain name. The disputed domain name does not resolve to a legitimate business or noncommercial use but instead has been used in a manner that raises security concerns.

The Complainant further argues that the Respondent registered and is using the disputed domain name in bad faith. Given the worldwide recognition of the ACCENTURE mark, the Respondent was likely aware of the Complainant’s rights at the time of registration. The Complainant further argues that the Respondent’s use of the domain name to host a site that triggers security warnings suggests malicious intent, such as phishing or malware distribution. The Respondent’s failure to make any legitimate use of the domain name further supports a finding of bad faith.

The Complainant requests that the disputed domain name be transferred to its ownership.

B. Respondent

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

6. Discussion and Findings

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. WIPO Overview of WIPO Panel Views on Selected UDRP Questions, Third Edition, ("[WIPO Overview 3.0](#)"), section 1.7.

The Complainant has shown rights in respect of a trademark or service mark for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 1.2.1.

The Panel finds the mark is recognizable within the disputed domain name. The minor variation, consisting of the insertion of the letter "u" after the letter "n" in "accenture," constitutes typosquatting. Such an alteration does not prevent a finding of confusing similarity. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 1.9. Accordingly, the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to the mark for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), 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 a 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 3.0](#), 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.

There is no evidence that the Respondent is commonly known by the disputed domain name, nor that the disputed domain name is being used in connection with a bona fide offering of goods or services or for a legitimate noncommercial or fair use.

Panels have held that the use of a domain name for phishing, distributing malware, or other fraudulent activity can never confer rights or legitimate interests on a respondent. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 2.13.1. Given that the disputed domain name results in a security warning indicating potential malicious activity, the Respondent's use does not establish any rights or legitimate interests.

Moreover, the typographical variation of the Complainant's trademark in the disputed domain name—specifically, the insertion of an extra letter “u”—suggests an intent to mislead or confuse Internet users, which is incompatible with a right or legitimate interest.

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 Respondent's actions demonstrate bad faith. The disputed domain name is a clear case of typosquatting of the Complainant's well-known ACCENTURE trademark, achieved by inserting an additional letter “u” after the letter “n.” Such a practice is designed to create confusion and divert users who may not notice the minor variation from the Complainant's mark. Given the global recognition of the ACCENTURE trademark, the Respondent's registration of a typo-squatted domain name indicates knowledge of and intent to target the Complainant's rights, which constitutes registration in bad faith.

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 3.0](#), section 3.2.1.

Panels have held that the use of a domain name for illegitimate activity, here, alleged phishing, malware distribution, or other fraudulent activity constitutes bad faith. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 3.4.

In this case, the disputed domain name results in a security warning, suggesting that it may be used for malicious purposes such as phishing or malware dissemination. The Respondent's failure to make any legitimate use of the domain name, coupled with its choice of a typo-squatted variation of the Complainant's well-known trademark, further supports a finding of bad faith.

Moreover, the Respondent has taken steps to conceal its identity by using a privacy service, which may further indicate bad faith in view of the totality of circumstances in this case. Panels have recognized that the deliberate use of privacy shields, combined with other factors such as the nature of the disputed domain name and the absence of a legitimate use, may support a finding of bad faith.

Having reviewed the record, the Panel finds the Respondent's registration and use of the disputed domain name constitutes bad faith under the Policy.

The Panel finds that the Complainant has established the third element 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 <accenuture.com> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Yuri Chumak/

Yuri Chumak

Sole Panelist

Date: March 3, 2025