

## **ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION**

Globant S.A. v. CHARLES HONESTRAJ

Case No. D2025-2314

### **1. The Parties**

The Complainant is Globant S.A., Spain, represented by Marval O' Farrell & Mairal, Argentina.

The Respondent is CHARLES HONESTRAJ, India.

### **2. The Domain Name and Registrar**

The disputed domain name <globant.site> is registered with Hostinger Operations, UAB (the "Registrar").

### **3. Procedural History**

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the "Center") on June 12, 2025. On June 13, 2025, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On June 16, 2025, 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 (Redacted for privacy / Domain Admin, Privacy Protect, LLC (PrivacyProtect.org)) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on June 18, 2025, 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 amendment to the Complaint on June 19, 2025.

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 the Respondent of the Complaint, and the proceedings commenced on June 24, 2025. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was July 14, 2025. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent's default on July 15, 2025.

The Center appointed Fabrizio Bedarida as the sole panelist in this matter on July 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 in this administrative proceeding is Globant S.A., a Spanish company. The Complainant is a digitally native company that offers a wide range of services, including software development, IT consulting, and digital marketing, among many others. Founded in Argentina in 2003, the Complainant has expanded its operations to every continent in the world. The Complainant now employs over 29,000 professionals globally and reported a revenue of USD 2.3 billion in Q2 of 2024, reflecting its continuous growth and global impact.

The Complainant has also expanded the visibility and recognition of its trademarks through prominent sponsorships with globally renowned organizations. These include partnership with Williams Racing in Formula 1, the NBA's L.A. Clippers franchise, and its collaboration with FIFA.

The Complainant is, inter alia, the owner of:

European Union trademark GLOBANT (figurative), registration number 018356645, registered on May 21, 2021;

European Union trademark GLOBANT (word), registration number 018356639, registered on May 21, 2021;

United Kingdom trademark GLOBANT (word), registration number UK00003831223, registered on January 13, 2023;

Indian trademark GLOBANT (combined), application number 4785553, registered on December 17, 2020.

The Complainant is also the owner of the domain name <globant.com>.

The disputed domain name was registered on January 4, 2025.

The disputed domain name resolves to a parking page displaying the following text: "Happy to see your domain with Hostinger! Your domain is active and is using Hostinger nameservers. Take the recommended steps below to continue your journey with Hostinger."

#### **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.

Notably, the Complainant contends that the disputed domain name is identical or confusingly similar to the Complainant's GLOBANT prior trademarks, domain name and company name, the only difference between the Complainant's trademark and the disputed domain name being the generic Top-Level Domain ("gTLD") ".site"; that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name; and, the fact that the disputed domain name is identical to the Complainant's renowned trademarks, combined with the passive holding of the disputed domain name and the use of a privacy shield service when registering the disputed domain name, show the Respondent's bad faith in registering and using the disputed domain name.

## **B. Respondent**

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

## **6. Discussion and Findings**

In accordance with paragraph 4(a) of the Policy, the Complainant must prove that each of the three following elements is satisfied:

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

### **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 entirety of the mark is reproduced within the disputed domain name. Accordingly, the disputed domain name is identical 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.

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.

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.

Owing to the distinctiveness of the Complainant's trademarks and reputation, and the fact that the disputed domain name is identical to the Complainant's trademark, it is reasonable to infer that the Respondent registered the disputed domain name with full knowledge of the Complainant's trademarks, and so the Panel finds on the balance of probabilities that the Respondent was aware of the Complainant's trademarks when registering the disputed domain name.

Moreover, the Panel notes that the Respondent has used a privacy service to register the disputed domain name.

Panels have consistently found that the mere registration of a domain name that is identical (particularly domain names comprising typos) to a famous or widely-known trademark by an unaffiliated entity can by itself create a presumption of bad faith. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 3.1.4.

The disputed domain name is currently inactive as it resolves to a parking page. Panels 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. Although 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. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 3.3. Having reviewed the available record, the Panel notes that in the circumstances of this case the current passive holding of the inherently misleading disputed domain name does not prevent a finding of bad faith under the Policy.

Finally, the Panel notes that the Respondent's failure to respond to the Complainant's assertions made in this proceeding regarding its bad faith in registering and using the disputed domain name is further inference of bad faith use and registration of the disputed domain name.

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 <globant.site> be transferred to the Complainant.

*/Fabrizio Bedarida/*

**Fabrizio Bedarida**

Sole Panelist

Date: July 31, 2025