

## **ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION**

Veolia Environnement SA v. Pimniti Thummultri  
Case No. D2025-2582

### **1. The Parties**

The Complainant is Veolia Environnement SA, France, represented by IP Twins, France.

The Respondent is Pimniti Thummultri, Thailand.

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

The disputed domain name <veolia-events.com> is registered with Dynadot Inc (the “Registrar”).

### **3. Procedural History**

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the “Center”) on July 2, 2025. On July 2, 2025, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On July 3, 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) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on July 7, 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 amended Complaint on July 9, 2025.

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 July 10, 2025. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was July 30, 2025. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent’s default on August 4, 2025.

The Center appointed Adam Taylor as the sole panelist in this matter on August 8, 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 part of a group of companies that trade under the mark VEOLIA in the water, waste and energy industries. The group has over 200,000 employees worldwide.

The Complainant owns many registered trade marks for VEOLIA including:

- International Registration No. 814678, registered on September 11, 2003, in classes 1, 6, 9, 11, 17, 19, 32, 35, 36, 37, 39, 40, 41 and 42; and
- Thai trade mark No. ๒22409, registered on July 2, 2004, in class 40.

The Complainant operates a website at “www.veolia.com”. The Complainant’s website includes an events page.

The disputed domain name was registered on January 28, 2025.

The Respondent did not reply to the Complainant’s cease and desist letter sent on June 23, 2025.

As of June 24, 2025, the disputed domain name resolved to a gambling website.

#### **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.

##### **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 trade mark 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 trade mark 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 confusingly similar to the mark for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 1.7.

Although the addition of other terms (here, “events” preceded by a hyphen), may bear on assessment of the second and third elements, the Panel finds the addition of such term does not prevent a finding of confusing similarity between the disputed domain name and the mark for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 1.8.

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 recognised 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.

As to paragraph 4(c)(i) of the Policy, the Respondent has used the disputed domain name for a gambling site with no obvious connection to the words in the disputed domain name but with the obvious potential to damage the reputation of the Complainant’s trade mark. Such use of the disputed domain name could not be described as bona fide.

Nor is there any evidence that paragraphs 4(c)(ii) or (iii) of the Policy are relevant in the circumstances of this case.

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 Panel’s view, the Respondent set out to create a likelihood of confusion with the Complainant’s mark in accordance with paragraph 4(b)(iv) of the Policy.

In the absence of a plausible explanation from the Respondent as to why it has used the disputed domain name for gambling services that have no obvious connection with the disputed domain name, the Panel thinks it reasonable to conclude that most likely the Respondent was seeking to take unfair advantage of the Complainant’s distinctive mark by profiting from traffic intended for the Complainant.

The likelihood of confusion is not diminished by the likelihood that users arriving at the Respondent’s site will realise that the site is not connected with the Complainant. Paragraph 4(b)(iv) of the Policy is concerned with the intentional attracting of Internet users. Here, the disputed domain name creates a risk of implied affiliation with the Complainant, and the Respondent profits from at least some of the traffic intended for the Complainant.

Furthermore, given that the disputed domain name is closely linked with the Complainant and its trade mark, the Respondent must have known that use of the disputed domain name for gambling was likely to damage the Complainant’s reputation.

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 <veolia-events.com> be transferred to the Complainant.

*/Adam Taylor/*

**Adam Taylor**

Sole Panelist

Date: August 21, 2025