

## **ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION**

Bureau Veritas v. David Chiu

Case No. D2025-3110

### **1. The Parties**

The Complainant is Bureau Veritas, France, represented by Denнемeyer & Associates SAS, France.

The Respondent is David Chiu, United States of America ("United States").

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

The disputed domain name <bureauveritas.com> is registered with Network Solutions, LLC (the "Registrar").

### **3. Procedural History**

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the "Center") on August 5, 2025. On August 5, 2025, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On August 5, 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 (PERFECT PRIVACY, LLC) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on August 6, 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 August 7, 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 August 7, 2025. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was August 27, 2025. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent's default on August 28, 2025.

The Center appointed Miguel B. O'Farrell as the sole panelist in this matter on September 4, 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**

Founded in 1828, the Complainant Bureau Veritas is a world leader in testing, inspection and certification (TICS) services with several subsidiaries. The Group employs over 82,000 people in more than 1,600 offices and laboratories worldwide. The Complainant helps its clients improve their performance by offering services and innovative solutions to ensure that their assets, products, infrastructures and processes meet standards and regulations in respect of quality, health and safety, environmental protection and social responsibility.

The Complainant owns a large number of BUREAU VERITAS word and complex marks throughout the world, including the following:

European Trademark Registration No. 004518544 filed on June 30, 2005, and registered on June 1, 2006, renewed on June 6, 2025, to designate services in classes 38 and 42; and

European Trademark Registration No. 005927711 filed on May 11, 2007, and registered on February 6, 2008, renewed on April 24, 2017, for services in class 42.

The Complainant is the owner of these trademarks in most countries in the world, as can be seen from the extracts of its portfolio.

The disputed domain name was registered on July 23, 2025, and resolves to a webpage with pay-per-click ("PPC") links. The disputed domain name has allegedly been used to send fraudulent emails to one of the Complainant's client impersonating one of the Complainant's companies.

#### **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 reproduces the verbal elements of the Complainant's trademark BUREAU VERITAS. The inversion of the letters "E", "I", and "R" of the word "veritas" in the disputed domain name has no effect on the imitation of the Complainant's earlier trademarks since it does not affect the visual and phonetic similarities or the public's perception of it. Therefore, the domain name is confusingly similar to the Complainant's trademarks and there is a clear risk of confusion.

The Complainant contends that the Respondent has never been authorized by the Complainant to register a domain name similar to its trademark registrations and company name. The Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the disputed domain name.

The Complainant contends that one of its clients received an email from the disputed domain name, impersonating as a Complainant's company. The email claimed that an account was undergoing an audit and requested the client to transfer a specific amount of money to another account. Unfortunately, the client transferred the amount to the account provided by the impersonator.

The Complainant submits that it is apparent from the composition of the disputed domain name, comprising the Complainant's trademark with a misspelling, that the Respondent was aware of the Complainant's rights and its reputation vested in the trademark, as the Respondent almost identically copied the trademark in the disputed domain name when registered it for an illegitimate and bad faith use.

The Respondent took advantage of the Complainant's reputation and insignificant differences between the marks and the domain name to cheat a client of the Complainant out of money. The Respondent is therefore making unlawful and unfair use of the domain name with the intention of diverting customers by creating confusion about the origin of the services and thus tarnishing the Complainant's aforementioned trademarks and damaging the Complainant's image and reputation.

The Complainant requests the Panel to issue a decision ordering the transfer of the disputed domain name to the Complainant.

## **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. Accordingly, the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to the mark for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), sections 1.7 and 1.9.

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.

Panels have categorically held that the use of a domain name for illegitimate activity (here phishing, impersonation, or other types of fraud) can never confer rights or legitimate interests on a respondent. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 2.13.1.

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.

The Panel is satisfied that the Respondent must have been aware of the Complainant's name and trademarks mentioned in Section 4 above when the disputed domain name was registered on July 23, 2025. By that time the trademark BUREAU VERITAS had long ago been registered and used in many jurisdictions.

In accordance with section 3.1.4 of [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), the Panel considers that the inversion of the letters "E", "I", and "R" in the word VERITAS in the disputed domain name is an act of typosquatting that creates a presumption of bad faith registration and use of the disputed domain name.

The Respondent, when registering the disputed domain name, has targeted the Complainant's business and its trademark BUREAU VERITAS with the intention to confuse Internet users and capitalize on the fame of the Complainant's trademark for its own benefit.

Such intent is apparent when considering the commercial use to which the disputed domain name has been put, namely, to confuse Internet users and make them think that the website to which the disputed domain resolves is owned or endorsed by the Complainant.

The Complainant has proven that the Respondent has used the disputed domain name to cheat a customer of the Complainant out of money.

The fact that there is a clear absence of rights or legitimate interests coupled with no credible explanation for the Respondent's choice of the disputed domain name is also a significant factor to consider that the disputed domain name was registered in bad faith (as stated in section 3.2.1 of the [WIPO Overview 3.0](#)).

Having reviewed the record, the Panel finds the Respondent's registration and use of the disputed domain name constitutes bad faith under the Policy and that the requirements of paragraph 4(a)(iii) of the Policy have been fulfilled.

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 <bureauviedades.com> be transferred to the Complainant.

*/Miguel B. O'Farrell/*

**Miguel B. O'Farrell**

Sole Panelist

Date: September 17, 2025