

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

Bureau Veritas Société Anonyme v. dan johnson
Case No. D2025-5068

1. The Parties

The Complainant is Bureau Veritas Société Anonyme, France, represented by Dennemeyer & Associates SAS, France.

The Respondent is dan johnson, United States of America.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <bureauveritas.com> 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 December 5, 2025. On December 8, 2025, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On December 9, 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 December 10, 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 December 11, 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 December 16, 2025. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was January 5, 2026. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent's default on January 20, 2026.

The Center appointed Manuel Moreno-Torres as the sole panelist in this matter on January 26, 2026. 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, established back in 1828, is a world leader in testing, inspection and certification (TICS) services, employs over 82,000 people in more than 1,600 offices and laboratories worldwide.

The Complainant holds, through its group of companies, a portfolio of trademarks in different jurisdictions. By way of example and before the European Union of Intellectual Property Office for BUREAU VERITAS: registration trademark No. 004518544, registered on June 1, 2006, or, registration trademark No. 007282651, registered on April 16, 2009. Likewise, the Complainant is the owner for BUREAU VERITAS trademark before the United States Patent and Trademark Office with registration number 3214422, registered on March 6, 2007.

The disputed domain name was registered on November 17, 2025, and redirects to a parking page of the Registrar. However, the disputed domain name has been used by the Respondent in a scam email scheme purporting to be one of the Complainant's employees and reproducing the Complainant's logo and trademark and claiming payment of an invoice from one of the Complainant's clients.

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 its BUREAU VERITAS trademark since it is identifiable. By adding the letter "i" the Respondent's registration fits in what is called a typosquatting. Accordingly, the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to the Complainant's trademarks and there is a clear risk of confusion and association with the Complainant.

The Complainant alleges that the Respondent has never been authorized to register a domain name similar to its trademark registrations and company name. Nor is the Respondent an employee of the Complainant. Further, the disputed domain name is inactive and only diverts to a parking page.

The Complainant also contends that by the composition of the disputed domain name, the Respondent was aware of BUREAU VERITAS trademark and the Complainant.

B. Respondent

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

6. Discussion and Findings

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

- (i) the disputed domain name is identical or confusingly similar to a trademark or service mark in which the Complainant has rights;
- (ii) the 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.

There are no exceptional circumstances within paragraph 5(f) of the Rules to prevent the Panel from determining the dispute based upon the Complaint, notwithstanding the failure of the Respondent to file a Response. Under paragraph 14(a) of the Rules in the event of such a “default” the Panel is still required “to proceed with a decision on the complaint”, whilst under paragraph 14(b) it “shall draw such inferences therefrom as it considers appropriate”. This dispute resolution procedure is accepted by the domain name registrant as a condition of registration.

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](#), section 1.7.

Although the addition of other terms here, letter “i” may bear on assessment of the second and third elements, the Panel finds the addition of such letter 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 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 held that the use of a domain name for illegal activity here, claimed as applicable to this case: phishing and impersonation/passing off can never confer rights or legitimate interests on a respondent. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 2.13.1. The evidence only leads to the conclusion that the composition of the disputed domain name, together with the email in which the Complainant’s trademark is reproduced, is more than likely to mislead the recipient into thinking that it came from the Complainant when this was not the 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 present case, the Panel notes that the Respondent falls in the circumstances set out in paragraph 4(b) (iv) of the Policy: intentionally attempted to attract, for commercial gain, Internet users by creating a likelihood of confusion with the complainant's mark. That is to say, the disputed domain name was purportedly registered and used to deceive the recipient of the Respondent's email, who might mistake it as an official email of the Complainant because of the composition of the disputed domain name and the impersonation of one of the Complainant's employees.

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.

The Panel also finds that the Respondent knew or should have known about the Complainant and its trademarks due to its reputation and distinctiveness when registering the disputed domain name. This is reinforced by the Respondent's use of the disputed domain name following its registration purporting to impersonate the Complainant. Therefore, the Respondent targeted the Complainant and its trademarks.

Arguably the lack of credible explanation for the Respondent's choice of the disputed domain name and its use in what seemingly is a scam email scheme supports a finding of bad faith use and registration.

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 <bureauiveritas.com> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Manuel Moreno-Torres/

Manuel Moreno-Torres

Sole Panelist

Date: February 9, 2026