

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

DNV AS v. Andrade Neves

Case No. D2025-5198

1. The Parties

The Complainant is DNV AS, Norway, represented by Zacco Norway AS, Norway.

The Respondent is Andrade Neves, Brazil.

2. The Domain Names and Registrar

The disputed domain names <dnvbrazil.com>, <dnvbrazil.online>, and <dnvbrazil.store> are registered with PDR Ltd. d/b/a PublicDomainRegistry.com (the “Registrar”).

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the “Center”) on December 12, 2025. On December 12, 2025, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain names. On December 15, 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 December 17, 2025. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was January 6, 2026. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent’s default on January 13, 2026.

The Center appointed Elise Dufour as the sole panelist in this matter on January 21, 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 is DNV AS, a Norwegian company founded in 1864, operating globally as a classification society and provider of assurance, certification, risk management, and technical advisory services. The Complainant conducts business in more than 100 countries and employs over 15,000 people worldwide. Its activities notably cover the maritime sector, the energy value chain (including renewables, oil and gas), certification services, digital risk management solutions, and cybersecurity-related offerings.

The Complainant is the owner of the trademark DNV, which has been registered and used for several decades in numerous jurisdictions worldwide that include:

- DNV figurative mark, Norwegian trademark registration number 162893, registration date May 26, 1994 in classes 9, 16, 35, 37 and 42.
- DNV figurative mark, European Union trademark registration number 003326873, registration date January 10, 2005 in classes 9,35 and 42.
- DNV word mark, United States of America trademark registration number 6513761, registration date October 12, 2021 in classes 9, 35, 37, 38, 40, 41 and 42.

The disputed domain names were registered on November 21, 2025.

At the time of the filing of the Complaint, the disputed domain names resolved to a website purporting to present itself as connected to the Complainant. The website made use of the Complainant's name, trademark, visual identity, and color scheme, and included a footer referring to "© DNV AS."

On December 2, 2025, the Complainant sent a cease-and-desist letter to the Respondent concerning the registration and use of the disputed domain names. No response was received prior to the filing of the Complaint.

At the time of the issuance of this Decision, the Panel notes that the disputed domain names no longer resolve to active websites.

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 names.

Notably, the Complainant contends that the disputed domain names are confusingly similar to its DNV trademark, in which it holds longstanding and worldwide rights predating the registration of the disputed domain names by several decades. According to the Complainant, the incorporation of the DNV trademark in its entirety, combined with the geographical term "Brazil," does not prevent a finding of confusing similarity, and the applicable generic Top-Level Domains are irrelevant for the purpose of the comparison.

The Complainant further contends that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain names. It asserts that it has not authorized the Respondent to use its DNV trademark in any manner, that the Respondent is not commonly known by the disputed domain names, and that there is no evidence of any bona fide offering of goods or services. The Complainant submits that the disputed domain names were used to host a website impersonating the Complainant, reproducing its trademark, visual identity, and corporate references without authorization, and without any accurate disclosure of the Respondent's identity or relationship to the Complainant.

Finally, the Complainant contends that the disputed domain names were registered and used in bad faith. It argues that, given the longstanding reputation and international recognition of the DNV trademark, the

Respondent was necessarily aware of the Complainant and its rights at the time of registration. According to the Complainant, the registration of the disputed domain names incorporating its trademark together with a geographical term, and their use to create a false impression of affiliation with the Complainant, demonstrate an intentional attempt to attract Internet users by creating a likelihood of confusion as to source, sponsorship, affiliation, or endorsement.

The Complainant also relies on the Respondent's failure to reply to its cease-and-desist letter as an additional indication of bad faith.

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 names. 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 names. Accordingly, the disputed domain names are confusingly similar to the mark for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 1.7.

The disputed domain names incorporate the Complainant's DNV trademark in its entirety, combined with the geographical term "Brazil." Where the relevant trademark is recognizable within the disputed domain names, as is the case here, the addition of other terms, whether descriptive or geographical, does not prevent a finding of confusing similarity under the first element of the Policy (see [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 1.8). The addition of such geographical terms does not dispel confusing similarity, as the Complainant's trademark remains clearly recognizable within the disputed domain names.

The Panel further notes that the entirety of the Complainant's DNV trademark is reproduced within each of the disputed domain names. Accordingly, the disputed domain names are confusingly similar to a trademark in which the Complainant has rights for the purposes of the Policy (see [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 1.7).

Consequently, the Panel finds that the first element of the Policy has been established.

B. Rights or Legitimate Interests

The Panel notes that there is no evidence that the Respondent has been commonly known by the disputed domain names. The Respondent is not affiliated with the Complainant or its business activities, and the Complainant has not licensed or otherwise authorized the Respondent to use its DNV trademark or to register domain names incorporating that trademark.

Further, the evidence on the record shows that, at least prior to the filing of the Complaint, the disputed domain names resolved to a website that reproduced the Complainant's trademark, visual identity, and corporate references, and presented itself as associated with the Complainant. Such use is indicative of impersonation or passing off and is not a bona fide offering of goods or services, nor a legitimate noncommercial or fair use of the disputed domain names.

Panels have consistently held that the use of a domain name for illegal or illegitimate activity, including impersonation or passing off, can never confer rights or legitimate interests on a respondent (see [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 2.13.1).

Accordingly, the Panel finds that the second element of the Policy has been established.

C. Registered and Used in Bad Faith

The Panel finds that the Complainant's DNV trademark was registered and widely used long before the registration of the disputed domain names on November 21, 2025. The Complainant has demonstrated that its trademark enjoys a longstanding and international reputation, including in Brazil, where the Respondent is located. In view of the distinctiveness and reputation of the DNV trademark, the Panel finds it implausible that the Respondent was unaware of the Complainant and its trademark rights at the time of registration of the disputed domain names.

The disputed domain names wholly incorporate the Complainant's DNV trademark together with the geographical term "Brazil," a combination that reinforces the false impression of an official or localized presence of the Complainant. Such composition of the disputed domain names supports a finding that they were deliberately chosen to target the Complainant and its trademark.

The record further shows that, prior to the filing of the Complaint, the disputed domain names were used to resolve to a website that reproduced the Complainant's trademark, visual identity, and corporate references, including a footer referring to "© DNV AS," and that failed to include any disclaimer clarifying the absence of an affiliation with the Complainant. The Panel finds that this conduct constitutes impersonation or passing off and demonstrates an intentional attempt to attract Internet users by creating a likelihood of confusion as to the source, sponsorship, affiliation, or endorsement of the website, within the meaning of paragraph 4(b)(iv) of the Policy.

The Panel also notes that the Respondent failed to reply to the Complainant's cease-and-desist letter dated December 2, 2025. While a respondent is under no obligation to respond to such correspondence, panels have considered a failure to do so, in the circumstances of a case, as a further indication of bad faith.

The Panel further observes that, at the time of this Decision, the disputed domain names no longer resolve to active websites. However, the passive holding of domain names incorporating a well-known trademark does not prevent a finding of bad faith, particularly where the circumstances of the case indicate that the disputed domain names were registered to target the Complainant.

In light of the foregoing, the Panel finds that the disputed domain names were registered and are being used in bad faith, and that the third element of the Policy has been established.

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 names <dnvbrazil.com>, <dnvbrazil.online>, and <dnvbrazil.store> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Elise Dufour/

Elise Dufour

Sole Panelist

Date: February, 6 2026