

## ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

Bureau Veritas Société Anonyme v. dsf dfs  
Case No. D2025-5206

### 1. The Parties

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

The Respondent is dsf dfs, Cambodia.

### 2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <bureauveritashk.com> is registered with Sav.com, LLC (the “Registrar”).

### 3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the “Center”) on December 12, 2025. On December 15, 2025, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On December 15, 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 (Unknown (redacted for privacy)) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on December 17, 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 18, 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 22, 2025. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was January 11, 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 27, 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 1828 trademark before the Department of Intellectual Property (Cambodia) with registration number 2774508, registered on January 18, 2008.

The disputed domain name was registered on December 2, 2025, and resolves to a pornographic website at the time of the filing the Complaint. Currently, the disputed domain name is inactive.

#### **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 and the addition of letters "hk" do not eliminate the reproduction of the mark. Indeed, says the Complainant since "hk" refers to the geographical term of "Hong Kong" this may lead the public to believe that the disputed domain name designates the Complainant's local website in Hong Kong, China.

The Complainant also asserts that the identity of the Respondent is fictitious and consists merely of a random string of letters, which does not provide any information regarding the Respondent's true identity or, address.

The Complainant refers to a similar UDRP decision *Bureau Veritas v. Sunny Chung, gingerkittyfriday*, WIPO Case No. [D2025-3045](#), where the domain name <bureauveritastaiwan.com> included Complainant's trademark together with a geographical name "taiwan", and a transfer to Complainant was ordered.

The Complainant contends that the Respondent was fully aware of the Complainant's rights and the reputation associated with its trademark and the mere reproduction of BUREAU VERITAS is clear evidence of such knowledge.

Besides, the Respondent is making unlawful and unfair use of the disputed domain name, with the intention of misleading Internet users to diverting traffic in terms depicted in paragraph 4(b)(iv) of the Policy.

##### **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 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, “hk” and acronym for “Hong Kong”, 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 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.

While the Policy in paragraph 4 (c) takes into consideration the three illustrative examples of Respondent rights, the Complainant has evidenced that none is met in this case. Arguably, the mere direction of the disputed domain name to a pornographic website, including the Complainant's trademark in its entirety, supports a finding of lack of rights or legitimate interests.

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 accepts Complainant's allegation that the circumstances of the case fit in paragraph 4 (b)(iv) of the Policy. That is to say, the Respondent intentionally attempted to attract, for commercial gain, Internet users by creating a likelihood of confusion with the complainant's mark. Indeed, by reproducing Complainant's trademark in the disputed domain name, the Respondent attracts Internet users to its website.

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 finds apparent that the Respondent knew about the Complainant and its trademarks at the moment of the registration of the disputed domain due to Complainant's BUREAU VERITAS distinctiveness and international recognition.

Panels have found that the non-use of a domain name would not prevent a finding of bad faith under the doctrine of passive holding. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 3.3. Having reviewed the available record, the Panel notes the distinctiveness and reputation of Complainant's trademark and, the composition of the disputed domain name. Accordingly, the Panel finds that in the circumstances of this case the current passive holding of the disputed domain name does not prevent a finding of bad faith under the Policy.

On balance, the Respondent's name "dsf dfs" does not appear to correspond to one of a human being. Accordingly, the Panel finds that the Whois records provide inaccurate data which would support the conclusion of bad faith registration and use by the Respondent. Further, resolving to a pornographic site is a way to tarnishing the Complainant. Thus, this is deemed to be in bad faith.

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 <bureauveritashk.com> be transferred to the Complainant.

*/Manuel Moreno-Torres/*

**Manuel Moreno-Torres**

Sole Panelist

Date: February 10, 2026