

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

Bureau Veritas v. Faisal Anwar
Case No. D2025-5302

1. The Parties

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

The Respondent is Faisal Anwar, Pakistan.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <bureauviritas.com> is registered with Spaceship, Inc. (the “Registrar”).

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the “Center”) on December 18, 2025. On December 19, 2025, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On December 19, 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, Privacy service provided by Withheld for Privacy ehf) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on December 22, 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 22, 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 30, 2025. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was January 19, 2026. The Respondent sent email communications to the Center on December 23, 2025, and December 30, 2025. The Center notified the Parties of the Commencement of Panel Appointment Process on January 21, 2026.

The Center appointed Andrea Mondini as the sole panelist in this matter on January 23, 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

Founded in 1828, the Complainant is a major provider of testing, inspection and certification services (TICS) with several subsidiaries. The Group employs over 82,000 people in more than 1,600 offices and laboratories worldwide.

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

European Union Trademark Registration No. 004518544, BUREAU VERITAS, filed on June 30, 2005, and registered on June 1, 2006, renewed on June 11, 2025, to designate services in classes 38 and 42; and European Union Trademark Registration No. 005927711, BUREAU VERITAS 1828 and design, filed on May 11, 2007, and registered on February 6, 2008, renewed on April 24, 2017, for services in class 42.

The disputed domain name was registered on May 22, 2025, and is currently redirected to the Complainant's official website at "www.group.bureauveritas.com".

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 the following:

The disputed domain name reproduces the verbal elements of the Complainant's trademark BUREAU VERITAS. The replacement of the letter "e" with an "i" in 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 perception by the public. Therefore, the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to the Complainant's trademarks and there is a clear risk of confusion.

The Respondent has never been authorized by the Complainant to register a domain name similar to its trademark registrations or company name. The Respondent is not commonly known by the disputed domain name and has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the disputed domain name.

The composition of the disputed domain name, comprising the Complainant's trademark with a misspelling, shows that the Respondent was aware of the Complainant's rights name when registering the disputed domain name.

The disputed domain name is currently redirected to the Complainant's official website. Such conduct does not indicate good faith. Instead, it confirms that the Respondent knew perfectly well the identity of the Complainant and its trademark rights. Panels have repeatedly held that redirecting a domain name incorporating another party's trademark to that party's official website is a strategy used to create an appearance of legitimacy, mask the Respondent's identity, and preserve the domain name for future abusive purposes. Such behavior serves only to appropriate the Complainant's identity and to establish technical control over a deceptive domain name, which can later be exploited for phishing, email fraud, or impersonation. The Respondent's behavior fits squarely within the circumstances described in paragraph

4(b)(iv) of the Policy, i.e. using a domain name to create a likelihood of confusion for commercial or fraudulent purposes.

B. Respondent

The Respondent did not submit a formal response. In his email communications to the Center of December 23, 2025, and December 30, 2025, the Respondent stated in essence that he does not claim any rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name. The Respondent further asserted that he did not register the disputed domain name for his own use, but as a “technical service provider” on behalf of an unidentified third-party client. The Respondent also consented to the transfer of the disputed domain name to the Complainant.

6. Discussion and Findings

The Panel notes that the Registrar-disclosed Respondent stated that he registered the disputed domain name in his capacity of a technical services provider only, on behalf of a third-party client, without disclosing that client’s identity or contact details. The Panel further notes that there is no evidence on the existence and nature of any relationship between the listed registrant and the alleged beneficial holder which would allow the Panel to consider that the beneficial holder should be treated as a Respondent. The Panel therefore considers that the Registrar-disclosed Respondent, Faisal Anwar, is the appropriate Respondent.

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. In his informal email communication to the Center, the Respondent has confirmed that he does not claim rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name.

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 when he registered the disputed domain name.

In accordance with section 3.1.4 of [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), the Panel considers that misspelling of the word "veritas" in the disputed domain name is an act of typosquatting, and under such circumstances, coupled with the redirection of the disputed domain name to the Complainant's official website constitute registration and use in bad faith.

Having reviewed the record, the Panel finds the Respondent's registration and use of the disputed domain name constitute 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 <bureauviritas.com> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Andrea Mondini/

Andrea Mondini

Sole Panelist

Date: January 28, 2026