

## **ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION**

Sopra Steria Group v. Zarifa Wazhi, Mocodajnia Dana Lenarczyk  
Case No. D2026-0604

### **1. The Parties**

The Complainant is Sopra Steria Group, France, represented by Fidal, France.

The Respondent is Zarifa Wazhi, Mocodajnia Dana Lenarczyk, Poland.

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

The disputed domain name <soprasteria-career.com> is registered with Metaregistrar BV (the “Registrar”).

### **3. Procedural History**

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the “Center”) on February 12, 2026. On February 13, 2026, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On February 16, 2026, 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 February 20, 2026. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was March 12, 2026. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent’s default on March 16, 2026.

The Center appointed Petra Pecar as the sole panelist in this matter on March 19, 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 Sopra Steria Group (hereinafter “the Complainant”), a French company founded in 1968, specializing in IT consulting, digital services and software development.

The Complainant is the owner of numerous registered marks protecting the terms SOPRA, STERIA, and SOPRA STERIA, including the following:

- European Union figurative mark Reg. No. 013623889 for  , registered on May 15, 2015, in classes 9, 16, 35, 36, 38, 41, 42, and 45;
- European Union word mark Reg. No. 003233335 for SOPRA, registered on February 3, 2005, in classes 9, 16, 35, 38, 41, and 42; and
- European Union word mark Reg. No. 003803061 for STERIA, registered on September 26, 2005, in classes 9, 38, and 42.

The Complainant operates numerous domain names, including <soprasteria.com> and <soprasteria.fr>, and uses subdomains <careers.soprasteria.com> and <careers.soprasteria.fr> for its recruitment activities.

The disputed domain name was registered on December 1, 2025 and at the time of the Complaint filing, it resolved to an inactive webpage.

The Respondent is located in Poland.

#### 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 <soprasteria-career.com> is confusingly similar to its SOPRA STERIA, SOPRA, and STERIA marks, as it wholly incorporates these marks with the addition of the descriptive term “career”. The Complainant further argues that the disputed domain name follows the structure of its own domain names and reproduces the distinctive element of its company name, thereby increasing the likelihood of confusion among Internet users.

The Complainant argues that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name, as it has not been authorized to use the Complainant's SOPRA STERIA, SOPRA, or STERIA marks and is not affiliated with the Complainant. The disputed domain name reproduces the Complainant's marks and follows its domain name structure without permission. Furthermore, the disputed domain name is inactive and does not support any bona fide offering of goods or services, but instead creates a likelihood of confusion with the Complainant's activities.

The Complainant states that the disputed domain name was registered and is being used in bad faith, as the Respondent was aware of the Complainant's prior rights at the time of registration and deliberately targeted its SOPRA STERIA, SOPRA, and STERIA marks. The Complainant further submits that the registration occurred after the Complainant had established its rights and that the passive holding of the disputed domain name, the absence of any evidence of actual or contemplated good faith use, and the Respondent's use of anonymized details indicate conduct consistent with bad faith. The Complainant also contends that the disputed domain name mirrors the structure of its official recruitment platforms, including <careers.soprasteria.com> and <careers.soprasteria.fr>, thereby increasing the likelihood of confusion as to source, sponsorship, affiliation, or endorsement.

## **B. Respondent**

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

## **6. Discussion and Findings**

Even if the Respondent did not file a Response to the Complainant's contentions, the Panel shall consider the issues present in the case based on the statements and documents submitted by the Complainant. "A Panel shall decide a complaint on the basis of the statements and documents submitted and in accordance with the Policy, these Rules and any rules and principles of law that it deems applicable", as indicated in paragraph 15(a) of the Rules.

Under paragraph 4(a) of the Policy, the Complainant is required to prove each of the following three elements:

- (i) the disputed domain names are 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 names; and
- (iii) the disputed domain names have been registered and are being used by the Respondent in bad faith.

### **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 Select UDRP Questions ("[WIPO Overview 3.1](#)"), section 1.7.

The Complainant has shown rights in respect of SOPRA STERIA mark for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), 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 SOPRA STERIA mark for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.7.

Although the addition of a hyphen and term "career" may bear on assessment of the second and third elements, the Panel finds the addition of such terms does not prevent a finding of confusing similarity between the disputed domain name and the mark for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.8.

Furthermore, it is well accepted practice by UDRP panels that a generic Top-Level Domain ("gTLD"), such as ".com", is typically ignored when assessing whether a domain name is identical or confusingly similar to a trademark (see section 1.11.1 of the [WIPO Overview 3.1](#)). For that reason, the Panel accepts not to take into consideration the gTLD ".com" when assessing confusing similarity of the disputed domain name.

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 that 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 3.1](#), 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.

The Panel considers that the composition of the disputed domain name carries a risk of implied affiliation with the Complainant. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 2.5.1. According to the Complainant, the Respondent is not affiliated with or connected to the Complainant in any way, and the Complainant has not granted the Respondent any license or authorization to use or register a domain name incorporating the SOPRA STERIA mark. The Respondent has failed to respond to the Complaint and has therefore provided no evidence of any rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name.

There is no indication that the Respondent has used, or made demonstrable preparations to use, the disputed domain name in connection with a bona fide offering of goods or services, that it has been commonly known by the disputed domain name, or that it is making any legitimate noncommercial or fair use of it.

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’s disputed domain name consists of the SOPRA STERIA mark, followed by a hyphen, the additional term “career”, and the gTLD “.com”. The Panel finds that the incorporation of the Complainant’s SOPRA STERIA mark in its entirety within the disputed domain name indicates that the Respondent was aware of the Complainant and its SOPRA STERIA mark at the time of registration, as a simple or quick Internet search would have revealed the existence of the Complainant and its registered mark rights. The Panel further notes that the structure of the disputed domain name imitates the Complainant’s naming conventions for its domain names, thereby reinforcing the likelihood that the Respondent deliberately sought to create an appearance of affiliation.

Regarding bad faith at the time of registration, the Panel finds that the Respondent was aware of the Complainant’s rights in the SOPRA STERIA mark when the disputed domain name was registered, given the long-standing and distinctive nature of the SOPRA STERIA mark, its complete incorporation into the disputed domain name without any additional distinguishing element, and the fact that such a precise match is unlikely to be accidental.

The disputed domain name was designed to create a misleading association with the Complainant and its activities, with the Complainant’s SOPRA STERIA mark predating the registration of the disputed domain name by approximately ten years. Consequently, the Panel concludes that the disputed domain name was registered in bad faith.

Panels have found that the non-use of a domain name, including an error webpage, would not by itself prevent a finding of bad faith under the doctrine of passive holding. To the contrary, in looking at the totality of circumstances in each case, panels have found that the registration and non-use of a domain name can still constitute bad faith for purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 3.3. Having reviewed the available record, the Panel notes the distinctiveness of the Complainant's trademark, and the composition of the disputed domain name, and finds that in the circumstances of this case, the passive holding of the disputed domain name does not prevent a finding of bad faith under the Policy.

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 <soprasteria-career.com> be transferred to the Complainant.

*/Petra Pecar/*

**Petra Pecar**

Sole Panelist

Date: April 2, 2026