

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

Veolia Environnement SA v. Linda Trujillo
Case No. D2026-0834

1. The Parties

The Complainant is Veolia Environnement SA, France, represented by IP Twins, France.

The Respondent is Linda Trujillo, United States of America (“United States”).

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <veollia.info> is registered with Wild West Domains, LLC (the “Registrar”).

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the “Center”) on February 26, 2026. On February 26, 2026, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On February 26, 2026, 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 (Registration Private) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on February 27, 2026, 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 March 9, 2026.

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 March 11, 2026. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was March 31, 2026. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent’s default on April 7, 2026.

The Center appointed Ugur G. Yalçiner as the sole panelist in this matter on April 14, 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 a multinational company headquartered in France, operating globally in the fields of water, waste management, and energy services. With a presence in numerous countries, the Complainant is widely recognized as a leading provider of environmental solutions and ecological transformation services.

The Complainant is the owner of trademark registrations in various jurisdictions, some of which are listed below:

- International trademark VEOLIA with registration No. 814678, registered on September 11, 2003 in classes 1, 6, 9, 11, 17, 19, 32, 35, 36, 37, 39, 40, 41, and 42.
- International trademark VEOLIA with registration No. 919580, registered on March 10, 2006, designating, amongst others, the United States (where the Respondent resides) in classes 9, 11, 16, 35, 36, 37, 38, 39, 40, 41, and 42.
- International trademark VEOLIA with registration No. 910325, registered on March 10, 2006 in classes 9, 11, 16, 32, 35, 36, 37, 38, 39, 40, 41, 42, and 44.

The Complainant also owns the domain name <veolia.com> since December 30, 2002.

The disputed domain name was registered on January 13, 2026 and does not resolve to any active website. However, the record shows that the disputed domain name has been used in connection with a phishing scheme, whereby emails impersonating an employee of the Complainant were sent to third parties in an attempt to solicit fraudulent payments.

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. The Complaint includes the following contentions:

(i) Identical or Confusingly Similar

The Complainant contends that it is the holder of various trademark rights in VEOLIA, which is a well-known trademark protected worldwide, and that the disputed domain name incorporates the trademark VEOLIA in its entirety with the mere addition of the letter "I". The Complainant asserts that the addition of the generic Top-Level Domain ".info" does not prevent a finding of confusing similarity. Therefore, the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to a trademark in which the Complainant has rights.

(ii) Rights or legitimate interests

The Complainant states that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the disputed domain name, and that its trademark rights predate the registration of the disputed domain name. The Respondent is not affiliated with the Complainant, is not authorized or licensed to use the VEOLIA trademark, and is not commonly known by the disputed domain name.

The Complainant further states that the disputed domain name has been used for phishing activities, whereby emails were sent to a client of the Complainant for fraudulent “outstanding invoices” and were made to appear to come from the Complainant, for financial gain. The Complainant submits that such use cannot confer rights or legitimate interests.

(iii) Registration and Use in Bad Faith

The Complainant asserts that the disputed domain name was registered and is being used in bad faith. In light of the well-known nature of the VEOLIA trademark, it is implausible that the Respondent was unaware of the Complainant at the time of registration, as the disputed domain name reproduces the trademark VEOLIA with the mere addition of a letter.

The Complainant further argues that the disputed domain name has been used to conduct phishing activities by sending emails to third parties for financial gain. Therefore, the Respondent has registered and used the disputed domain name in bad faith.

B. Respondent

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

6. Discussion and Findings

In accordance with paragraph 4(a) of the Policy, the Complainant must prove that each of the three elements are present:

- (i) the disputed domain name registered by the Respondent is identical or confusingly similar to a trademark or service mark in which the Complainant has rights; and
- (ii) the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the disputed domain name; and
- (iii) the disputed domain name has been registered and is being used 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 a trademark for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.2.1. The Panel is satisfied that the Complainant is the owner of the trademark VEOLIA registered in several jurisdictions.

The disputed domain name incorporates the Complainant's trademark VEOLIA in its entirety, together with the additional letter "l". In this regard, the Panel considers that such addition constitutes a misspelling variation, which does not prevent a finding of confusing similarity, as the Complainant's VEOLIA trademark remains recognizable within the disputed domain name ([WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.9).

It is an accepted principle that TLDs, in this case ".info", are to be typically disregarded in the consideration of the issue of whether a domain name is identical or confusingly similar to a Complainant's trademark. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.11.1.

In the light of the above, the Panel finds that the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to the Complainant's registered trademark and that the requirements in paragraph 4(a)(i) of the Policy are fulfilled.

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 3.1](#), 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 notes that the Respondent does not have any registered trademarks or trade names, and that no license or authorization of any kind has been granted to the Respondent by the Complainant to use its trademark. On the contrary, as evidenced by the Complainant's assertions and supporting documents, the Respondent registered an email address in the name of an employee of the Complainant and used it to send emails to the Complainant's clients for fraudulent "outstanding invoices". The Respondent's use of the disputed domain name therefore does not support a finding of rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name on the part of the Respondent. (See [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 2.13.1, "Panels have categorically held that the use of a domain name for illegal activity (e.g., phishing/identity theft, , passing off, or other types of fraud) can never confer rights or legitimate interests on a respondent".)

As a result, the Panel finds that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name, and the requirements of paragraph 4(a)(ii) of the Policy are therefore fulfilled by the Complainant.

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 is satisfied with the relevant evidence submitted by the Complainant showing that it owns trademark rights in VEOLIA, which have been registered and used for many years prior to the registration of the disputed domain name.

The Panel considers that the Complainant's trademark is widely known in the water, waste and energy industries, as it has been recognized as such in UDRP decisions, namely *Veolia Environnement S.A. v. Hartford Vehicle*, WIPO Case No. [D2021-3821](#); *Veolia Environnement SA v. Mark Scotto Di Perta*, WIPO Case No. [DAU2023-0051](#); *Veolia Environnement SA v. WhoisGuard Protected / Greg Tapper*, WIPO Case No. [D2020-0531](#).

Several UDRP panels have held that the mere registration of a domain name that is identical or confusingly similar to a famous or widely-known trademark by an unaffiliated entity can by itself create a presumption of bad faith. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 3.1.4.

The Panel is of the opinion that it is not possible for the Respondent to have been unaware of the Complainant and its trademark at the time of registration of the disputed domain name, and that the Respondent's aim in registering the disputed domain name was to take unfair advantage of the Complainant's trademark, as the Respondent registered an email address using the name of an employee of the Complainant and used it to send emails impersonating that employee to third parties in an attempt to solicit fraudulent payments. Panels have held that the use of a domain name for purposes such as sending emails, phishing, or identity theft, rather than to host a website, constitutes bad faith ([WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 3.4). It has also been held in a similar case, *Veolia Environnement SA v. Whois Privacy Protection Foundation / Name Redacted*, WIPO Case No. [D2022-0785](#), that the use of domain names for the purpose of impersonating a complainant's employees as part of a fraudulent phishing scheme amounts to bad faith use. The Panel is convinced that the purpose of these activities was to mislead the clients of the Complainant for potential commercial gain.

Having considered all the facts in this case, the Panel finds that the Complainant has sustained its burden of proof in showing that the disputed domain name was registered and used in bad faith.

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 <veollia.info> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Ugur G. Yalçiner/

Ugur G. Yalçiner

Sole Panelist

Date: April 21, 2026