

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

Amdocs Development Ltd., Amdocs Software Systems Ltd., Amdocs
Software Solutions LLC v. Pravin Chavan
Case No. D2024-5159

1. The Parties

The Complainants are Amdocs Development Ltd., Cyprus, Amdocs Software Systems Ltd., Ireland, and Amdocs Software Solutions LLC, Hungary, represented by Liad Whatstein & Co., Israel.

The Respondent is Pravin Chavan, India.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <amdocscareer.com> (the “Domain Name”) is registered with GoDaddy.com, LLC (the “Registrar”).

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the “Center”) on December 16, 2024. On December 16, 2024, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the Domain Name. On December 16, 2024, the Registrar transmitted by email to the Center its verification response disclosing registrant and contact information for the Domain Name which differed from the named Respondent (Domains By Proxy, LLC) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainants on December 17, 2024, providing the registrant and contact information disclosed by the Registrar, and inviting the Complainant to submit an amendment to the Complaint. The Complainants filed an amended Complaint on December 22, 2024.

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 23, 2024. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was January 12, 2025. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent’s default on January 13, 2025.

The Center appointed Ian Lowe as the sole panelist in this matter on January 16, 2025. 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 named Complainants (referred to as the “Complainant”) are all members of the Amdocs group of companies, which develops and markets software solutions in various fields. The Complainant employs approximately 25,000 employees worldwide and serves the leading players in the communications and media industries, spanning 85 countries. The Complainant provides a cloud-native, open and dynamic portfolio of digital solutions, platforms and services to meet the evolving needs of its customers as they drive growth, transform and take their business to the cloud. The Complainant is listed on the NASDAQ Global Select Market and had a market capitalization of USD 10.27 billion at the end of year 2023. It promotes its products and services on its website at “www.amdocs.com”.

The Complainant is the proprietor of a substantial number of registered trademarks comprising AMDOCS, including Israel trademark number 134226 AMDOCS registered on January 3, 2001; International trademark number 1302596 AMDOCS registered on April 11, 2016, designating India and other countries; and European Union trademark number 015184252 AMDOCS registered on July 13, 2016.

The Domain Name was registered on November 13, 2024. It resolves to the Careers page of the Complainant’s website at “www.amdocs.com/careers/home”.

5. Parties’ Contentions

A. Complainant

The Complainant contends that the Domain Name is confusingly similar to its AMDOCS trademark, that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the Domain Name, and that the Respondent registered and is using the Domain Name in bad faith within the meaning of paragraph 4(b)(iv) of the Policy.

B. Respondent

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

6. Discussion and Findings

For this Complaint to succeed in relation to the Domain Name the Complainant must prove that:

- (i) the Domain Name 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 Domain Name; and
- (iii) the 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 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 and the Domain Name comprises the entirety of the Complainant's AMDOCS mark (the "Mark") with the addition of the word "career". In the Panel's view, this addition does not prevent a finding of confusing similarity between the Domain Name and the Mark.

The Panel finds that 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. Accordingly, 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.

The Domain Name is not being used for an independent, active website but to resolve to the Careers webpage of the Complainant's website. In the Panel's view, it is difficult to conceive a legitimate purpose for registering a domain name comprising the Complainant's Mark with the addition of the word "career" or any possible justification for the Respondent having registered the Domain Name.

Having reviewed the available evidence, the Panel finds that the Complainant has established a prima facie case that the Respondent lacks rights or legitimate interests in the 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 Domain Name such as those enumerated in the Policy or otherwise.

The Panel finds the second element of the Policy has been established.

C. Registered and Used in Bad Faith

In light of the nature of the Domain Name, and its resolving to a webpage of the Complainant's website, the Panel is in no doubt that the Respondent had the Complainant and its rights in the Mark in mind when it registered the Domain Name. 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 inference that the Panel draws from the registration of a Domain Name comprising the entirety of the Mark, with the addition of the word "career", and the forwarding of the Domain Name to the Careers webpage of the Complainant's website, is that the Respondent intends Internet users to believe that the Domain Name is being operated by the Complainant and intends to lend legitimacy to the Domain Name. Such actions have been a precursor in the past for emails to be sent to prospective or hopeful applicants for employment with entities like the Complainant, using an email address intended to appear to be a legitimate email address of the target company, with a view to phishing for personal information or other, unlawful, activity. Using a domain name in connection with unlawful or fraudulent activities is manifestly considered evidence of bad faith; see [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 3.4.

In any event, the obvious inference is that the Respondent has registered and used the Domain Name to deceive Internet users into believing that the Domain Name is operated or authorized by the Complainant, and to attract Internet users by creating a likelihood of confusion with the Mark, for commercial gain.

Accordingly, the Panel finds that the Domain Name has been registered and is being used 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 Domain Name <amdocscareer.com> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Ian Lowe/

Ian Lowe

Sole Panelist

Date: January 30, 2025