

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

Accenture Global Services Limited v. Elvis Igiemeh

Case No. D2025-1316

1. The Parties

The Complainant is Accenture Global Services Limited, Ireland, represented by McDermott Will & Emery LLP, United States of America (“United States”).

The Respondent is Elvis Igiemeh, Nigeria.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <accenturedepartment.com> is registered with PDR Ltd. d/b/a PublicDomainRegistry.com (the “Registrar”).

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the “Center”) on April 1, 2025. On April 1, 2025, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On April 2, 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 (Unidentified Registrant of AccentureDepartment.com) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on April 2, 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 April 4, 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 April 8, 2025. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was April 28, 2025. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent’s default on April 29, 2025.

The Center appointed Gökhan Gökçe as the sole panelist in this matter on May 8, 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 Complainant, Accenture Global Services Limited, is a global multinational professional service company headquartered in Dublin, Ireland, that specializes in information technology, outsourcing services and management consulting. The Complainant has offices and operations in more than 200 cities in 49 countries.

The Complainant provides evidence that it owns a large international portfolio of trademark registrations for the word ACCENTURE and for the stylized word ACCENTURE. These registrations include:

- United States trademark registration No. 3,091,811 ACCENTURE (word) for goods and services in classes 9, 16, 35, 36, 37, 41 and 42, registered on May 16, 2006;
- United States trademark registration No. 3,340,780 ACCENTURE (combined) for goods in classes 16, 18, 21, 24 and 28, registered on November 20, 2007;
- United States trademark registration No. 2,884,125 ACCENTURE (combined) for goods in classes 18, 25 and 28, registered on September 14, 2004;
- United States trademark registration No. 2,665,373  for goods in classes 35, 36, 41 and 42, registered on December 24, 2002.

The Complainant is also the registrant of the domain name <accenture.com> since 2000.

The disputed domain name was registered on March 24, 2025, and at the time the Complaint was filed and at the date of this Decision resolved to an active website which displays a version of the Complainant's logo, copyright notice with the Complainant's name, and a "dashboard" inviting a visitor to input login information, or to input their email address to reset a password.

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 is confusingly similar to its trademarks;
- the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the disputed domain name;
- the Respondent has registered and is using the disputed domain names in bad faith.

B. Respondent

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

6. Discussion and Findings

According to paragraph 15(a) of the Rules, the Panel shall decide the Complaint on the basis of the statements and documents submitted and in accordance with the Policy, the Rules and any rules and principles of law that it deems applicable.

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

- (i) the disputed domain name is identical or confusingly similar to a trademark 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 has been registered and is being used in bad faith.

Paragraph 4(a) of the Policy states that the Complainant bears the burden of proving that all these requirements are fulfilled, even if the Respondent has not replied to the Complainant's contentions. *Stanworth Development Limited v. E Net Marketing Ltd.*, WIPO Case No. [D2007-1228](#).

However, concerning the uncontested information provided by the Complainant, the Panel may, where relevant, accept the reasonable factual allegations provided in the Complaint as true. See section 4.3 of the WIPO Overview of WIPO Panel Views on Selected UDRP Questions, Third Edition ("[WIPO Overview 3.0](#)").

For the evaluation of this case, the Panel has taken note of the [WIPO Overview 3.0](#) and, where appropriate, will decide consistently with the consensus views stated therein.

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 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 term here, "department", 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.

Lastly, the addition of the generic Top-Level Domain ("gTLD") ".com" to the disputed domain name has no relevance for the first element confusing similarity test. Therefore, the Panel finds the addition of the gTLD does not prevent a finding of confusing similarity between the disputed domain name and the trademark for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 1.11.1.

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.

The Panel notes that:

- (i) First of all, the Respondent has not submitted any response and has not claimed any rights or legitimate interests with respect to the disputed domain name.
- (ii) The Complainant’s trademark is globally recognized and has acquired distinctiveness through extensive use. There is no evidence that the Respondent has been commonly known by the disputed domain name, nor that it has received any license or authorization to use the Complainant’s trademark. The disputed domain name resolves to a website that prominently displays the Complainant’s logo, a copyright notice in the Complainant’s name, and a dashboard soliciting login credentials or password reset information.
- (iii) The Panel notes the composition of the disputed domain name which carries a risk of implied affiliation with the Complainant. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 2.5.1.
- (iv) The Respondent’s registration of the disputed domain name on March 24, 2025 was significantly later than the Complainant’s registration of its trademarks. Prior to the Respondent’s registration of the disputed domain name, the Complainant’s trademarks had enjoyed certain fame and reputation.

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 must have been aware of the Complainant’s trademark as the disputed domain name was registered more than 20 years after the registration of the Complainant’s trademark. Additionally, The Complainant’s trademark is globally recognized, with longstanding registrations in numerous jurisdictions. Given the fame and widespread use of the ACCENTURE trademark and considering that the website resolving from the disputed domain name reproduces the Complainant’s name and logo and presents itself as a login portal affiliated with the Complainant, it is evident that the Respondent was aware of the Complainant and its rights in the ACCENTURE trademark at the time of registration.

In view of the fame of the Complainant’s trademark, the Complainant’s ownership of the domain <accenture.com>, and the use to which the disputed domain name has been put, the Panel finds that the Respondent’s choice of domain name was opportunistic.

In the present case, the Panel notes that the disputed domain name which reproduces the ACCENTURE trademark with the mere addition of the generic term “department”, combined with the gTLD “.com”, falsely suggests that Internet users will find a website affiliated with the Complainant and proposing employment related or internal corporate services, such as HR or recruitment support. The Respondent has sought to create a misleading impression of association with the Complainant, which is a famous company in the consulting field, when registering the disputed 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 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 <accenturedepartment.com> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Gökhan Gökçe/

Gökhan Gökçe

Sole Panelist

Date: May 16, 2025.