

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

Accenture Global Services Limited v. Shi Lei
Case No. D2025-1605

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 Shi Lei, China.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <mypasswordlessaccenture.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 April 22, 2025. On April 22, 2025, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On April 23, 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 (Redacted for Privacy Purposes, Privacy service provided by Withheld for Privacy ehf) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on April 29, 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 May 1, 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 May 2, 2025. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was May 22, 2025. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent's default on May 23, 2025.

The Center appointed Áron László as the sole panelist in this matter on June 4, 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 is an international business that provides a broad range of services and solutions in strategy, consulting, digital technology and operations under the name “Accenture”. It is the owner of the ACCENTURE trademark and company name, as well as marks that incorporate the ACCENTURE term fully. The Complainant began using the ACCENTURE mark in connection with various services, including management consulting, technology services, and outsourcing services, on January 1, 2001. It now has offices and operations in more than 200 cities in 49 countries.

Since January 2001, the Complainant has extensively used, and continues to use, the ACCENTURE mark in connection with various services and specialties. These include management consulting and business process services, which cover various aspects of business operations, such as supply chain and logistics services, as well as technology and outsourcing services. Advertising expenditure in 2022 amounted to USD 94 million. In 2024, the Complainant ranked 31st in Interbrand’s Best Global Brands Report.

The Complainant holds registrations for the ACCENTURE and ACCENTURE & Design marks in over 140 jurisdictions. The Complainant owns over 1,000 registrations for the ACCENTURE and ACCENTURE & Design marks, as well as many other marks incorporating the ACCENTURE brand, for a variety of products and services, including management consulting, technology services, and outsourcing services.

The Complainant is the proprietor of several trademark registrations for ACCENTURE, including United States Trademark Registration No. 3091811 in Classes 9, 16, 35, 36, 37, 41, and 42, registered on May 16, 2006; and European Union Trademark No. 001925650 in Classes 9, 16, 35, 36, 37, 39, 41, and 42, registered on October 9, 2002.

The Complainant’s main website is available under <accenture.com>. The Complainant registered this domain name on August 29, 2000. The Complainant operates a gateway to its own internal site for its employees and authorized parties to arrange for passwordless authentication, which is available under <mypasswordless.accenture.com>.

The Respondent is an individual residing in China.

The disputed domain name was registered on April 23, 2024. At the time of this Decision, the disputed domain name leads to a website presenting pay-per-click links labelled “Access Management”, “Enterprise Passwordless Authentication”, “Static IP Service” and “Wholesale Cellphones from China”. At the time the Complaint was filed, different links were available, labelled such as “Account Login”, “Forgot Password”, and “Password Management”.

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 almost identical to, and therefore confusingly similar with, the famous ACCENTURE trademark owned by the Complainant. The disputed domain name comprises the ACCENTURE trademark alongside the descriptive terms “my” and “passwordless”, suggesting that it is intended to refer specifically to the Complainant’s own internal site

where employees and authorized parties can arrange passwordless authentication, which is available under <mypasswordless.accenture.com>.

As for the second element, the Complainant contends that the Respondent is not affiliated with them, nor has it been licensed or permitted to use their ACCENTURE marks or any domain name incorporating the marks. The Respondent's name is "Shi Lei". Therefore, the Respondent is not commonly known by the disputed domain name, nor was the Respondent known by that name prior to registering it. The Respondent is not making legitimate, noncommercial, or fair use of the disputed domain name. Rather, the disputed domain name redirects to a hosted website that promotes sponsored click-through links, which could mislead visitors into believing that they are password request or recovery services associated with the Complainant. The Respondent's activities under the disputed domain name also constitute passing off, as the Respondent is attempting to impersonate the Complainant by offering a resource associated with the Complainant.

Regarding the third element, given the Complainant's worldwide reputation and the ubiquitous presence of the ACCENTURE marks on the Internet, the Respondent was clearly aware of the ACCENTURE marks when registering the disputed domain name. The fact that the disputed domain name aligns with an Accenture internal resource for passwordless authentication suggests that the Respondent had actual knowledge of the Complainant and its trademark rights. Furthermore, the Respondent's use of the disputed domain name to redirect Internet users to commercial websites via misleading sponsored links constitutes bad faith. This indicates that the Respondent registered and is using the disputed domain name with the intention of attracting Internet users to their website for commercial gain, creating a likelihood of confusion with the Complainant's ACCENTURE trademark regarding the source, sponsorship, affiliation, or endorsement of the Respondent's website. Given the well-known status of the Complainant's ACCENTURE marks and the Complainant's ownership of the <accenture.com> domain name, it is highly plausible that the Respondent registered the disputed domain name in order to trade off the reputation and goodwill of the Complainant's marks.

B. Respondent

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

6. Discussion and Findings

Paragraph 15(a) of the Rules instructs this Panel to decide a complaint based on the statements and documents submitted in accordance with the Policy, the Rules and any rules and principles of law that it deems applicable. Paragraph 4(a) of the Policy requires that a complainant must prove each of the following three elements to obtain an order that a domain name should be cancelled or transferred:

- i. the domain name registered by the respondent is 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 domain name; and
- iii. the domain name has been registered and is being used in bad faith.

In view of the Respondent's failure to submit a Response, the Panel shall decide this administrative proceeding based on the Complainant's undisputed representations pursuant to paragraphs 5(f), 14(a), and 15(a) of the Rules and draw such inferences as it considers appropriate pursuant to paragraph 14(b) of the Rules.

The Panel may accept all reasonable allegations set forth in a complaint. However, the Panel may deny relief where a complaint wholly contains mere conclusory or unsubstantiated arguments. WIPO Overview of WIPO Panel Views on Selected UDRP Questions, Third Edition (["WIPO Overview 3.0"](#)), section 4.3.

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 with the mark for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 1.7.

Although the addition of other terms here, "my" and "passwordless", 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 3.0](#), section 1.8.

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 Respondent's name is "Shi Lei". Therefore, the Respondent is not commonly known by the disputed domain name. The Respondent has not demonstrated any legitimate noncommercial or fair use of the disputed domain name.

The disputed domain name is almost identical to <mypasswordless.accenture.com> that the Complainant actually uses. Therefore, the composition of the disputed domain name carries a risk of implied affiliation because Internet users could be misled into believing that the disputed domain name may be associated with the Complainant. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 2.5.1.

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.

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.

Having reviewed the record, the Panel finds the Respondent's registration and use of the disputed domain name constitutes bad faith under the Policy.

Given the Complainant's global reputation, the Panel believes that the Respondent must have been aware of the ACCENTURE trademarks when registering the disputed domain name. Furthermore, the fact that the disputed domain name is almost identical to the domain name <mypasswordless.accenture.com> used by the Complainant for passwordless authentication for its employees and authorized parties, suggests to the Panel that the Respondent was aware of the Complainant and its trademark rights. This suggests that the Respondent registered and is using the disputed domain name with the intention of attracting Internet users to their own website with pay-per-click links for commercial gain, thereby creating a likelihood of confusion with the Complainant's ACCENTURE trademark with regard to the source, sponsorship, affiliation or endorsement of the website in question. Given the well-known status of the ACCENTURE marks owned by the Complainant and its ownership of the <accenture.com> and <mypasswordless.accenture.com> domain names, it is highly plausible that the Respondent registered the disputed domain name to trade off the reputation and goodwill of these marks.

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 <mypasswordlessaccenture.com> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Áron László/

Áron László

Sole Panelist

Date: June 17, 2025