

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

Bureau Veritas v. Rana Abrar, Falmc
Case No. D2025-1862

1. The Parties

Complainant is Bureau Veritas, France, represented by Dennemeyer & Associates SAS, France.

Respondent is Rana Abrar, Falmc, Saudi Arabia.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <bureauveritas-sa.com> is registered with Netregistry Wholesale Pty Ltd (the “Registrar”).

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the “Center”) on May 9, 2025. On May 12, 2025, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On May 14, 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 (unknown) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to Complainant on May 16, 2025, providing the registrant and contact information disclosed by the Registrar, and inviting Complainant to submit an amendment to the Complaint. Complainant filed an amended Complaint on May 19, 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 Respondent of the Complaint, and the proceedings commenced on May 20, 2025. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was June 9, 2025. Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified Respondent’s default on June 10, 2025.

The Center appointed Scott R. Austin as the sole panelist in this matter on June 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

Without contest by Respondent, Complainant asserts in its Complaint and its Annexes attached provide evidence sufficient to support that:

Founded in 1828, Complainant provides testing, inspection and certification services under the trademark BUREAU VERITAS (the "BUREAU VERITAS Mark"), employing over 82,000 people in more than 1,600 offices and laboratories worldwide.

Complainant claims statutory trademark rights through a number of registrations for the BUREAU VERITAS Mark around the world for a range of products and services, including the following:

The European Union Trademark Registration No. 004518544, BUREAU VERITAS, registered on June 1, 2006 for a range of services in International Classes 38 and 42.

The Saudi Arabia Trademark Registration No. 142808310, registered on January 23, 2010 for services in International Class 42.

The European Union Trademark Registration No. 005927711, BUREAU VERITAS, registered on February 6, 2008 for a range of services in International Class 42.

The European Union Trademark Registration No. 007282651, BUREAU VERITAS, registered on April 16, 2009 for a range of services in International Classes 9, and 35 to 42.

Complainant also shows it wholly incorporates the BUREAU VERITAS Mark into a number of official registered country code domain names ("ccTLD") and generic Top Level Domain names ("gTLD") including the domain name providing access its primary corporate website, "www.group.bureauveritas.com/fr/group" (the "Official BUREAU VERITAS Mark Website"), as are the domain names used to access its national websites, such as <bureauveritas.fr>, <bureauveritas.de> and <bureauveritas.jp>. All of the Complainant's worldwide websites can be accessed at "www.bureauveritas.fr/place-locator" which shows the locations of its offices and laboratories around the world and demonstrates the worldwide recognition and use of its BUREAU VERITAS Mark

Respondent registered the disputed domain name on April 20, 2025, and initially the disputed domain name redirected users to a website "www.falmco.com" which provided content for large engineering and construction related products and services not directly related to Complainant's website content and testing, inspection and certification services, but the disputed domain name currently resolves to an inactive website.

5. Parties' Contentions

A. Complainant

Complainant contends that it has satisfied each of the elements required under the Policy for a transfer of the disputed domain name. Complainant contends that the disputed domain name is identical or confusingly similar to Complainant's BUREAU VERITAS Mark, that Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the disputed domain name, and that the disputed domain name was registered and is being used in bad faith. Notably, Complainant contends its is widely recognized and well known based on its use for its office and laboratory locations around the world as clearly identified on the Official BUREAU VERITAS Mark Website. Complainant further contends that Respondent's configuration of the disputed domain name by

adding “sa” to the BUREAU VERITAS Mark supports targeting as grounds for bad faith registration and use and is likely to increase consumer confusion because “sa” is a common abbreviation for the legal form of Complainant’s business entity, organized in France as a “société anonyme” (public limited company).

B. Respondent

Respondent did not reply to Complainant’s contentions.

6. Discussion and Findings

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

The onus is on Complainant to make out its case and it is apparent from the terms of the Policy that Complainant must show that all three elements set out in paragraph 4(a) of the Policy have been established before any order can be made to transfer a domain name. As the proceedings are administrative, the standard of proof under the Policy is often expressed as the “balance of the probabilities” or “preponderance of the evidence” standard. Under this standard, an asserting party needs to establish that it is more likely than not that the claimed fact is true. WIPO Overview of WIPO Panel Views on Selected UDRP Questions, Third Edition (“[WIPO Overview 3.0](#)”), section 4.2.

Thus, for Complainant to succeed it must prove within the meaning of paragraph 4(a) of the Policy and on the balance of the probabilities that:

- (i) the disputed domain name is identical or confusingly similar to a trademark or service mark in which Complainant has rights; and
- (ii) 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.

The Panel finds that Complainant has met its burden in all three elements of the Policy and will deal with each of these elements in more detail below.

A. Identical or Confusingly Similar

To prove this element, Complainant must have trade or service mark rights, and the disputed domain name must be identical or confusingly similar to Complainant’s trade or service mark.

Ownership of a trademark registration is generally sufficient evidence that a complainant has the requisite rights in a mark for purposes of paragraph 4(a)(i) of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 1.2.1. Moreover, “[n]oting in particular the global nature of the Internet and Domain Name System, the jurisdiction(s) where the trademark is valid is not considered relevant to panel assessment under the first element. [...] the filing/priority date, date of registration, and date of claimed first use, are not considered relevant to the first element test. These factors may however bear on a panel’s further substantive determination under the second and third elements”. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 1.1.2.

Based upon the trademark registrations cited by Complainant, as well as supporting documents, the Panel finds that Complainant has established trademark rights in and to its BUREAU VERITAS Mark.

Having met its burden for established trademark rights in the BUREAU VERITAS Mark, Complainant next contends that the disputed domain name is identical or confusingly similar to Complainant’s BUREAU VERITAS Mark because the dominant part of the disputed domain name comprises the terms “BUREAU

VERITAS”, identical to the BUREAU VERITAS Mark, as well as the predominant portion of the domain name registered by Complainant to access as its Official BUREAU VERITAS Mark Website and identical to the second level of each of the official domain names used to access its national websites, e.g., <bureauveritas.fr>, <bureauveritas.de> and <bureauveritas.jp>.

[WIPO Overview 3.0](#) Section 1.7 provides: “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.”

Prior UDRP panels have held the fact that a domain name wholly incorporates a complainant’s registered mark is sufficient to establish identity or confusing similarity for purposes of the Policy despite the addition of other words to such marks. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 1.8 (“Where the relevant trademark is recognizable within the disputed domain name, the addition of other terms (whether descriptive, geographical, pejorative, meaningless, or otherwise) would not prevent a finding of confusing similarity under the first element”); see also *BNP Paribas v. Ronan Laster*, WIPO Case No. [D2017-2167](#); *Compagnie Gervais Danone v. DomainPark Limited*, WIPO Case No. [D2008-0587](#); and *Oki Data Americas, Inc. v. ASD, Inc.*, WIPO Case No. [D2001-0903](#).

The disputed domain name incorporates Complainant’s BUREAU VERITAS Mark in its entirety and with a hyphen attaches the letters “sa” a common abbreviation for the French business entity “société anonyme”. Respondent’s appending this term to Complainant’s BUREAU VERITAS Mark does not prevent a finding of confusing similarity for the reasons stated in the UDRP decisions cited above. The addition of the gTLD, “.com” in this case, is viewed as a standard registration requirement and as such is disregarded under the first element confusing similarity test. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 1.11; see also *Research in Motion Limited v. thamer Ahmed Alfarshooti*, WIPO Case No. [D2012-1146](#).

Complainant’s BUREAU VERITAS Mark remains fully recognizable as incorporated in its entirety into the disputed domain name. Accordingly, the Panel finds the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to the BUREAU VERITAS Mark in which Complainant has rights and Complainant has thus satisfied its burden under paragraph 4(a)(i) of the Policy.

B. Rights or Legitimate Interests

Paragraph 4(c) of the Policy provides a list of circumstances in which 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 perplexing 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. See also, *Malayan Banking Berhad v. Beauty, Success & Truth International*, WIPO Case No. [D2008-1393](#). Respondent here has failed to appear to present any evidence of its rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name.

The Panel finds that Complainant has established a prima facie case that Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name.

First, Complainant contends that it is not aware of any relationship between it and Respondent that would give rise to any license, permission, or authorization given by Complainant to Respondent, to use the BUREAU VERITAS Mark in the disputed domain name or otherwise. Complainant also asserts and the Whois record submitted in the Annex to the Complaint supports, Respondent appears to be trading under the name “Rana Abrar, Falmc” which does not resemble the disputed domain name or Complainant’s mark in any manner.

The Panel finds that Respondent has neither any connection with Complainant, nor has Respondent been authorized or licensed by Complainant to use and register the BUREAU VERITAS Mark or to register any domain name incorporating Complainant’s BUREAU VERITAS Mark.

Prior UDRP panels under the Policy have found that “[i]n the absence of any license or permission from Complainant to use its trademark, no actual or contemplated bona fide or legitimate use of the disputed domain name could reasonably be claimed”. See *Sportswear Company S.P.A. v. Tang Hong*, WIPO Case No. [D2014-1875](#).

Paragraph 4(a)(ii) of the Policy also directs an examination of the facts to determine whether a respondent has rights or legitimate interests in a domain name. Paragraph 4(c) lists a number of ways in which a respondent may demonstrate that it does have such rights or legitimate interests.

Complainant contends Respondent is not commonly known by the disputed domain name or the BUREAU VERITAS Mark, in accordance with paragraph 4(c)(ii) of the Policy. The Panel finds upon review of the Whois record and evidence submitted by Complainant that Respondent Rana Abrar, Falmc, is not commonly known by the disputed domain name.

Complainant next contends that Respondent is not using the disputed domain name in connection with a legitimate noncommercial or fair use of the disputed domain name anticipated under paragraph 4(c)(iii) of the Policy, but has intentionally chosen a domain name based on a well-known registered trademark in order to generate traffic and income, initially as of the filing of the Complaint, through a website featuring products and services for “Skilled manpower”, “Heavy lifting and Rigging” “Equipment Rental” with digital images of large civil engineering projects, not related to Complainant in any way. The Panel notes that the record of evidence submitted in the Annex to the Complaint supports Complainant’s argument that Respondent is juxtaposing Complainant’s widely recognized BUREAU VERITAS Mark for testing, inspection and certification services with a website created by Respondent to create a false association with Complainant, by which Respondent likely earns income or is being used to phish personal or financial information from Complainants customers or prospective customers.

Previous UDRP panels have held that “a respondent’s use of a domain name will not be considered ‘fair’ if it falsely suggests affiliation with the trademark owner; the correlation between a domain name and the complainant’s mark is often central to this inquiry”. Here, the disputed domain name combines the widely recognized BUREAU VERITAS Mark with terms descriptive of the Complainant’s form of business entity, namely, “sa”, and uses such risk of implied affiliation to mislead Internet users expecting to find the Complainant and instead are directed to a website featuring Respondent’s business as a pretext for Respondent’s commercial gain. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), sections 2.5.1 and 2.5.3.

In view of the above, the Panel finds that Complainant has made out a prima facie case that Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name. Respondent has not submitted any argument or evidence to rebut Complainant’s prima facie case. The Panel determines, therefore, that Respondent does not have rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name and that Complainant has satisfied the requirements of paragraph 4(a)(ii) of the Policy.

C. Registered and Used in Bad Faith

Whether a domain name is registered and used in bad faith for purposes of the Policy may be determined by evaluating four (non-exhaustive) factors set forth in the Policy, paragraph 4(b):

- (i) circumstances indicating that the respondent has registered or the respondent has acquired the domain name primarily for the purpose of selling, renting, or otherwise transferring the domain name registrations to complainant who is the owner of the trademark or service mark or to a competitor of that complainant, for valuable consideration in excess of the respondent's documented out-of-pocket costs directly related to the domain name; or
- (ii) the respondent has registered the domain name in order to prevent the owner of the trademark or service mark from reflecting the mark in corresponding domain name, provided that the respondent has engaged in a pattern of such conduct; or
- (iii) the respondent has registered the domain name primarily for the purpose of disrupting the business of a competitor; or
- (iv) by using the disputed domain name, the respondent has intentionally attempted to attract, for commercial gain, Internet users to the respondent's website or other online location, by creating a likelihood of confusion with complainant's mark as to the source, sponsorship, affiliation, or endorsement of the respondent's website or location or of a product or service on the respondent's website or location.

The Panel finds that Respondent has registered and used the disputed domain name in bad faith for at least the following reasons.

First, Complainant contends and has provided persuasive support that Respondent registered the disputed domain name fully aware of Complainant's rights, because the submitted record shows the registration date of the disputed domain name is subsequent to when Complainant registered the BUREAU VERITAS Mark, by decades, and including in Saudi Arabia, where Respondent purportedly resides, therefore, Respondent cannot claim to have been using the BUREAU VERITAS Mark, without being aware of Complainant's rights to it. Complainant's evidence in support of its allegations is sufficient for the Panel to agree that Respondent could not plausibly argue that it did not have knowledge of Complainant's world renowned BUREAU VERITAS Mark, registered in the United States since 2010, when Respondent registered the disputed domain name decades later in April 2025.

The Panel also finds based on Complainant's website showing office location evidence submitted it is highly unlikely that a respondent would not have had awareness of complainant's rights given Complainant's recognition worldwide.

The Panel finds that given the more than a decade of prior use of Complainant's BUREAU VERITAS Mark prior to Respondent's registration of the disputed domain name, the worldwide recognition of the BUREAU VERITAS Mark, and Respondent's addition of "sa", the French business descriptor equivalent of adding "inc." in the disputed domain name targeting Complainant's BUREAU VERITAS Mark, Respondent registered the disputed domain name with actual knowledge of Complainant's BUREAU VERITAS Mark in bad faith. See *Royds Withy King LLP v. Help Tobuy*, WIPO Case No. [D2019-0624](#). See [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 3.2.2; see, e.g., *eBay Inc. v. Sunho Hong*, WIPO Case No. [D2000-1633](#) (actual knowledge of Complainant's rights in its trademarks a factor supporting bad faith).

Moreover, the UDRP panel in *Intel Corporation v. The Pentium Group*, WIPO Case No. [D2009-0273](#), stated that, "[t]he incorporation of a well-known trademark into a domain name by a registrant having no plausible explanation for doing so may be, in and of itself, an indication of bad faith". See also *Veuve Clicquot Ponsardin, Maison Fondée en 1772 v. The Polygenix Group Co.*, WIPO Case No. [D2000-0163](#); *General Electric Company v. CPIC NET and Hussain Syed*, WIPO Case No. [D2001-0087](#); and *Microsoft Corporation v. Montrose Corporation*, WIPO Case No. [D2000-1568](#).

Respondent has had multiple opportunities to explain and justify how Respondent came to register the disputed domain name but has failed to do so.

Indeed, the fact that Respondent has elected not to appear in this proceeding underscores that Respondent likely has no valid explanation for Respondent's actions, which to this Panel appears on the evidence submitted to have been undertaken in bad faith. See, e.g., *Volkswagen Group of America, Inc. v. Super Privacy Service Ltd. c/o Dynadot*, WIPO Case No. [D2019-2521](#).

Finally, Complainant contends Respondent's actions constitute use of the disputed domain name in bad faith because Respondent has chosen a trademark, which is world renowned for its testing and inspection services, to attract visitors to a website featuring Respondent's business for Respondent's commercial benefit.

As mentioned above, the disputed domain name is connected to websites featuring civil engineering services and related construction product rental services, not related to Complainant in any way. Previous UDRP panels have consistently held that a respondent's use of a confusingly similar domain name to direct unsuspecting Internet users to their own business website, as here, is evidence of bad faith registration and use of that domain name. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 3.1.4.

This Panel finds the same conclusion should be applied here because Respondent is using the BUREAU VERITAS Mark within the disputed domain name to attract visitors and then direct them to the website featuring its commercial services. This use clearly constitutes an intentional attempt by Respondent to attract, for commercial gain, Internet users to its website by creating a likelihood of confusion with Complainant's BUREAU VERITAS Mark as to the source, affiliation or endorsement of the website to which the disputed domain name resolves in violation of paragraph 4(b)(iv) of the Policy.

The Panel finds Complainant's arguments and evidence persuasive, and Respondent has submitted no arguments or evidence to the contrary. Considering all the circumstances, the Panel concludes that Respondent has registered and used the disputed domain name in bad faith and Complainant has satisfied paragraph 4(a)(iii) 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 <bureauveritas-sa.com> be transferred to Complainant.

/Scott R. Austin/

Scott R. Austin

Sole Panelist

Date: June 30, 2025