

## ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

Randstad N.V. v. Name Redacted  
Case No. D2025-2027

### 1. The Parties

The Complainant is Randstad N.V., Netherlands (Kingdom of the), represented by Chiever B.V., Netherlands (Kingdom of the).

The Respondent is Name Redacted.<sup>1</sup>

### 2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <randstademploi.com> 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 May 22, 2025. On May 22, 2025, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On May 22, 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 (Registration Private, Domains By Proxy, LLC) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on May 23, 2025, providing the registrant and contact information disclosed by the Registrar, and inviting the Complainant to submit an amendment to the Complaint. The Center received an email from the Respondent on May 23, 2025. The Complainant filed an amendment to the Complaint on May 26, 2025.

The Center verified that the Complaint together with the amendment to the 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”).

---

<sup>1</sup>The Respondent appears to have used the name of a third party when registering the disputed domain name. In light of the potential identity theft, the Panel has redacted the Respondent’s name from this decision. However, the Panel has attached as Annex 1 to this decision an instruction to the Registrar regarding transfer of the disputed domain name, which includes the name of the Respondent. The Panel has authorized the Center to transmit Annex 1 to the Registrar as part of the order in this proceeding, and has indicated Annex 1 to this decision shall not be published due to the exceptional circumstances of this case. See *Banco Bradesco S.A. v. FAST-12785241 Attn. Bradescourgente.net / Name Redacted*, WIPO Case No. [D2009-1788](#).

In accordance with the Rules, paragraphs 2 and 4, the Center formally notified the Respondent of the Complaint, and the proceedings commenced on May 30, 2025. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was June 19, 2025. On June 4, 2025, the Center received an email communication from a third party claiming unauthorized use of its identity and contact details. The Respondent did not file any formal Response, and the Center accordingly notified the commencement of panel appointment process on June 20, 2025.

The Center appointed Syed Naqiz Shahabuddin as the sole panelist in this matter on June 25, 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 following summary sets out the uncontested factual submission made by the Complainant:

4.1 The Complainant was founded in the Netherlands (Kingdom of the) in 1960 and is one of the global leaders in recruitment and human resources services. In 2024, the Complainant assisted 1.7 million job seekers and advised over 180,000 clients on their talent needs throughout 39 markets.

4.2 The services provided by the Complainant have been promoted extensively under the RANDSTAD trademark, through marketing campaigns across the world. These marketing efforts include TV and radio advertisements, sponsorships and advertisements in the press and on billboards placed in high visibility locations such as airports, train station and along major highways.

4.3 The Complainant is the owner of various trademark registrations for the wordmark RANDSTAD and variations thereof including word-and-device marks in multiple jurisdictions worldwide. The Complainant's registrations cover, broadly, personnel recruitment and employment agency services.

4.4 The Complainant's first trademark registration dates back to December 1969. The trademarks registered by the Complainant for the wordmark RANDSTAD, since that time include, inter alia, the following:

Jurisdiction	Registration Number	Date of Registration	Description of Goods / Services
International Registration	364425	December 17, 1969	Class 16
Australia	629065	May 5, 1994	Class 35
International Registration	643208	August 31, 1995	Classes 35, 41, and 42
International Registration	835273	July 8, 2004	Classes 35, and 41
Benelux	566426	November 1, 1995	Classes 35, and 41

4.5 The Complainant also owns and operates a website at "www.randstad.com" to offer its services and corporate information. This website is supported by local websites in each territory where the Complainant operates, as well as dedicated sites for each of its business divisions. Through these websites, Internet users can search for job opportunities across various sectors and access detailed information about the Complainant's services.

4.6 The disputed domain name incorporates the RANDSTAD trademark with the suffix “emploi”. The word “emploi” is a French word which means “employment” in English. Moreover, the website to which the disputed domain name resolves, prominently displays the title “RANDSTAD EMPLOYMENT”.

4.7 The Respondent’s website also states that it is “Launching Soon” and enables Internet users to contact the Respondent or to sign up for updates and promotion.

4.8 The Respondent has used an email address associated with the disputed domain name to send email messages impersonating the Complainant’s human resources department.

## **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, inter alia, the following:

5.1 The Complainant asserts that RANDSTAD is a well-known trademark that is used globally. The disputed domain name is confusingly similar to the Complainant’s RANDSTAD trademark for the following reasons:

(a) the disputed domain name comprises of the Complainant’s RANDSTAD trademark as its dominant feature.

(b) the addition of the suffix “emploi” does not detract from the overall impression formed by the public that the disputed domain name is owned by or related to the Complainant. The additional term “emploi” is descriptive of the employment services which the Complainant provides. This further exacerbates or compounds the likelihood of confusion.

5.2 The Complainant further contends that the Respondent does not have any rights or legitimate interests to the disputed domain name because:

(a) the Respondent is not connected or affiliated with the Complainant, nor has the Complainant ever granted the Respondent any license or consent, expressed or implied, to use the RANDSTAD trademark in any manner.

(b) the Respondent does not use the disputed domain name, or a name corresponding to it, in connection with a bona fide offering of goods or services, nor is the Respondent commonly known by the disputed domain name.

5.3 The Complainant further contends that the Respondent registered and uses the disputed domain name in bad faith and relies on the following:

(a) the Complainant has not found any evidence to suggest that the Respondent has any legitimate rights or interests to the RANDSTAD trademark, including any license or authorization from the Complainant.

(b) the Respondent is using the disputed domain name to intentionally attempt to attract, for commercial gain, Internet users to the website, by creating a likelihood of confusion with the Complainant’s mark as the source, sponsorship, affiliation or endorsement of its website.

(c) the Respondent is not using the disputed domain name in connection with a bona fide offering of goods and services, but is instead seeking to ride and usurp the Complainant’s reputation and goodwill in the RANDSTAD trademark. The disputed domain name will cause confusion and divert Internet users away from the Complainant’s official website.

(d) the Respondent knew or must have known the existence of the Complainant's RANDSTAD trademark prior to registering and using the disputed domain name due to the long use and reputation of the trademark.

(e) the manner in which the Respondent is using the disputed domain name and the website to which it resolves is an attempt to bait Internet users into thinking that they are communicating with the Complainant, thereby creating a likelihood of confusion for commercial gain.

## **B. Respondent**

The Respondent did not formally reply to the Complainant's contentions. On May 23, 2025, the Respondent sent an email to the Center acknowledging receipt of the registrant information.

On June 4, 2025, a third party sent an email to the Center stating that it has received the Written Notice sent by the Center, and the disputed domain name was registered using its name and contact information without authorization.

## **6. Discussion and Findings**

In order to succeed in its Complaint, the Complainant is required to establish the following elements set out under paragraph 4(a) of the Policy:

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

(b) that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interest in respect of the disputed domain name; and

(c) that 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 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. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 1.2.1.

The Panel finds that the entirety of the mark is reproduced and recognizable 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, "emploi", 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.

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.

Furthermore, panels have held that the use of a domain name for illegal activity here, claimed as impersonation/passing off, can never confer rights or legitimate interests on a respondent. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 2.13.1.

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.

In the present case, the Panel notes that the Respondent had registered the disputed domain name well after the trademark had been registered. The trademark appears to be used extensively by the Complainant on a worldwide basis in respect of employment related services. As such, the circumstances in which the disputed domain name was registered and used by the Respondent indicate an attempt by the Respondent to ride on the established reputation and goodwill of the Complainant.

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 Respondent has used the disputed domain name to send fraudulent emails impersonating the Complainant, which constitutes bad faith registration and use under the paragraph 4(b)(iv) of the Policy. Panels have also held that the use of a domain name for illegal activity here, claimed as impersonation/passing off constitutes bad faith. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 3.4.

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

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 <randstademploi.com> be transferred to the Complainant.

*/Syed Naqiz Shahabuddin/*

**Syed Naqiz Shahabuddin**

Sole Panelist

Date: July 9, 2025