

## **ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION**

Accenture Global Services Limited v. Benjamin Sunder, summitskin  
Case No. D2025-2097

### **1. The Parties**

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

The Respondent is Benjamin Sunder, summitskin, US.

### **2. The Domain Name and Registrar**

The disputed domain name <acentureai.com> is registered with Wild West Domains, LLC (the "Registrar").

### **3. Procedural History**

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the "Center") on May 28, 2025. On May 28, 2025, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On May 29, 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 (summitskin) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on June 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 June 6, 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 June 10, 2025. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was June 30, 2025. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent's default on July 1, 2025. Following the notification of the Respondent's default, the Respondent sent two email communications to the Center on July 1, 2025.

The Center appointed Mehmet Polat Kalafatoğlu as the sole panelist in this matter on July 7, 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 an international corporation incorporated in Ireland that provides a broad range of services and solutions in strategy, management consulting, digital, technology, and operations under the business name Accenture. The Complainant also offers services pertaining to generative artificial intelligence ("AI"). The Complainant has offices and operations in more than 200 cities in 49 countries worldwide. In addition, the ACCENTURE brand has been recognized as a leading global brand in its industry.

The record shows that the Complainant owns several registrations in different jurisdictions for its ACCENTURE and ACCENTURE & Design trademarks. These registrations include the following trademarks registered in the US, where the Respondent is located.

- the US trademark No. 3,091,811 for ACCENTURE, registered on May 16, 2006, in the international classes 9, 16, 35, 36, 37, 41, and 42; and
- the US trademark No. 2,665,373 for ACCENTURE & Design, registered on December 24, 2002, in the international classes 9, 16, 35, 36, 37, 41, and 42.

In addition, prior UDRP decisions recognized that the ACCENTURE trademark is distinctive and well-known (including, *Accenture Global Services Limited v. ICS INC. / PrivacyProtect.org*, WIPO Case No. [D2013-2098](#); and *Accenture Global Services Limited v. wang kang hui and Foster William*, WIPO Case No. [D2023-3566](#)).

The Complainant owns and operates the domain name <accenture.com> registered on August 29, 2000.

The disputed domain name was registered on May 5, 2025. At the time of filing the Complaint, it was resolving to a website that offered generative AI solutions and related services for businesses, including consultations, data preparation, AI model development, and integration of the AI solutions. At the time of this Decision, it does not resolve to an active website.

#### 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. The Complainant's contentions regarding the three elements under the Policy can be summarized as follows.

First, the Complainant contends that the disputed domain name is nearly identical and confusingly similar to its well-known and distinctive ACCENTURE trademark. The disputed domain name consists of a misspelling of the ACCENTURE trademark (missing only the first letter "c") paired with the letters "AI", which seem to refer to "artificial intelligence".

Second, the Complainant asserts that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the disputed domain name. The Complainant submits, inter alia, that the Respondent is neither affiliated with, nor has it been licensed or permitted to use the Complainant's ACCENTURE trademark; the Respondent is not commonly known by the disputed domain name. The Complainant also claims that the Respondent is not making legitimate noncommercial and fair use of the disputed domain name. According to the

Complainant, the Respondent is using the disputed domain name to advertise “AI solutions” that compete directly with the consulting services of the Complainant in relation to generative AI. The Respondent’s activities constitute passing off, and it appears that the Respondent has chosen the disputed domain name to falsely pose as the Complainant for financial gain, to trade off the reputation and goodwill associated with the ACCENTURE trademark. The Complainant further notes that it has grounds to believe that the website at the disputed domain name may be fake.

Third, the Complainant contends that the disputed domain name was registered and is being used in bad faith. In this regard, the Complainant asserts that the Respondent had constructive notice that the ACCENTURE trademark was a registered trademark in the US and many other jurisdictions. Given the Complainant’s reputation, the ubiquitous presence of the ACCENTURE trademarks on the Internet, and the Respondent’s use of this trademark in a typosquatted form, the Respondent clearly was aware of the said trademark prior to registering the disputed domain name. The Respondent registered it in order to trade off the reputation and goodwill of the ACCENTURE trademark. The Respondent uses the disputed domain name in bad faith to mislead Internet users and to offer products and services that compete directly with the Complainant. The Complainant also notes that the registration and use of a domain name in an attempt to appear associated or affiliated with another constitutes bad faith. The Respondent has intentionally attempted to attract Internet users to its website for commercial gain by creating a likelihood of confusion with the Complainant’s trademarks.

## **B. Respondent**

The Respondent did not formally reply to the Complainant’s contentions. However, following the Center’s notification of the Respondent’s default, the Respondent sent two email communications and simply noted that the disputed domain name is no longer active or publicly accessible.

## **6. Discussion and Findings**

### **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 the mark is 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. Considering the circumstances of the case, the Panel finds that the disputed domain name represents an example of intentional misspelling of the Complainant’s trademark as it incorporates the ACCENTURE trademark with the missing letter “c”. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 1.9.

Although the addition of other terms here, the letters “ai”, which are an abbreviation for “artificial intelligence”, 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.

The Complainant affirmed that it did not authorize the Respondent to use its ACCENTURE trademark or a version thereof, and the Respondent is not affiliated with the Complainant. The Respondent does not have a name or a business name corresponding to the disputed domain name. Additionally, there is no indication in the available records that the Respondent is commonly known by the disputed domain name. In particular, the Panel notes that the disputed domain name consists of a misspelling of the Complainant’s trademark and it was resolving to a website offering services in direct competition with the Complainant. Therefore, the Panel finds that the Respondent was using the confusingly similar disputed domain name for his commercial gain by taking unfair advantage of the Complainant’s ACCENTURE trademark and such use cannot be considered as a bona fide offering of goods or services or as a legitimate noncommercial or fair use. The current inactive use of the disputed domain name does not alter the Panel’s conclusion.

In addition, the Respondent did not provide any explanation or evidence of why he chose the disputed domain name. Therefore, the Respondent has failed to rebut the Complainant’s prima facie case.

Accordingly, 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.

In the present case, the Panel considers the following: the ACCENTURE trademark is distinctive and well known; the above-listed ACCENTURE trademark registrations at the Respondent’s location largely predate the registration of the disputed domain name; the disputed domain name includes a misspelling of the ACCENTURE trademark; and it was previously used for promoting products and services which directly compete with the Complainant. Accordingly, the Panel finds that the Respondent must have been aware of the Complainant’s prior trademark at the time of registering the disputed domain name and he registered the disputed domain name in bad faith to target the Complainant’s trademark and its services.

Considering the previous use of the disputed domain name described above, the Panel finds that the disputed domain name has been used in bad faith as the Respondent has intentionally attempted to attract, for commercial gain, Internet users to his website by creating a likelihood of confusion with the Complainant's ACCENTURE trademark as to the source, sponsorship, affiliation, or endorsement of the website or of products or services offered on the website. Under the circumstances of the case, the current inactive use of the disputed domain name does not alter the Panel's conclusion under the third element.

Based on the available record, 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 <acentureai.com> be transferred to the Complainant.

*/Mehmet Polat Kalafatoglu/*

**Mehmet Polat Kalafatoglu**

Sole Panelist

Date: July 21, 2025