

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

Bureau Veritas v. Farooqi Farms
Case No. D2025-2167

1. The Parties

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

The Respondent is Farooqi Farms, Pakistan.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <e-certificate-bureauveritas.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 June 3, 2025. On June 4, 2025, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On June 5, 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 (Domain Admin) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on June 5, 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 10, 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 12, 2025. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was July 2, 2025. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent’s default on July 3, 2025.

The Center appointed Kiyoshi Tsuru as the sole panelist in this matter on July 11, 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 was founded in 1828 and is a worldwide leader in testing, inspection and certification services with more than 82,000 employees and 1,600 offices and laboratories around the world. The Complainant owns the following trademark registrations for BUREAU VERITAS:

Trademark	Registration No.	Jurisdiction	Date of Registration	Class
BUREAU VERITAS	004518544	European Union	June 1, 2006.	Class 38, and Class 42.
BUREAU VERITAS 1828 BUREAU VERITAS 	007282651	European Union.	April 16, 2009.	Class 9, Class 35, Class 36, Class 37, Class 38, Class 39, Class 40, Class 41, Class 42, Class 43, Class 44, and Class 45.
BUREAU VERITAS 1828 	005927711	European Union.	February 6, 2008.	Class 42.

The Complainant also owns the following domain names: <bureauveritas.com>, <e-certificates.bureauveritas.com>, and <group.bureauveritas.com> among others.

The disputed domain name <e-certificate-bureauveritas.com> was registered on March 11, 2025. At the time of writing this decision (and filing of the Complaint), the disputed domain name <e-certificate-bureauveritas.com> resolves to a WordPress templated website with the text "Hello world!".

The disputed domain name has been used to create false certificates by inviting users to scan a QR code on the certificates falsely claiming that the QR code will resolve to the Complainant's <e-certificates.bureauveritas.com> domain name for certificate verification. The QR Code actually directs to a website in connection with the disputed domain name prominently displaying the Complainant's trademark and showing that the QR code is validated.

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:

I. Identical or Confusingly Similar

That the disputed domain name reproduces the elements that constitute the Complainant's BUREAU VERITAS trademarks.

That the addition of the term "e-certificate" has no effect on the reproduction of the Complainant's BUREAU VERITAS trademarks, since it does not affect the visual and phonetic identity or the public perception of it.

That the public might think that the Complainant offers its certification services through the disputed domain name since the Complainant owns a nearly identical domain name, i.e., <e-certificates.bureauveritas.com>, through which the Complainant's clients authenticate their certificates.

That the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to the Complainant's BUREAU VERITAS trademarks and domain name <e-certificates.bureauveritas.com>, and that there is a risk of confusion and association to the public who could think that the disputed domain name belongs to the Complainant.

II. Rights or Legitimate Interests

That the disputed domain name was registered by the Respondent, who is not an employee of the Complainant, and who is not linked in any way with the Complainant, and that the Respondent was never authorized by the Complainant to register the disputed domain name.

That the Respondent is making unlawful use and unfair commercial use of the disputed domain name with the intention of obtaining a commercial advantage by misleading consumers or tarnishing the Complainant's BUREAU VERITAS trademarks.

III. Registered and Used in Bad Faith

That the disputed domain name resolves to a website which appears to be inactive, but that said disputed domain name is used to create fake certificates used for impersonation purposes through a QR code by falsely claiming that the QR code will redirect to the Complainant's <e-certificates.bureauveritas.com> domain name.

That the Respondent is making unlawful use and unfair commercial use of the disputed domain name with the intention of obtaining a commercial advantage by misleading consumers or tarnishing the Complainant's BUREAU VERITAS trademarks.

B. Respondent

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

6. Discussion and Findings

Paragraph 4(a) of the Policy sets out the three requirements that the Complainant must prove in order to successfully request remedies:

- (i) that the disputed domain name is identical or confusingly similar to a trademark or service mark to which the Complainant has rights;
- (ii) that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in connection with the disputed domain name; and
- (iii) that the disputed domain name has been registered and is being used in bad faith.

Given the Respondent's default and therefore failure to specifically address the case merits as they relate to the three UDRP elements, the Panel may decide this proceeding based on the Complainant's undisputed factual allegations under paragraphs 5(f), 14(a), and 15(a) of the Rules (see *Joseph Phelps Vineyards LLC v. NOLDC, Inc., Alternative Identity, Inc., and Kentech*, WIPO Case No. [D2006-0292](#); *Encyclopaedia Britannica, Inc. v. null John Zuccarini, Country Walk*, WIPO Case No. [D2002-0487](#); see also 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 the BUREAU VERITAS trademark for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 1.2.1.

The disputed domain name is confusingly similar to the Complainant's BUREAU VERITAS trademark because it reproduces said trademark entirely (see [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 1.7), and because the incorporation of the term "e-certificate" and the hyphen does not prevent a finding of confusing similarity. The Complainant's BUREAU VERITAS trademark is recognizable in the disputed domain name (see [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 1.8; see *Playboy Enterprises International, Inc. v. Zeynel Demirtas*, WIPO Case No. [D2007-0768](#); *InfoSpace.com, Inc. v. Hari Prakash*, WIPO Case No. [D2000-0076](#); *AT&T Corp. v. WorldclassMedia.com*, WIPO Case No. [D2000-0553](#) and *Six Continents Hotels, Inc., Inter-Continental Hotels Corporation v. South East Asia Tours*, WIPO Case No. [D2004-0388](#))

The addition of the generic Top-Level Domain ("gTLD") ".com" to the disputed domain name constitutes a technical requirement of the Domain Name System ("DNS"). Thus, it has no legal significance and is typically disregarded in assessing identity or confusing similarity in the present case (see *CARACOLITO S SAS v. Nelson Brown, OXM.CO*, WIPO Case No. [D2020-0268](#); *SAP SE v. Mohammed Aziz Sheikh, Sapteq Global Consulting Services*, WIPO Case No. [D2015-0565](#); and *Bentley Motors Limited v. Domain Admin / Kyle Rocheleau, Privacy Hero Inc.*, WIPO Case No. [D2014-1919](#) and [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 to or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name. The Complainant has asserted that there is no evidence of the Respondent's use of the disputed domain name in connection with a bona fide offering of goods or services, and that the Respondent has not been licensed or otherwise permitted by the Complainant to use its BUREAU VERITAS trademarks, or to register the disputed domain name (see *Amdocs Development Ltd. and Amdocs Software Systems Ltd. v. cenk erdogan*, WIPO Case No. [D2023-3044](#); *Amdocs Development Ltd. and Amdocs Software Systems Ltd. v. Nick Lamba*, WIPO Case No. [D2023-2573](#), and *Autodesk, Inc. v. Brian Byrne, meshIP, LLC*, WIPO Case No. [D2017-0191](#)). The Complainant has submitted evidence showing the Respondent is using the disputed domain name to create fake certificates falsely claiming users will be directed to the Complainant's <e-certificates.bureauveritas.com> domain name.

The Respondent has not rebutted the Complainant's prima facie showing and has not come forward with any relevant evidence demonstrating rights to or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name such as those enumerated in the Policy or otherwise.

The case file contains no evidence that demonstrates that the Respondent has used or has made demonstrable preparations to use the disputed domain name in connection with a bona fide offering of goods or services (see *Valentino S.p.A. v. Qiu Yufeng, Li Lianye*, WIPO Case No. [D2016-1747](#); and *Associated Newspapers Limited v. Manjeet Singh*, WIPO Case No. [D2019-2914](#)).

Furthermore, the Panel considers that the composition of the disputed domain name carries a risk of implied affiliation with the Complainant, its trademarks, and its business. [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.

The Panel notes that the dates of registration of the Complainant's BUREAU VERITAS trademarks significantly precede the date of registration of the disputed domain name.

In the present case, the Panel notes that the Respondent registered the disputed domain name on March 11, 2025, well after the Complainant obtained its first registrations for its BUREAU VERITAS trademark and began using said trademark. The Respondent's bad faith registration is evidenced by the fact that (1) the Respondent is using the disputed domain name to create fake certificates which contain a QR code falsely claiming that users will be direct to the Complainant's <e-certificates.bureauveritas.com> domain name, but the QR code directs to the disputed domain name; (2) the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to the Complainant's BUREAU VERITAS trademark, as it incorporates said trademark entirely; and (3) the disputed domain name is almost identical to the Complainant's <e-certificates.bureauveritas.com> domain name.

The case docket shows that the Respondent has targeted the Complainant and its potential clients, which constitutes opportunistic bad faith (see section 3.2.1 of the [WIPO Overview 3.0](#); see also *L'Oréal v. Contact Privacy Inc. Customer 0149511181 / Jerry Peter*, WIPO Case No. [D2018-1937](#); and *Gilead Sciences Ireland UC / Gilead Sciences, Inc. v. Domain Maybe For Sale c/o Dynadot*, WIPO Case No. [D2019-0980](#)).

Panels have held that the use of a domain name for illegitimate or illegal activity (in the present case claimed as impersonation/passing off, and fraudulent conduct arising from the creation of false certificates) constitutes bad faith (see [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 3.4, *Arla Foods Amba v. Michael Guthrie, M. Guthrie Building Solutions*, WIPO Case No. [D2016-2213](#); *Minerva S.A. v. Whoisguard Protected, Whoisguard, Inc., / GREYHAT SERVICES*, WIPO Case No. [D2016-0385](#)).

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 <e-certificate-bureauveritas.com> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Kiyoshi Tsuru/

Kiyoshi Tsuru

Sole Panelist

Date: July 25, 2025.