

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

Globant S.A. v. MEI WANG

Case No. D2025-2310

1. The Parties

The Complainant is Globant S.A., Spain, represented by Marval O'Farrell & Mairal, Argentina.

The Respondent is MEI WANG, China.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <globant.xyz> is registered with Dynadot Inc (the "Registrar").

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the "Center") on June 12, 2025. On June 13, 2025, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On June 13, 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, Super Privacy Service LTD c/o Dynadot) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on June 17, 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 amendment to the Complaint on June 19, 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").

In accordance with the Rules, paragraphs 2 and 4, the Center formally notified the Respondent of the Complaint, and the proceedings commenced on June 20, 2025. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was July 10, 2025. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent's default on July 11, 2025.

The Center appointed Gareth Dickson as the sole panelist in this matter on August 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 was established in Argentina in 2003. It is a company active in the field of technology and digital transformation, offering services such as software development, IT consulting, and digital marketing. The Complainant has expanded globally and is listed on the New York Stock Exchange.

The Complainant says it owns multiple registrations for GLOBANT (the "Mark") and relies on numerous registrations, including:

- (i) European Union Trade Mark No. 18356639 in classes 9, 35, 38, 41 and 42, registered on May 21, 2021;
- (ii) United Kingdom Trade Mark No. 3831223 in classes 9, 35, 36, 38, 41 and 42, registered on January 13, 2023.

The Complainant also asserts it owns over 50 registered marks for GLOBANT worldwide.

The disputed domain name <globant.xyz> was registered on June 1, 2024. The Complainant submits that the disputed domain name resolves to a GoDaddy-hosted page where it is listed for sale for USD 1,450.

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 contends that the disputed domain name is identical to the Mark, as it wholly incorporates GLOBANT with no additional distinguishing elements, apart from the ".xyz" Top-Level Domain ("TLD"), which should be disregarded for the purposes of comparison.

The Complainant submits that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name because the Complainant has not licensed or otherwise authorized the Respondent to use the Mark, and because the Respondent is not commonly known by the disputed domain name. The Complainant states that it has no information regarding the Respondent and further asserts that there is no business or legal relationship between the parties. The Complainant alleges that the disputed domain name has not been used in connection with a bona fide offering of goods or services, nor has it been used for legitimate noncommercial or fair use. Instead, the Complainant claims the disputed domain name has been used to redirect users to a page listing the disputed domain name for sale at USD 1,450.

The Complainant asserts that the disputed domain name was registered and is being used in bad faith. It submits that the Respondent could not have been unaware of the Complainant's longstanding and well-known rights in the Mark when registering the disputed domain name. The Complainant further alleges that the Respondent registered the disputed domain name primarily for the purpose of selling it for valuable consideration in excess of out-of-pocket expenses. The Complainant also notes that the Respondent used a privacy service, which it argues is further evidence of bad faith.

B. Respondent

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

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 asserts that it is the owner of a large number of trademark registrations around the world for the Mark, and has provided evidence in support of that position from trade mark offices in Argentina, the European Union, the United Kingdom, and India. However, each of these registrations is in the name of Globant España S.A., and not Globant S.A. Nonetheless, in light of the apparent subsidiary relationship, the Panel accepts that the Complainant has demonstrated rights for the purposes of this proceeding. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 1.4.

The Complainant has therefore 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 identical to the Mark for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 1.7.

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 rebuttal much less any relevant evidence demonstrating rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name such as those enumerated in the Policy or otherwise.

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 notes that the Respondent registered the disputed domain name incorporating the Complainant's coined Mark in its entirety after the Complainant had secured registered rights, and that the disputed domain name is being offered for sale at a price significantly in excess of the Respondent's likely out-of-pocket expenses. The Respondent has not come forward to explain any good faith basis for its registration or use.

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 <globant.xyz> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Gareth Dickson/

Gareth Dickson

Sole Panelist

Date: September 7, 2025