

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

Globant S.A. v. 312312 3123, A Sa Da Sheng De
Case No. D2025-2311

1. The Parties

The Complainant is Globant S.A., Spain, represented by Marval, Argentina.

The Respondent is 312312 3123, A Sa Da Sheng De, Hong Kong, China.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <globant.vip> 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 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 (Registration Private, Domains By Proxy, LLC) 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 sent an email communication to the Center on June 19, 2025, and filed an amendment to the Complaint on June 24, 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 sent an email communication to the Center on June 20, 2025, requesting the automatic four calendar day extension for Response under paragraph 5(b) of the Rules. On the same date, the Center granted the Respondent’s request and fixed the due date for the Response to July 14, 2025. The Respondent submitted its Response on July 14, 2025, and made a supplemental filing on July 15, 2025. The Complainant made a supplemental filing on July 15, 2025.

The Center appointed Assen Alexiev as the sole panelist in this matter on July 21, 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 offers a wide range of services, including software development, IT consulting, digital marketing, etc. Founded in Argentina in 2003, the Complainant now employs over 29,000 professionals globally and reported a revenue of USD 2.3 billion in the second quarter of 2024. The Complainant has entered into partnerships with Williams Racing in Formula 1, the NBA franchise L.A. Clippers, and collaborates with FIFA. The Complainant operates its official website at the domain name <globant.com>, registered on November 11, 2002.

The Complainant's subsidiary Globant España S.A. (Sociedad Unipersonal) is the owner of a number of trademark registrations of the sign **Globant** (the "GLOBANT trademark"), including the following representative registrations:

- the European Union trademark with registration No. 018356645, registered on May 21, 2021, for goods and services in International Classes 9, 35, 38, 41 and 42;
- the Mexican trademark with registration No. 2299689, registered on September 20, 2021, for services in International Class 35;
- the Chinese trademark with registration No. 52074731, registered on March 7, 2022, for goods and services in International Classes 9, 35, 38, 41 and 42; and
- the Argentinian trademark with registration No. 3965635, registered on April 25, 2022, for services in International Class 42.

The disputed domain name was registered on February 12, 2025. It is currently inactive. At the time of filing of the Complaint, the disputed domain name directed to a website that displayed the message: "¡Bienvenido a Globant Alquiler! Alto rendimiento y eficiencia" (in English, "Welcome to Globant Rental! High performance and efficiency"), and invited visitors to log in to the website by providing their mobile telephone number and password, or to sign up to it. According to the evidence submitted by the Complainant, visitors who signed up to the website were redirected to an internal page that displayed the Complainant's trademark **Globant** and offered products for sale or rent that appear to be related to artificial intelligence, alongside links such as "Comercio cuantitativo", "Recarga", "Ingresos del día", "Gas natural", "Invita a tus amigos" (in English, "Quantitative Trade", "Recharge", "Daily Income", "Natural Gas", "Invite your friends").

According to the Complaint, registered users of the website at the disputed domain name were also added to a Spanish-language WhatsApp group named "Globant", which also displays the Complainant's trademark **Globant** and the text:

"Invertir en IA es invertir en el futuro* *Utilizá la tecnología para lograr libertad financiera!*

Queremos contarte que los programas de trading con IA, utilizan algoritmos de inteligencia artificial y análisis de big data para realizar trading de manera automatizada.

Globant es un proveedor de servicios de comercio de inteligencia artificial, mundialmente reconocido, que asiste y motiva a inversores a sumarse a proyectos valiosos, de elevado crecimiento, de forma precisa y sobre todo eficiente, generando tranquilidad y confianza.

En Globant. los sueños de los clientes se hacen realidad: ¡Únete a nosotros y logró beneficios mutuos con nuestro equipo!!!

(In English, "Investing in AI is investing in the future" *Use technology to achieve financial freedom!*

We want to tell you that AI trading programs use artificial intelligence algorithms and big data analysis to perform automated trading.

Globant is a globally recognized artificial intelligence trading service provider that assists and motivates investors to join valuable, high-growth projects accurately and, above all, efficiently, generating peace of mind and confidence.

At Globant, clients' dreams come true: Join us and achieve mutual benefits with our team!!!)

The Respondent refers to itself as "James" and does not provide any details about its activities.

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 states that the disputed domain name is identical to its GLOBANT trademark, because it reproduces the Complainant's trademark in its entirety without any other elements.

According to the Complainant, the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the disputed domain name, because the Complainant has not licensed it to use the GLOBANT trademark or to register a domain name that incorporates it. The Complainant adds that it has no relationship with the Respondent. The Complainant submits that the Respondent is not commonly known by the disputed domain name and has not used it in connection with a bona fide offering of goods or services or made any legitimate noncommercial or fair use of it. According to the Complainant, the Respondent only seeks to exploit the GLOBANT trademark, as the disputed domain name redirects to a website that impersonates the Complainant in order to offer some type of rental service for commercial gain.

The Complainant contends that the disputed domain name was registered and is being used in bad faith. It submits that the GLOBANT trademark has been extensively used since 2003 in connection with the Complainant's services worldwide and has been widely publicized globally and constantly featured throughout the Internet, as a result of which the trademark has become notorious, so it is almost impossible that the Respondent was not aware of the Complainant and its GLOBANT trademark when registering the disputed domain name in 2025.

The Complainant points out that the disputed domain name has resolved to a website that prominently displayed the Complainant's GLOBANT trademark and falsely presented itself as an official website of the Complainant in order to promote a business called "Globant Alquiler". According to the Complainant, the disputed domain name has been used with the intent to deceive Internet users by impersonating the Complainant, collect their personal data, and mislead them into believing they are interacting with an official platform of the Complainant, and the Respondent's primary motive in registering and using the disputed domain name was to take advantage of the Complainant's trademark and reputation. The Complainant maintains that this deceptive use of the Complainant's identity misleads users into believing in the legitimacy of the offers featured on the Respondent's website, which shows the Respondent's intent to disrupt the Complainant's business and exploit the Complainant's reputation.

B. Respondent

The Respondent contends that the Complainant has not satisfied the elements required under the Policy for a transfer of the disputed domain name.

The Respondent states that the disputed domain name was registered independently and in good faith. According to it, the term "globant" is a creative, abstract combination of the words "glob", referencing "global,"

and “ant”, representing industriousness, collaboration, and decentralized systems, and the “.vip” generic Top-Level Domain (“gTLD”) was selected solely for its generic and premium branding value. The Respondent states that “globant” does not carry an inherent or exclusive association with the Complainant’s brand in ordinary usage, and that other similar word formations, such as “Globot,” “Globex,” “AntTech”, are not uncommon and exist across the Internet. The Respondent adds that the fact that a large company may have established rights in one specific context does not negate the possibility of other legitimate uses in unrelated industries or conceptual spaces, especially when the content, intent, and market of the disputed domain name are different.

The Respondent maintains that at the time of registration of the disputed domain name, it had no intention of targeting or infringing any trademark, and that it was not aware of the Complainant’s branding or operations in any meaningful detail, and that the disputed domain name was not registered with the intention of impersonating or confusing any third party.

The Respondent submits that the disputed domain name has never been commercialized, marketed, advertised, or promoted to users or to the public, and that was only briefly linked to a test interface as part of an early-stage prototype. The Respondent maintains that this was not a publicly launched platform, was not indexed or optimized for discovery, that there was no user base, sales campaign, and no targeting of the Complainant’s customers or brand reputation. According to the Respondent, the lack of public promotion, the absence of commercial deployment, and the limited test-only appearance of its website suggest that no harm or confusion was ever caused to Internet users.

The Respondent disputes the Complainant’s evidence about the content of the website at the disputed domain name. It submits that only one of the screenshots submitted by the Complainant contains a visible browser address bar showing its source, and that the remaining screenshots show only generic interface images that lack any technical indicators of their source, which according to the Respondent raises the possibility that not all screenshots are from the same source or that some content may be speculative or presented without context. The Respondent adds that there is no supporting server data or Wayback Machine records, which according to it further weakens the probative value of the Complainant’s evidence.

According to the Respondent, the screenshots reflect at best a temporary test page that was never intended for public use, and not a sustained or malicious deployment of the domain name. The content present on the test interface at the disputed domain name, including phrases such as “Comercio cuantitativo,” “Recarga,” and “Gas natural”, demonstrates a thematic focus on alternative financial or energy-related services, not on IT consulting or software development. The Respondent maintains that there was no use of the Complainant’s logo, brand fonts, slogans, or copyrighted design elements, that the interface was login-based and invitation-limited, further indicating it was not designed to deceive or attract random web visitors. According to the Respondent, the test interface was only intermittently accessible and not linked from any external website, and its login-only structure made public interaction impossible without explicit invitation.

The Respondent further states that it has never offered the disputed domain name for sale to the Complainant or to any competitor, that it has not been listed on any marketplaces or auctioned.

6. Discussion and Findings

6.1. Procedural issue – Supplemental filings by the Parties

In this proceeding, the Parties have made unsolicited supplemental filings.

Paragraph 10 of the Rules vests the panel with the authority to determine the admissibility, relevance, materiality and weight of the evidence, and also to conduct the proceedings with due expedition, and Paragraph 12 of the Rules expressly provides that it is for the panel to request, in its sole discretion, any further statements or documents from the parties it may deem necessary to decide the case.

As discussed in section 4.6 of the WIPO Overview of WIPO Panel Views on Selected UDRP Questions, Third Edition ("[WIPO Overview 3.0](#)"), unsolicited supplemental filings are generally discouraged, unless specifically requested by the panel. In all such cases, panels have repeatedly affirmed that the party submitting or requesting to submit an unsolicited supplemental filing should clearly show its relevance to the case and why it was unable to provide the information contained therein in its complaint or response (e.g., owing to some "exceptional" circumstance).

The first supplemental filing was made by the Complainant. After it received the Center's communication of June 17, 2025, providing the registrant and contact information disclosed by the Registrar, and inviting the Complainant to submit an amendment to the Complaint by June 22, 2025, the Complainant initially confirmed that it did not wish to make any substantive amendments to the Complaint other than to include the registrant information provided by the Registrar. On June 24, 2025, it however filed an amendment to the Complaint, stating that it had recently received additional information regarding the bad faith use of the disputed domain name, which came to its attention after the initial deadline to amend the Complaint had passed. This amendment was filed only two days after the expiration of the time limit fixed by the Center for amendment of the Complaint and contains relevant information and evidence about the use the disputed domain name by the Respondent. The amendment to the Complaint was provided to the Respondent and it had an opportunity to take it into account when preparing its Response, and it indeed made comments on its substance and on the evidence attached to it, without objecting to its admission in the proceeding. Taking the above into account, the Panel decides to accept and take into account the amendment to the Complaint filed on June 24, 2025 by the Complainant.

The Respondent submitted its Response on July 14, 2025, and made a supplemental filing on July 15, 2025. It did not provide any reasons why it could not submit with its Response the information and arguments included in its supplemental filing. Moreover, this additional information and arguments are not relevant to the substance of the dispute regarding the registration and use of the disputed domain name but refer to other UDRP proceedings that involve different domain names and different respondents. Taking the above into account, the Panel decides not to accept the supplemental filing of the Respondent submitted on July 15, 2025.

The Complainant made a supplemental filing on July 15, 2025 in reply to the Respondent's Response and supplemental filing. Considering that the Panel has decided not to accept the Respondent's supplemental filing, that the Rules provide for only one round of pleadings, and that the Complainant's supplemental filing does not contain any new information or documents, but only replies to arguments raised in the Response, the Panel decides not to accept the Complainant's supplemental filing of July 15, 2025.

Even if these two supplemental filings had been admitted, the Panel considers that they would not have affected the Panel's analysis set out below.

6.2. Substantive issues

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.

As discussed in section 1.4.1 of the [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), a trademark owner's affiliate such as a subsidiary of a parent or of a holding company, or an exclusive trademark licensee, is considered to have rights in a trademark under the UDRP for purposes of standing to file a complaint. The Panel considers that the same approach is applicable in the present case, where the trademark owner is a subsidiary of the Complainant, and finds that the Complainant has shown rights in respect of the GLOBANT trademark for the purposes of the Policy.

The Panel finds that the GLOBANT trademark is recognizable within the disputed domain name, because it incorporates the entirety of the word element of the trademark. Accordingly, the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to the GLOBANT trademark 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 relevant evidence demonstrating rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name such as those enumerated in the Policy or otherwise.

The Respondent maintains that the disputed domain name was chosen independently of the Complainant’s GLOBANT trademark, and submits that “globant” is a creative, abstract combination of words, which is not associated with the Complainant’s trademark. According to the Respondent, the fact that the Complainant has trademark rights does not negate the possibility of other legitimate uses of the disputed domain name.

The Respondent, however, does not explain the purposes for which it intends to use the disputed domain name and the plans that it has in this regard. It only submits that the disputed domain name was only briefly linked to a test interface as part of an early-stage prototype, without providing any details or supporting evidence. The Respondent disputes the Complainant’s evidence about the content of the website at the disputed domain name, but at the same time concedes that the submitted screenshots reflect a temporary test page, and discusses the specific phrases displayed on these screenshots, claiming that they demonstrate a thematic focus on alternative financial or energy-related services, not on IT consulting or software development. Notably, the Respondent does not dispute the Complainant’s allegation that Internet users who register to the Respondent’s website are added to a “Globant” WhatsApp group and the screenshot of this WhatsApp group. The Panel regards the above as a confirmation by the Respondent that the screenshots submitted by the Complainant reflect the content of the website at the disputed domain name and of the “Globant” WhatsApp group at the time when the Complaint was filed.

The Respondent also maintains that there was no use of the Complainant’s logo, but the screenshots submitted by the Complainant of the Respondent’s website and of the WhatsApp group to which registered users of the Respondent’s website are added, prominently display an exact copy of the distinctive GLOBANT trademark with its specific font, design element and colors.

Taking all the above into account, the Panel finds that the Respondent’s allegations and explanations as self-contradictory and unconvincing, and accepts that it is more likely than not that the Respondent has registered and used the disputed domain name with an intent to exploit the goodwill of the Complainant’s

trademark for commercial gain, which conduct cannot give rise to rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name.

The Panel therefore finds that 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 Respondent maintains that at the time of registration of the disputed domain name, it was not aware of the Complainant's branding or operations in any meaningful detail. This allegation is however disproven by the fact that its website and the "Globant" WhatsApp group to which its registered users are added prominently display an exact copy of the Complainant's GLOBANT trademark, which shows the Respondent's knowledge of and intention to use this trademark.

The Respondent also submits that the disputed domain name has never been advertised to the public, and that was only briefly linked to a test interface as part of an early-stage prototype. As already discussed, the evidence submitted by the Complainant shows that there was an active website containing a login interface and commercial offers of various products with prices and offer validity periods and an active WhatsApp group containing similar offers. They do not appear as test interfaces or prototypes, and the website was only deactivated after the submission of the Complaint to the Center. The Panel therefore does not regard the Respondent's explanations as convincing and considers that the content and design of its website and of the related WhatsApp group show an intention for an active and long-term use of the disputed domain name.

Considering the above, and in light of the discussion in the previous section on rights and legitimate interests, the Panel finds that it is more likely than not that by registering and using the disputed domain name, the Respondent has intentionally attempted to attract, for commercial gain, Internet users by creating a likelihood of confusion with the Complainant's GLOBANT trademark as to the source or affiliation of the Respondent's website and of the products and services offered on it. This supports a finding of registration and use of the disputed domain name in bad faith under paragraph 4(b)(iv) of the Policy.

The Panel therefore 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.vip> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Assen Alexiev/

Assen Alexiev

Sole Panelist

Date: August 4, 2025