

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

Globant S.A. v. 任艺伟 (Yi Wei Ren)

Case No. D2025-2313

1. The Parties

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

The Respondent is 任艺伟 (Yi Wei Ren), China.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <globant.online> is registered with Chengdu West Dimension Digital Technology Co., Ltd. (the "Registrar").

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed in English 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 16, 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 (Jiang Su) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on June 18, 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 in English on June 19, 2025.

On June 18, 2025, the Center informed the Parties in Chinese and English, that the language of the Registration Agreement for the disputed domain name is Chinese. On June 19, 2025, the Complainant confirmed its request that English be the language of the proceeding. The Respondent did not submit any comment on the Complainant's submission.

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 in Chinese and English of the Complaint, and the proceedings commenced on June 24, 2025. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was July 14, 2025. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent’s default on July 15, 2025.

The Center appointed Xu Lin as the sole panelist in this matter on July 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 Complainant was founded in Argentina in 2003, providing services such as software development, IT consulting, and digital marketing. Since its establishment, the Complainant has expanded its business and operations internationally, and currently operates in the technology and digital transformation industry across various markets.

The Complainant owns various trademarks for GLOBANT, including the following:

- European Union trademark No. 018356639 registered on May 21, 2021 in classes 9, 35, 38, 41, and 42; and
- Chinese trademark No. 52101324A registered on July 7, 2023 in classes 35, 38, 41, and 42.

The Complainant also owns the domain name <globant.com>, which resolves to its official website.

The Respondent is an individual based in China.

The disputed domain name <globant.online> was registered on November 5, 2024. On the date of this decision, the disputed domain name redirects to a webpage indicating that the disputed domain name is for sale for USD 950.

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 that the disputed domain name is identical or confusingly similar to the Complainant’s Trademark GLOBANT since it reproduces the Complainant’s trademark in its entirety without any other distinctive elements. The generic Top-Level Domain (“gTLD”) suffix “.online” is a standard registration element and should be disregarded when assessing confusing similarity.

Secondly, the Complainant contends that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests with respect to the disputed domain name, arguing that:

- the Complainant has not licensed or otherwise permitted the Respondent to use the trademark GLOBANT;
- the Complainant has no legal and/or business relationship with the Respondent which would give rise to

any license, permission, or authorization for the Respondent to use the disputed domain name;

- there is no evidence that the Respondent has been commonly known by the disputed domain name;
- the Respondent has not used the disputed domain name in connection with a bona fide offering of goods or services;
- the Respondent has not made demonstrable preparations to use the disputed domain name in connection with a bona fide offering of goods or services;
- the Respondent has not made a legitimate noncommercial or fair use of the disputed domain name.

Additionally, the disputed domain name redirects users to a website hosted by GoDaddy where the disputed domain name is offered for sale, indicating that the Respondent's use does not constitute legitimate noncommercial or fair use of the disputed domain name, nor a bona fide offering of goods or services.

Finally, the Complainant alleges that the disputed domain name was registered and is being used by the Respondent in bad faith. The Complainant contends that trademark GLOBANT has been extensively used since 2003 in connection with the Complainant's services worldwide and has been widely publicized globally and constantly featured throughout Internet. Throughout the years, the Complainant's trademark GLOBANT, became undoubtedly widely known in the world. In this context, it is almost impossible that the Respondent was not aware of the Complainant and its GLOBANT trademark when it recently registered the disputed domain name.

B. Respondent

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

6. Discussion and Findings

6.1. Procedural Issue: Language of the Proceeding

In this case, the language of the Registration Agreement for the disputed domain name is Chinese. Pursuant to the Rules, paragraph 11(a), in the absence of an agreement between the parties, or unless specified otherwise in the registration agreement, the language of the administrative proceeding shall be the language of the registration agreement.

The Complaint was filed in English. The Complainant requested that the language of the proceeding be English for several reasons, including:

- the disputed domain name uses Latin characters and includes the English term "online";
- the disputed domain name redirects to a website hosted by GoDaddy entirely in English;
- the Respondent's email address is in English;
- the Complainant's representatives are based in Argentina and requiring a translation would impose material additional expenses and unnecessary delay;
- in prior UDRP cases, panels held that English was the appropriate language of the proceedings based on considerations similar to those raised in the present case.

The Respondent did not make any specific submissions with respect to the language of the proceeding.

In exercising its discretion to use a language other than that of the registration agreement, the Panel has to exercise such discretion judicially in the spirit of fairness and justice to both parties, taking into account all relevant circumstances of the case, including matters such as the parties' ability to understand and use the proposed language, time and costs (see WIPO Overview of WIPO Panel Views on Selected UDRP Questions,

Third Edition ([“WIPO Overview 3.0”](#)), section 4.5.1).

Having considered all the matters above, the Panel determines under paragraph 11(a) of the Rules that the language of the proceeding shall be English.

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.

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

The disputed domain name is identical to the Complainant’s trademark GLOBANT, which carries a high risk of implied affiliation with the Complainant. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 2.5.1. The Complainant has not granted any license or right to the Respondent to use its trademark; there is no evidence that the Respondent has been commonly known by the disputed domain name, or used the disputed domain name in connection with a bona fide offering of goods or services; and the disputed domain name redirects Internet users to a website where the disputed domain name is offered for sale, which does not constitute a legitimate noncommercial or fair use.

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 evidence as presented indicates that the Respondent's aim in registering the disputed domain name was to profit from or exploit the Complainant's trademark.

According to the evidence provided by the Complainant, the trademark GLOBANT has been extensively used since 2003 in connection with the Complainant's services worldwide and has been widely publicized globally and constantly featured throughout Internet. This Panel finds therefore that on the balance of probabilities the Respondent was aware of the Complainant and its GLOBANT mark when filing registration for the disputed domain name.

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 Panel finds applicable the circumstances set out in UDRP paragraph 4(b)(i), namely that the respondent has registered or acquired the domain name primarily for the purpose of selling, renting, or otherwise transferring the domain name to the complainant who is the owner of the trademark or service mark or to a competitor of that complainant, for valuable consideration in excess of the respondent's documented out-of-pocket costs directly related to the domain name.

The Panel notes that the disputed domain name redirects to a webpage indicating it is available for sale at USD 950, which is likely exceeding the Respondent's out-of-pocket expenses, absent evidence from the Respondent to the contrary.

In addition, the Respondent did not take part in the administrative proceedings. Considering the above circumstances, 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.online> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Xu Lin/

Xu Lin

Sole Panelist

Date: August 8, 2025