

## **ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION**

Accenture Global Services Limited v. antonio thomas  
Case No. D2025-2427

### **1. The Parties**

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

The Respondent is antonio thomas, United States.

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

The disputed domain name <svaccenture.com> 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 19, 2025. On June 19, 2025, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On June 20, 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 (Unidentified Registrant) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on June 23, 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 26, 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 July 1, 2025. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was July 21, 2025. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent's default on July 22, 2025.

The Center appointed Harini Narayanswamy as the sole panelist in this matter on July 28, 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 is an international business providing services in consulting, strategy, digital technology and operations. Its operations commenced on January 1, 2001 and it currently has a presence in more than 200 cities in 49 countries.

The Complainant operates its website from the domain name <accenture.com>, which was registered on August 29, 2000. ACCENTURE is the trademark used by the Complainant and it is also reflected in its company name. The Complainant's first trademark registration for the ACCENTURE mark dates back to 2002. Its large portfolio of registered trademarks includes:

ACCENTURE word mark, United States trademark registration number 3,091,811, registration date May 16, 2006 in classes 9, 16, 35, 36, 37, 41, and 42.

ACCENTURE word mark, United States trademark registration number 7,266,256, registration date January 9, 2024, in classes 9, 35, 36, 37, 41, and 42.

ACCENTURE & design mark, United States trademark registration number 2,665,373, registration date December 24, 2002, in classes 35, 36, 41, and 42.

The disputed domain name was registered by the Respondent on May 23, 2025. At the time of filing the Complaint, the disputed domain name resolved to a webpage displaying a message that it is not reachable.

#### **5. Parties' Contentions**

##### **A. Complainant**

The Complainant contends that it has extensively used the ACCENTURE mark in connection with various services and its mark is widely known. The Complainant has provided its annual advertising expenses from the year 2009 to 2025 and has also provided evidence of some promotional advertisements and news clippings published in the media.

The Complainant states that its trademark portfolio currently consists of over 1000 registered marks in more than 140 countries and the ACCENTURE mark has been recognized by reputed brand consulting companies. It has been consistently ranked on Interbrand's Best Brands Report since 2002, and has ranked 31st on Interbrand's Best Global Brands Report of 2024. Kantar Milward Brown's BrandZ- Top 100 Brand Ranking 2025 has ranked the ACCENTURE brand as 20th, with a valuation of over USD 100 billion and Brand Finance in its 2024 Global 500 brand rankings, named ACCENTURE as the world's most valuable IT service brand with a valuation of USD 40.5 billion.

The Complainant states that it has won many awards and recognitions for its business, products and services under the ACCENTURE mark. It has been consistently listed by Fortune Global 500 for the past twenty-two years. It has got top ranking for various categories by the Fortune publications, such as the fourth rank on Fortune's Most Powerful Women (2024). Some of its other awards and recognitions include World's Most Ethical Company List (2008 -2024), Corporate Knights Global 100, PEOPLE Magazine and Great Place to Work, 100 Companies that Care, CDP'S Climate Change "A List" (2023), Working Mother's 100 Best Companies – Hall of Fame (2002-2020) and is ranked No.1 on the Global Diversity & Inclusion Index.

The Complainant states that its sports endorsement include partnering with the PGA TOUR Championship for which it has an agreement in place for the period 2022 – 2027. The Complainant states that its cultural initiatives include its collaboration with the Louvre Museum in Paris, France to develop new technological programs as an initiative to spread culture, enhance image and reach new segments of the public and it was also the key presenter and participant of the Cannes Lions Festival of Creativity.

Notably, the Complainant contends that due to its extensive use and promotion, the mark has become distinctive and famous much prior to date of disputed domain name registration. Furthermore, the Complainant asserts that its mark is a coined word and is not a descriptive or generic term. The Complainant argues that the Respondent ought to have been aware of its widely known and reputed ACCENTURE mark due to its ubiquitous presence and argues that the use of its mark in the disputed domain name is likely to mislead Internet users looking for the Complainant.

The Complainant submits that the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to its mark, the Respondent lacks rights or legitimate interest in the disputed domain name, and the disputed domain name has been registered in bad faith and is being used in bad faith. The Complainant contends that it has satisfied each of the elements required under the Policy for a transfer of the disputed domain name.

## **B. Respondent**

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

## **6. Discussion and Findings**

Three elements need to be established by the Complainant under paragraph 4 (a) of the Policy to obtain transfer of the disputed domain name, these are:

- (i) The disputed domain name is identical or confusingly similar to a trademark or service mark in which the Complainant has rights; and
- (ii) The Respondent lacks rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name; and
- (iii) The disputed domain name was registered and is being used in bad faith by the Respondent.

### **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 provided evidence of its registered trademarks, which satisfies the threshold requirement of having rights in the mark. WIPO Overview of WIPO Panel Views on Selected UDRP Questions, Third Edition, ("[WIPO Overview 3.0](#)") section 1.1. Accordingly, the Complainant is found to have established its rights in respect of the trademark or service mark for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#) section 1.2.1.

Addition of the letters "s" and "v" that are prefixed to the mark in the disputed domain name, 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 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.

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, these are: (i) use of the domain name for a bona fide offering of goods or services, or demonstrable plans for such use (ii) being commonly known by the domain name or (iii) legitimate noncommercial or fair use of the 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.

In the present case, the Respondent is clearly not known by the disputed domain name, as the name of the registrant given in the registration records is Antonio Thomas. The Complainant has stated that the Respondent has no connection or affiliation with the Complainant.

The Complainant has argued that the inactive and/or the passive holding of the disputed domain name does not indicate legitimate or bona fide use of the domain name under the Policy. The Panel agrees that this view is consistent with previous panel views and concurs that the passive holding of a disputed domain name that consists of a widely reputed mark, does not constitute either bona fide use, legitimate noncommercial use or fair use under the circumstances of this case.

Having reviewed the available record and the circumstances of the present case, 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 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, 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.

- (i) Circumstances indicate that the respondent has registered or acquired the domain name primarily for purpose of selling, renting, or otherwise transferring the domain name registration 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 respondent’s documented out-of-pocket costs directly related to the domain name; or
- (ii) The respondent has registered the domain name in order to prevent the owner of the trademark or service mark from reflecting the mark in a corresponding domain name, provided that the respondent has engaged in a pattern of such conduct; or
- (iii) the respondent has registered the domain name primarily for the purpose of disrupting the business of a competitor; or
- (iv) By using the disputed domain name, the respondent has intentionally attempted to attract, for commercial gain, Internet users to the respondent’s website or other online location, by creating a likelihood of confusion with the complainant’s mark as to the source, sponsorship, affiliation or endorsement of the respondent’s website or location or of a product or service on the respondent’s website or location.

Given the global reach of the ACCENTURE mark and its extensive use by the Complainant for over two decades prior to registration of the disputed domain name, it is inconceivable that the Respondent chose the disputed domain name without knowledge of Complainant's trademark. The Respondent has failed to reply, respond or provide any credible reasons for choosing to register the disputed domain name. Therefore, the Panel finds that the disputed domain name was registered in bad faith.

The disputed domain name, as mentioned earlier, is not being used by the Respondent. Panels have found that the non-use of a domain name including a blank page would not prevent a finding of bad faith under the doctrine of passive holding. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 3.3. The totality of facts and circumstances in each case are considered by panelists under the doctrine of passive holding. In particular, factors that are considered relevant include: (i) the degree of distinctiveness or reputation of the trademark, (ii) the failure of the respondent to submit a response or to prove any evidence of actual or contemplated good faith use of the disputed domain name, (iii) implausibility of any good faith use to which the domain name could be put to (iv) respondent concealing identity or using false contact details.

In the present case, having reviewed the available record, the Panel notes the distinctiveness and fame associated with the Complainant's trademark. The Panel also notes that the wide spread reputation of the Complainant's trademark has been recognized in previous UDRP decisions such as in the case *Accenture Global Services Limited v. Marc Diks*, WIPO Case No. [D2021-1383](#).

The evidence on record does not suggest that the disputed domain name has been put to any good faith use. Given the fame, reputation and widely known status of the ACCENTURE mark, it is unlikely that it can be put to any contemplated good faith use by the Respondent, who is not authorized to use the mark. Furthermore, the Respondent's use of privacy shield to conceal identity and the provision of what appears to be false contact details (the courier service was not able to deliver the Written Notice) under the discussed circumstances, are additional factors that indicate bad faith.

Having reviewed the available record, the Panel finds that the entire set of circumstances around the non-use of the disputed domain name does not prevent a finding of bad faith under the Policy. The Panel finds for all the reasons discussed that the Complainant has established the third element of the Policy, that the disputed domain name was registered in bad faith and is being used in bad faith by the Respondent.

## 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 <svaccenture.com> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Harini Narayanswamy/

**Harini Narayanswamy**

Sole Panelist

Date: August 11, 2025