

## ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

MI-GSO v. sarah john  
Case No. D2025-2460

### 1. The Parties

The Complainant is MI-GSO, France, represented by Domgate, France.

The Respondent is sarah john, United States of America.

### 2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <migso-pcurbed.com> is registered with Realtime Register B.V. (the "Registrar").

### 3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the "Center") on June 23, 2025. On June 23, 2025, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On June 24, 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) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on June 26, 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 July 3, 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 8, 2025. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was July 28, 2025. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent's default on July 29, 2025.

The Center appointed Iris Quadrio as the sole panelist in this matter on August 8, 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, MI-GSO, is a French company created in France in 1999, which has been a pioneer in engineering and Project Management consulting. PCUBED was created in 2001 and closed in January, 2015 and together with MI-GSO belonged to ALTEN group. Both companies are referred to as MI-GSO | PCUBED and most of the time as MIGSO-PCUBED. MIGSO-PCUBED is indeed used to designate the world leader group in Project Controls.

Today, MIGSO-PCUBED is a unique international group offering a comprehensive range of high-value services in Project Management, PMO, Project Controls, and Business Transformation.

The Complainant has presence in 15 countries and more than 3,000 employees. In 2024 MIGSO-PCUBED generated EUR 300M of revenue and has also gained a strong widespread following on social networks with 359,000 followers on LinkedIn and some videos on Youtube are reaching 11,000 or 6,300 views.

The Complainant is the owner of several MI-GSO trademarks including United States of America Patent and Trademark Office Registration No. 6430535, dated July 27, 2021, International Registration No. 926736 and 1196285 (designated countries: United Kingdom, Spain and Germany) dated September 13, 2006, and October 11, 2013, respectively. The Complainant also holds a trademark registration for PCUBED at Institut National de la Propriété Industrielle (INPI) under Registration No. 4601433 dated March 13, 2020.

The Complainant's main website corresponds to the domain name <migso-pcubed.com>. Likewise, the Complainant claims to have several domain names associating the two trademarks with a hyphen, including but not limited to:

<migso-pcubed.net>  
<migso-pcubed.org>  
<migso-pcubed.fr>  
<migso-pcubed.au>  
<migso-pcubed.ca>  
<migso-pcubed.cn>  
<migso-pcubed.co.uk>  
<migso-pcubed.de>  
<migso-pcubed.es>  
<migso-pcubed.hk>  
<migso-pcubed.it>

The Complainant's rights largely predate the registration of the disputed domain name <migso-pcurbed.com>, which was registered on August 22, 2024.

As evidenced in Annex 14, the Complainant tried to resolve this dispute outside of this administrative proceeding by sending a cease-and-desist letter to the Respondent in May 2024 but did not receive a reply.

The disputed domain name resolves to a Registrar's parking page.

#### **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 claims that the disputed domain name is made up of the registered trademarks MI-GSO and PCUBED with the only addition of the letter “r” in the middle of the second trademark and that these trademarks are separated by a hyphen and followed by the generic Top-Level-Domain (“gTLD”) extension “.com”.

The Complainant also contends that the disputed domain name fully incorporates both MI-GSO and PCUBED, trademarks which are owned by the Complainant and by companies belonging to the same holding group and which are often combined for use in their domain names. In particular, the Complainant contends that the addition of the letter “r” between “p” and “cubed” is a typical example of typosquatting. The Complainant alleges that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the disputed domain name, nor is related in any way to the Complainant.

More specifically, the Complainant states that the Respondent is not commonly known under the name PCUBED, MI-GSO, MIGSO or MIGSOPCUBED and/or that the Respondent is not the owner of any MIGSO or PCUBED trademark. The Complainant expressly indicated that the disputed domain name resolves to an inactive website.

The Complainant tried to resolve this dispute outside of this administrative proceeding by sending a cease-and-desist letter to the Respondent in May 2024 but did not receive a reply.

## **B. Respondent**

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

## **6. Discussion and Findings**

According to paragraph 4(a) of the Policy, for this Complaint to succeed in relation to the disputed domain name, the Complainant must prove each of the following, namely that:

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

### **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 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 Panel finds the marks MI-GSO and PCUBED are recognizable within the disputed domain name. Accordingly, the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to the marks for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 1.7. The typosquatting practice of adding a letter in between the word “pcubed” to read “prcubed” does not prevent this Panel to conclude that the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to the Complainant’s trademark under [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 1.9.

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.

Currently, the Respondent is passively holding the disputed domain name by directing users to a parked page and, therefore, this Panel considers that the Respondent is not making any legitimate noncommercial or fair use of disputed domain name.

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 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 such connection, the Complainant has submitted evidence to support that the Complainant’s trademarks were registered and used before the Respondent registered the disputed domain name. When registering the disputed domain name, the Respondent has targeted the Complainant’s trademarks to create confusion among Internet users and benefit from the Complainant’s reputation. Therefore, the Panel is satisfied that the Respondent must have been aware of the Complainant and the Complainant’s trademarks when it registered the disputed domain name.

The Complainant has submitted evidence that the Respondent’s disputed domain name resolves to a registrar parking page. In this regard, 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.

Having reviewed the available record, the Panel notes the distinctiveness or reputation of the Complainant’s trademark, and the composition of the disputed domain name comprising two of the Complainant’s trademarks with a typo and finds that in the circumstances of this case the passive holding of the disputed domain name does not prevent a finding of bad faith under the Policy.

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 <migso-pcurbed.com> be transferred to the Complainant.

*/Iris Quadrio/*

**Iris Quadrio**

Sole Panelist

Date: August 22, 2025