

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

IPSOS v. Alberto Scoccianti

Case No. D2025-2652

1. The Parties

The Complainant is IPSOS, France, represented by NOVAGRAAF FRANCE, France.

The Respondent is Alberto Scoccianti, Italy.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <ipsos-bva.com> 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 July 7, 2025. On July 7, 2025, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On July 7, 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 (unknown) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on July 8, 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 8, 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 9, 2025. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was July 29, 2025. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent’s default on July 30, 2025.

The Center appointed Delia-Mihaela Belciu as the sole panelist in this matter on August 4, 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, founded in 1975, is a large market research, surveys, and marketing company, present in more than 90 countries, having more than 17,000 employees all around the world, with a turnover of more than 2,440.8 millions of euros in 2024, and with more than 5 000 clients.

On March 31, 2025, the Complainant has officially announced that such has entered into exclusive negotiations to acquire the company BVA, acquisition finalized on June 24, 2025, as per the information available in the file.

The Complainant is the owner of the following IPSOS trademarks:

- the European Union trademark No. 005583621 for IPSOS, registered on January 10, 2008, for services in classes 35, 41, and 42;
- the European Union trademark No. 018161418 for IPSOS, registered on May 22, 2020, for goods and services in classes 9, 16, 35, 41, and 42.

The Complainant owns a domain name reflecting its IPSOS trademark, namely <ipsos.com> registered since May 27, 1998.

The company BVA acquired by the Complainant on June 24, 2025, as per the information available in the file, is the owner of the following BVA trademark:

- the European Union trademark No. 000679142 for BVA, registered on January 24, 2001, for services in classes 35, 41, and 42.

The disputed domain name <ipsos-bva.com> was registered on April 1, 2025, and resolved at the time when the Complaint was filed to a contact page displaying the marks IPSOS and BVA.

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:

- (i) the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to the Complainant's IPSOS mark as well as to the BVA mark belonging to the BVA company, acquired by the Complainant on June 24, 2025, as it contains both marks IPSOS and BVA in their entirety, separated by a dash;
- (ii) the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the disputed domain name for a number of reasons, among which that, (1) the Complainant has never agreed to the registration of the disputed domain name, (2) the Respondent is not related to the Complainant, has no link with the Complainant's activity and was not authorized by the Complainant in any manner, (3) the Complainant is a large market research, surveys, and marketing company which could not have been ignored by the Respondent when

registering the disputed domain name, moreover as one day before the registration of the disputed domain name, the Complainant has officially announced that such has entered into exclusive negotiations to acquire the company BVA, (4) the Respondent has no prior rights regarding the marks IPSOS-BVA nor IPSOS BVA, (5) according to the Complainant's trademark search regarding the terms IPSOS BVA and IPSOS-BVA, no trademark corresponding to these terms has been identified;

(iii) the disputed domain name was registered and is being used in bad faith for a number of reasons, among which that, (1) the Complainant's IPSOS trademark is a notorious trademark, (2) the full reproduction of the IPSOS mark within the disputed domain name, term which has no meaning, is distinctive, and enjoys a certain reputation, clearly demonstrates, in the Complainant's view, the bad faith of the Respondent who registered the disputed domain name to take advantage of the Complainant's reputation, (3) the disputed domain name resolves to a contact page displaying the marks IPSOS and BVA, (4) the disputed domain name was registered one day after the Complainant has officially announced that such has entered into exclusive negotiations to acquire the company BVA, owner of the BVA trademark.

B. Respondent

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

6. Discussion and Findings

In order for the Complainant to succeed, such must prove, according to paragraph 4(a) of the Policy, that:

- (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 has no rights or legitimate interests with respect to the disputed domain name; and
- (iii) the disputed domain name has been registered and is being used in bad faith.

In case all three elements above have been fulfilled, the Panel is able to grant the remedy requested by the Complainant. Thus, the Panel will deal with each of the requirements in turn.

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 that the entirety of the Complainant's IPSOS mark is reproduced within the disputed domain name with the addition of a second mark BVA, which belongs to a company acquired by the Complainant, as per the information available in the file, separated by a dash. Accordingly, the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to the mark for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), sections 1.7 and 4.13.

In what concerns the addition of the generic Top-Level Domain ("gTLD") ".com" in relation to the disputed domain name, such is viewed as a standard registration requirement, and is disregarded under the first element confusing similarity test. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 1.11.1.

Based on the available record, the Panel finds that 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.

Thus, based on the available evidence, the Respondent does not appear to be commonly known by the name “ipsos bva”, is not affiliated with the Complainant, nor has the Complainant’s authorization to use the IPSOS mark.

The disputed domain name incorporates in their entirety the Complainant’s IPSOS mark, as well as the BVA mark, which belongs to a company acquired by the Complainant, as per the information available in the file.

It must be underlined that, based on the available record, the Complainant has officially announced that such has entered into exclusive negotiations to acquire the company BVA one day before the registration date of the disputed domain name, acquisition finalized on June 24, 2025.

Therefore, the composition of the disputed domain name, incorporating the Complainant’s IPSOS mark with the addition of the BVA mark belonging to the company acquired by the Complainant, separated by a dash, might lead to confusion for Internet users and as such, carries a risk of implied affiliation with the Complainant, its activity and the BVA company acquired by such. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 2.5.1.

All the above does not amount to a bona fide offering of goods or services, or to a legitimate noncommercial or fair use of the disputed domain name.

Based on the available record, the Panel 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.

In the present case, the Panel notes that the Complainant’s rights in the IPSOS mark, as well as of the BVA mark belonging to the company acquired by the Complainant, predate the registration date of the disputed domain name.

In light of the above as well as of the distinctive character of the IPSOS mark, the Panel finds that it is not conceivable that the Respondent registered the disputed domain name without knowledge of the Complainant's IPSOS mark, as well as of the official announcement made by the Complainant one day before the registration of the disputed domain name regarding the fact that such has entered into exclusive negotiations to acquire the company BVA, which supports a finding of bad faith registration.

[WIPO Overview 3.0](#), sections 3.2.1 and 3.2.2.

Moreover, the disputed domain name resolved at the time when the Complaint was filed to a contact page displaying both marks IPSOS and BVA. Panels have held that the use of a domain name for illegal activity, as in this case in relation to impersonation/passing off of the Complainant together with its new acquired BVA company, constitutes bad faith. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 3.4.

Having reviewed the record, the Panel finds the Respondent's registration and use of the disputed domain name constitutes bad faith under the Policy and 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 <ipsos-bva.com> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Delia-Mihaela Belciu/

Delia-Mihaela Belciu

Sole Panelist

Date: August 18, 2025