

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

Bureau Veritas v. Waseem Khan, Saipem
Case No. D2025-2850

1. The Parties

The Complainant is Bureau Veritas, France, represented by Denнемeyer & Associates SAS, France.

The Respondent is Waseem Khan, Saipem, Saudi Arabia.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <bureauviretas.com> is registered with NameCheap, Inc. (the “Registrar”).

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the “Center”) on July 18, 2025. On July 18, 2025, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On July 18, 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 July 24, 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 the same date.

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 31, 2025. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was August 20, 2025. The Respondent sent an email communication to the Center on July 28, 2025.

The Center appointed Miguel B. O'Farrell as the sole panelist in this matter on September 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 Bureau Veritas was founded in 1828 and is one of the leaders in testing, inspection and certification (TICS) services with several subsidiaries. The Group employs over 82,000 people in more than 1,600 offices and laboratories worldwide. The Complainant helps its clients improve their performance by offering services and innovative solutions to ensure that their assets, products, infrastructures and processes meet standards and regulations in respect of quality, health and safety, environmental protection and social responsibility.

The Complainant owns several trademark registrations for or including BUREAU VERITAS in many jurisdictions, including the following.

European Union Trademark Registration No. 004518544 filed on June 30, 2005, and registered on June 1, 2006, renewed on June 6, 2025, to designate services in classes 38 and 42,

European Union Trademark Registration No. 007282651 filed on October 2, 2008, registered on April 16, 2009, and renewed on July 4, 2018, in class 42 and

European Union Trademark Registration No. 005927711 filed on May 11, 2007, and registered on February 6, 2008, renewed on April 24, 2017, for services in class 42.

The Complainant is the owner of these trademarks in most countries in the world.

The corporate website domain name of the Complainant is constructed identically as the disputed domain name with no space between the two terms "bureau" and "veritas" ("www.group.bureauveritas.com/fr/group"), as are its national websites ("www.bureauveritas.fr"; "www.bureauveritas.de"; "www.bureauveritas.jp" and others which may be viewed at "www.bureauveritas.fr/place-locator".

The disputed domain name was registered on May 5, 2025, and resolved to a webpage offering services similar to those offered by the Complainant showing the Complainant's logo and trademarks without authorization.

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 reproduces the verbal elements "bureau" and "veritas" that constitute the Complainant's aforementioned trademarks. The inversion of the vowels "e" and "i" in the word "veritas" has no effect on the imitation of the Complainant's earlier trademarks since it does not affect the visual and phonetic similarities or the public's perception of it. There is a clear risk of confusion in the public mind.

The inversion of the letters of the domain name was done solely to deceive the public and the Complainant's customers. This is a clear typo squatting as recently set forth in other cases on similar domain names involving the Complainant. Notably <bureauevritas.com>, in *Bureau Veritas v. Adriaan Johan Nigrini*, WIPO Case No. [D2024-0788](#) dated April 8, 2024; <bureauverietas.com> in *Bureau Veritas v. Ryan Manning*, WIPO Case No. [D2024-2083](#) dated July 8, 2024; and <bureauveritass.com> in *Bureau Veritas v. KUNCHLA RAO*, WIPO Case No. [D2024-3586](#) dated October 25, 2024.

The Complainant is frequently the victim of such acts, given the number of rulings handed down on domain names that reproduced its trademarks with slight variations in order to take advantage of its reputation and mislead the public or its customers. Therefore, the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to the Complainant's trademarks and there is a clear risk of confusion and association for the public who might think that the disputed domain name belongs to the Complainant or is a declination of its domain name <bureauveritas.com>.

The disputed domain name refers to a copy of the Complainant's website with the reproduction of its trademarks BUREAU VERITAS. It leads the public to believe that the disputed domain name is linked to the Complainant and that it also provides certification services in the field of engineering and construction. The links to this website are inactive.

The Complainant requests the Panel to issue a decision ordering the transfer of the disputed domain name to the Complainant.

B. Respondent

The Respondent did not formally reply to the Complainant's contentions, however, sent an email on July 28, 2025, indicating that its account with the Registrar has been suspended and requesting access to a backup of the content associated with the suspended account.

6. Discussion and Findings

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 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](#), sections 1.7 and 1.9.

The Panel considers that the inversion of the vowels "e" and "i" in the word "veritas" of 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 1.9.

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.

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.

The Panel is satisfied that the Respondent must have been aware of the Complainant’s business and trademarks BUREAU VERITAS mentioned in section 4 above. Also, the Respondent must have been aware of the Complainant’s websites to which its domain names resolve to when it registered the disputed domain name on May 5, 2025. By that time, the Complainant had registered and used the trademark BUREAU VERITAS for many years.

By registering the disputed domain name, the Respondent was targeting the Complainant and its business by incorporating the Complainant’s trademark BUREAU VERITAS with the small modification of inverting the letters “e” and “i” in the disputed domain name.

The fact that there is a clear absence of rights or legitimate interests coupled with no explanation for the Respondent’s choice of the disputed domain name and the nature of the disputed domain name, are indicative of bad faith (as stated in section 3.2.1 of the [WIPO Overview 3.0](#)).

The Complainant has proven that the website to which the disputed domain name resolves purportedly offered services similar to those offered by the Complainant and included the Complainant’s trademarks and logo, which leads Internet users to mistakenly think that the website is an official website of the Complainant and thereby the Respondent may capitalize on the prestige of the trademark BUREAU VERITAS for its own monetary benefit.

The Panel finds that the Respondent registered and is using the disputed domain name in bad faith and that the requirements of paragraph 4(a)(iii) of the Policy have been fulfilled.

Therefore, 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 <bureauviretas.com> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Miguel B. O'Farrell/

Miguel B. O'Farrell

Sole Panelist

September 12, 2025