

## **ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION**

Bureau Veritas v. Sunny Chung, gingerkittyfriday  
Case No. D2025-3045

### **1. The Parties**

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

Respondent is Sunny Chung, gingerkittyfriday, Taiwan Province of China.

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

The disputed domain name <bureauveritastaiwan.com> (the “Domain Name”) 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 31, 2025. On July 31, 2025, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the Domain Name. On July 31, 2025, the Registrar transmitted by email to the Center its verification response disclosing registrant and contact information for the Domain Name which differed from named Respondent (Unknown (redacted for privacy)) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to Complainant on August 5, 2025, providing the registrant and contact information disclosed by the Registrar, and inviting Complainant to submit an amendment to the Complaint. Complainant filed an amended Complaint on August 6, 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 Respondent of the Complaint, and the proceedings commenced on August 8, 2025. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was August 28, 2025. Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified Respondent’s default on September 3, 2025.

The Center appointed Clive L. Elliott K.C. as the sole panelist in this matter on September 10, 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

Complainant was founded in 1828 and is one of the leaders in testing, inspection and certification (TICS) services. Complainant, together with its subsidiaries (the Group), employs over 82,000 people in more than 1,600 offices and laboratories worldwide. In 2024, Complainant announced the opening of a new laboratory in Taiwan Province of China.

Complainant is the registered owner of a large number of BUREAU VERITAS (Complainant's Mark), word and complex marks worldwide, including, but not limited to the following:

Mark	Jurisdiction	Registration No	Registration Date	Classes
BUREAU VERITAS	European Union	004518544	June 1, 2006	38, 42
	European Union	007282651	April 16, 2009	9, 35, 36, 37, 38, 39, 40, 41, 42, 43, 44, 45
	European Union	005927711	February 6, 2008	42
BUREAU VERITAS	Taiwan Province of China	01685893	January 1, 2015	41, 42
	Taiwan Province of China	01311837	May 16, 1997	41, 42

According to the publicly available WhoIs the Domain Name was registered on July 25, 2025, and resolves to an inactive WordPress page.

#### 5. Parties' Contentions

##### A. Complainant

Complainant contends that it has satisfied each of the elements required under the Policy for a transfer of the Domain Name.

Notably, Complainant contends that the Domain Name is confusingly similar to Complainant's Mark as it contains Complainant's Mark in its entirety together with the geographical word "taiwan". Complainant asserts that even though the two terms making up Complainant's Mark are linked it has no effect on their visual, aural and conceptual perception by the public and they remain identifiable and understandable by the public who will read them as "bureau veritas". Therefore, Complainant submits that there is a clear risk of confusion and association for the public who might believe that the Domain Name belongs to Complainant or is a declaration of its domain name for the services rendered in Taiwan.

Complainant goes on to state that the Domain Name has been registered fraudulently by Respondent, who is not an employee of Complainant nor linked with Complainant in any way. Complainant is of the belief that Respondent is making unlawful and unfair use of the Domain Name with the intention of diverting customers by creating confusion and thus tarnishing Complainant's Marks and damaging Complainant's image and reputation.

Complainant advises that in a similar UDRP decision, where the domain name "bureauveritasindia.com" included Complainant's Mark together with a geographical name "india", and a transfer to Complainant was ordered. See *Bureau Veritas (Société Anonyme) v. KUNCHLA RAO*, WIPO Case No. [D2025-0112](#).

## **B. Respondent**

Respondent did not reply to Complainant's contentions.

## **6. Discussion and Findings**

### **A. Identical or Confusingly Similar**

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 Complainant's Mark and the Domain Name. WIPO Overview of WIPO Panel Views on Selected UDRP Questions, Third Edition ("[WIPO Overview 3.0](#)"), section 1.7.

Complainant has made extensive use of and registered Complainant's Mark. Complainant has shown rights in respect of a trade mark or service mark for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 1.2.1.

Complainant's Mark is wholly incorporated within the Domain Name. The Domain Name differs only to the extent of the addition of the word "taiwan" at the end of the Domain Name. The Panel finds that the Domain Name is confusingly similar to the mark for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 1.8.

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 Respondent may demonstrate rights or legitimate interests in a 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 respondent lacks rights or legitimate interests, the burden of production on this element shifts to respondent to come forward with relevant evidence demonstrating rights or legitimate interests in the Domain Name (although the burden of proof always remains on complainant). If respondent fails to come forward with such relevant evidence, complainant is deemed to have satisfied the second element. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 2.1.

The Panel finds Complainant has established a prima facie case that Respondent lacks rights or legitimate interests in the Domain Name. Respondent has not challenged Complainant's prima facie showing and has not provided an argument or relevant evidence demonstrating rights or legitimate interests in the Domain Name, such as those enumerated in the Policy or otherwise.

In the present case, Complainant asserts that the public will read and understand the parts of the Domain Name together as "bureau veritas" and that there is a clear risk of confusion and association for the public who might believe that the Domain Name belongs to Complainant or is a declaration of its domain name for the services rendered in Taiwan Province of China, a region in which it has a commercial presence.

Based on the above submission and in the absence of any explanation from Respondent, the Panel finds that the registration and use of the Domain Name in this manner carries a real risk of the Domain Name being used to impersonate Complainant or at least to create the impression of some form of association, contrary to the fact. In this regard, the composition of the Domain Name, incorporating Complainant's Mark, albeit with an additional geographic term, gives rise to a risk of implied affiliation. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 2.5.1.

Accordingly, 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 notes that the composition of the Domain Name, incorporating Complainant's Mark in its entirety, but with a geographic term added, suggests Respondent knew of and sought to take advantage of Complainant's Mark when registering and using the Domain Name. That is, particularly given that Complainant announced the opening of a new laboratory in Taiwan Province of China in 2024, prior to the registration of the Domain Name.

Respondent has failed to explain why it chose to register the Domain Name a year after the above announcement, and in light of Complainant's substantial international reputation. Absent such explanation, the Panel considers that there is a significant risk that Internet users visiting the Domain Name will be misled or deceived, falsely assuming a connection with Complainant.

The Domain Name does not resolve to an active website. In light of the above, the Panel finds that the passive holding of the Domain Name does not prevent a finding of bad faith. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 3.3.

The Panel finds that 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 Domain Name <bureauveritastaiwan.com> be transferred to Complainant.

*/Clive L. Elliott K.C./*

**Clive L. Elliott K.C.**

Sole Panelist

Date: September 26, 2025