

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

Accenture Global Services Limited v. aaron woodson
Case No. D2025-3085

1. The Parties

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

The Respondent is aaron woodson, United States of America.

2. The Domain Names and Registrars

The disputed domain name <aisvaccenture.com> is registered with Dynadot Inc.

The disputed domain name <svaccentureapp.com> is registered with NameSilo, LLC (the “Registrars”).

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the “Center”) on August 2, 2025. On August 4, 2025, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrars a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain names. On August 4, and 7, 2025, the Registrars transmitted by email to the Center their verification responses disclosing registrant and contact information for the disputed domain names, which differed from the named Respondent (REDACTED FOR PRIVACY and PrivacyGuardian.org) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on August 11, 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 August 19, 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 August 27, 2025. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was September 16, 2025. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent’s default on September 17, 2025.

The Center appointed Syed Naqiz Shahabuddin as the sole panelist in this matter on September 26, 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 following summary sets out the uncontested factual submission made by the Complainant:

4.1 The Complainant is a multinational corporation practising under the style and mark ACCENTURE (the “Trademark”) with offices and operations in more than 200 cities in 49 countries.

4.2 The Complainant has used and continues to use the Trademark since January 2001 in connection with various services and specialties, including, inter alia, management consulting and business process services, which comprise various aspects of business operations such as supply chain and logistics services, technology services and outsourcing services as well as services pertaining to generative artificial intelligence.

4.3 The Trademark is a coined term and the Complainant owns more than 1,000 registrations for the Trademark and variations thereof in more than 140 jurisdictions. The following table includes a sample of registrations of the Trademark by the Complainant (whether on its own or through its related or associated company) in selected jurisdictions:

Jurisdiction	Mark	Registration Number	Date of Registration	Classification of Goods / Services
United States of America	ACCENTURE	3,091,811	May 16, 2006	9, 16, 35, 36, 37, 41, and 42
United States of America	ACCENTURE	7,266,256	January 9, 2024	9, 35,36, 37, 41, and 42
India	ACCENTURE	1084149	September 29, 2003	35, 36, 37, 41, and 42
Pakistan	ACCENTURE	460590	June 5, 2017	41

4.4 The Complainant also registered the <accenture.com> domain name on August 30, 2000. At this website, Internet users can find detailed information about the management consulting, technology services, outsourcing and myriad other services offered by the Complainant and its global offices in connection with the Trademark.

4.5 The Trademark has been advertised in connection with various media and has been written about in the press. The annual advertising expenditure worldwide since 2009 - 2025 (as of March 2025) is more than USD 1.17 billion.

4.6 Reputable brand consulting companies in the industry have recognized the Trademark as a leading global brand. The Trademark has been recognized and ranked highly in Interbrand's *Best Global Brands Report* since 2002, *BrandZ – Top 100 Brand Rankings* since 2006 and Brand Finance in its *2024 Global 500*.

4.7 The Complainant has also been recognized and awarded for its business services and brand recognition. For the past 22 years, it has been listed in the Fortune Global 500, which ranks the world's largest companies. In addition, the Complainant has appeared in various other top rankings by Fortune, including FORTUNE Most Powerful Women, FORTUNE 100 Best Companies to Work For, FORTUNE World's Most Admired, FORTUNE World's Most Ethical Companies, Corporate Knights Global 100, PEOPLE Magazine and Great Place to Work's 100 Companies that Care, Climate Change "A List", Working Mother's 100 Best Companies - Hall of Fame, and Refinitiv Global Diversity & Inclusion Index.

4.8 The Complainant supports numerous social development projects worldwide in connection with the Trademark including, but not limited to, its Skills to Succeed initiative, which has equipped more than 7.5 million people around the world with the skills to find a job or build a business.

4.9 The Complainant also actively participates in various sporting and cultural events. The Complainant has been a proud partner of the PGA Tour Championship since 2022 and has collaborated with the Louvre Museum and the Cannes Lions Festival of Creativity on its programmes and initiatives.

4.10 The Respondent registered the disputed domain names on June 11, 2025, over 24 years after the Complainant first used the Trademark in commerce.

4.11 The Respondent is neither affiliated with the Complainant, nor has it been licensed or permitted to use the Trademark or any domain name incorporating the Trademark.

4.12 The disputed domain names resolve to websites with identical looking webpages. These webpages display the Trademark and the Complainant's logo in the upper left corner of a login page. Neither the websites nor the login pages are authorized by the Complainant.

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 names.

Notably, the Complainant contends, *inter alia*, as follows:

5.1 The Complainant asserts that the Trademark is distinctive, is a well-known trademark that is used globally and that the disputed domain names are identical or confusingly similar to the Trademark for the following reasons:

(a) the addition of the ".com" generic Top-Level Domain ("gTLD") is insufficient to distinguish the disputed domain names from the Trademark.

(b) the Trademark is the most distinctive element in the disputed domain names and the addition of the random letters "ai", and/or "sv", and/or "app" do not change that fact and would instead cause Internet users to be confused as to whether an association exists between the disputed domain names and the Complainant.

5.2 The Complainant further contends that the Respondent does not have any rights or legitimate interests to the disputed domain names because:

(a) the Respondent is not commonly known by the disputed domain names, nor was it validly known as such prior to the dates on which the Respondent registered the disputed domain names.

(b) the Respondent had not made any demonstrable preparations to use the disputed domain names in connection with a bona fide offering of goods or services.

(c) the Respondent is not using the disputed domain names for a noncommercial or fair use, without intent for commercial gain, but to misleadingly divert consumers or to tarnish the Trademark.

(d) the Trademark is a coined term and is not a generic or descriptive term in which the Respondent might have an interest. The Trademark is globally famous and has acquired secondary meaning through the Complainant's substantial, continuous, and exclusive use in connection with the Complainant's goods and services.

(e) the Respondent is trying to pass itself off as the Complainant by displaying the Complainant's logo on the websites resolved by the disputed domain names and purporting to offer a log-in page or resource associated with the Complainant. This is an attempt to get Internet users to log-in to its websites under false pretenses for fraudulent purposes.

5.3 The Complainant further contends that the Respondent registered and uses the disputed domain names in bad faith and relies on the following:

(a) the Respondent had constructive notice that the Trademark was a registered trademark in many jurisdictions worldwide given the Complainant's global reputation and the ubiquitous presence of the Trademark on the Internet.

(b) the Respondent uses the disputed domain names to mislead Internet users who are searching for the Complainant to the Respondent's websites instead, where the Respondent holds itself out as the Complainant or as associated with the Complainant. This act of passing off disrupts the Complainant's business and is conducted in bad faith.

(c) the Respondent intentionally attempted to attract for commercial gain Internet users to its websites by creating a likelihood of confusion with the Trademark as to the source, sponsorship, affiliation or endorsement of the websites.

(d) the Respondent did not register the disputed domain names to actually offer services but, instead, registered and is using the disputed domain names for the bad-faith purpose of intentionally misleading the public to believe that the Respondent is associated or affiliated with the Complainant.

(e) given the well-known status of the Trademark, there is no reason for the Respondent to have registered the disputed domain names other than to ride on the reputation and goodwill of the Trademark.

B. Respondent

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

6. Discussion and Findings

In order to succeed in its Complaint, the Complainant is required to establish the following elements set out under paragraph 4(a) of the Policy:

(a) that the disputed domain names are identical or confusingly similar to a trademark or service mark in which the Complainant has rights; and

(b) that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interest in respect of the disputed domain names; and

(c) that the disputed domain names have been registered and are 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 is satisfied with the evidence adduced by the Complainant of various international registrations of the Trademark as well as marketing and business activities and initiatives over the course of many years to build the reputation and goodwill of the Trademark at an international level.

The Panel finds that the entirety of the mark is recognizable within the disputed domain names. Although the addition of other characters here, "aisv", "sv" and "app", and the use of the gTLD ".com" may bear on assessment of the second and third elements, the Panel finds that neither the addition of such terms nor the use of the gTLD prevents a finding of confusing similarity between the disputed domain names and the Trademark for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 1.8 and 1.11.1.

Accordingly, the disputed domain names are confusingly similar to the Trademark 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.

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 names. 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 names such as those enumerated in the Policy or otherwise.

The Complainant has clearly stated that it has not authorized the Respondent in any way to use the Trademark or to register the disputed domain names. The Complainant has also denied any affiliation or association with the Respondent.

The additional terms or characters in the disputed domain names when used in conjunction with the Trademark do not appear to suggest any alternative, secondary or generic meaning in the English language.

Also noting the findings under the third prong of the Policy, 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.

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.

Past panels often cite paragraph 4(b)(iv) as one of the circumstances to substantiate evidence of bad faith registration and use. Paragraph 4(b)(iv) of the Policy provides that where a respondent intentionally attempts to attract, for commercial gain, Internet users to its website or other on-line 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, then this would justify a finding of bad faith.

The Panel is cognizant of the goodwill attached to the Trademark. This often leads to attempts to hijack or to ride and usurp the goodwill attached thereto by third parties unconnected to the Complainant. The evidence adduced by the Complainant suggests that the Respondent intended to do so. This includes the following factors:

- (a) the date of registration of the disputed domain names which were long after the Trademark was registered and acquired distinctiveness and global appeal;
- (b) the inclusion of the Trademark in its entirety in the disputed domain names;
- (c) the manner in which the Respondent uses the disputed domain names to redirect to websites which display the Complainant's Trademark and logo and purportedly provides a log-in access.

Having reviewed the record, therefore, the Panel finds the Respondent's registration and use of the disputed domain names constitute 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 names <aisvaccenture.com> and <svaccentureapp.com> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Syed Naqiz Shahabuddin/

Syed Naqiz Shahabuddin

Sole Panelist

Date: October 8, 2025