ARBITRATION
AND
MEDIATION CENTER

WIPO
WORLD
INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY
ORGANIZATION

# ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION
Accenture Global Services Limited v. wan muhammad shafiq wan zulkifle, Name Redacted
Case No. D2025-3107

## 1. The Parties

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

The Respondent is wan muhammad shafiq wan zulkifle, Name Redacted.[1]

## 2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <acenturenetworks.com> is registered with Wix.com Ltd. (the "Registrar").

## 3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the "Center") on August 5, 2025. On August 5, 2025, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On August 8, 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 (DT)) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on August 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 August 11, 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").

[1] The Respondent appears to have used the company name of a third party when registering the disputed domain name. In light of the potential identity theft, the Panel has redacted the Respondent organization name from this Decision. However, the Panel has attached as Annex 1 to this Decision an instruction to the Registrar regarding transfer of the disputed domain name, which includes the Respondent organization name. The Panel has authorized the Center to transmit Annex 1 to the Registrar as part of the order in these proceedings and has indicated Annex 1 to this Decision shall not be published due to the exceptional circumstances of this case. *See Banco Bradesco S.A. v. FAST 12785241 Attn. Bradescourgente.net / Name Redacted*, WIPO Case No. D2009-1788.

In accordance with the Rules, paragraphs 2 and 4, the Center formally notified the Respondent of the Complaint, and the proceedings commenced on August 11, 2025. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was August 31, 2025. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent's default on September 1, 2025.

The Center appointed Simone Huser as the sole panelist in this matter on September 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 is an international business that provides a broad range of services and solutions in strategy, consulting, digital, technology and operations. The Complainant began using the mark ACCENTURE in connection with various services, including management and marketing consulting, technology services and outsourcing services, on January 1, 2001. The Complainant has offices and operations in more than 200 cities in 49 countries.

The Complainant holds the domain name <accenture.com> which hosts its main website.

The Complainant owns numerous trademark registrations in several jurisdictions, including:

- ACCENTURE, U.S. Trademark registration No. 3091811, registered on May 16, 2006, in international classes 9, 16, 35, 36, 37, 41, and 42; and

- accenture, International Trademark registration No. 828118, registered on February 24, 2004, in international classes 9, 16, 18, 25, 28, 35, 36, 37, 41, 42, and 45.

The disputed domain name was registered on February 25, 2025.

According to the evidence submitted with the Complaint, the disputed domain name resolves to a website where consulting and strategy services are advertised under the mark "Accenture Network".

## 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 as follows:

The disputed domain name is confusingly similar to the ACCENTURE trademark in which the Complainant has rights, because it is comprised of a misspelling of the ACCENTURE trademark (missing only the second letter "c") paired with the descriptive term "networks", which is not sufficient to prevent a finding of confusing similarity.

The Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the disputed domain name. The trademark ACCENTURE has been extensively used to identify the Complainant and its services. The Respondent has not been authorized by the Complainant to use this trademark, is not commonly known by the disputed domain name, and there is no evidence of the Respondent's use, or demonstrable preparation to use, the disputed domain name in connection with a bona fide offering of goods and services.

The disputed domain name was registered in bad faith because it is obvious that the Respondent had knowledge of both the Complainant and its well-known trademark ACCENTURE at the time it registered the disputed domain name.

The Respondent is using the disputed domain name in bad faith, by purporting to offer the same or similar services as the Complainant and trying to pass itself off as the Complainant.

**B. Respondent**

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

## 6. Discussion and Findings

According to paragraph 4(a) of the Policy, in order to succeed, a complainant must establish each of the following elements:

(i) the disputed domain name is identical or confusingly similar to the trademark or service mark in which the complainant has rights;
(ii) the respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the disputed domain name; and
(iii) the disputed domain name has been 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 omission of the letter "c" in the disputed domain name is considered a misspelling of the Complainant's mark and does not prevent a finding of confusing similarity under the Policy. WIPO Overview 3.0, section 1.9. Although the addition of other terms, such as here "networks", may bear on assessment of the second and third elements, the Panel finds that in the present case the addition of such terms 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 1.8.

The addition of the generic Top-Level Domain ("gTLD") ".com" in the disputed domain name is a standard registration requirement and as such may be disregarded under the confusing similarity test under the Policy, paragraph 4(a)(i). See WIPO Overview 3.0, section 1.11.1.

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.

Panels have held that the use of a domain name for illegitimate activity, such as impersonation/passing off, can never confer rights or legitimate interests on a respondent. WIPO Overview 3.0, section 2.13.1.

Having reviewed the available record, the Panel finds that 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 notes that the disputed domain name resolves to a website featuring products and services that are the same as the Complainant's products and services, the website is allegedly operated by "Accenture Network" without disclosing its lack of relationship to the Complainant. The Panel also notes that the Complainant's trademark ACCENTURE is correctly reproduced on the website under the disputed domain name, i.e., without the missing second letter "c".

Based on the available record, 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.

In the view of the Panel, noting that that the Complainant's trademark rights predate the registration of the disputed domain name and considering that the Complainant's trademark is well known and that the disputed domain name resolves to a website featuring the Complainant's trademark ACCENTURE, it is inconceivable that the Respondent could have registered the disputed domain name without knowledge of the Complainant's trademark. In the circumstances of this case, this is evidence of registration in bad faith.

Moreover, Panels have held that the use of a domain name for illegitimate activity, here claimed impersonation/passing off, constitutes bad faith. WIPO Overview 3.0, section 3.4.

In the view of the Panel, the impression given by the website under the disputed domain name would cause Internet users to believe that the Respondent is somehow associated with the Complainant when, in fact, it is not. The Panel holds that by using the disputed domain name, the Respondent has intentionally attempted to attract, for commercial gain, Internet users to its website, by creating a likelihood of confusion with the Complainant's mark as to the source, sponsorship, affiliation, or endorsement of its website in the sense of Policy, paragraph 4(b)(iv).

Noting the distinctiveness and reputation of the Complainant's trademark and the failure of the Respondent to submit a response, the Panel finds the Respondent's registration and use of the disputed domain name constitutes 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 <acenturenetworks.com> be transferred to the Complainant.

*/Simone Huser/*
**Simone Huser**
Sole Panelist
Date: September 22, 2025