

## **ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION**

Accenture Global Services Limited v. Hermila Layne  
Case No. D2025-3386

### **1. The Parties**

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

The Respondent is Hermila Layne, United States of America.

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

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

### **3. Procedural History**

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the “Center”) on August 22, 2025. On August 22, 2025, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On August 22, 2025, the Registrar transmitted by email to the Center its verification response confirming that the Respondent is listed as the registrant and providing the contact details.

The Center verified that the 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 Christelle Vaval as the sole panelist in this matter on September 29, 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 a company operating in multiple jurisdictions, with offices and business activities in more than 200 cities across 49 countries. It provides a broad range of services and solutions in the areas of strategy, consulting, digital, and technology, including services related to generative artificial intelligence (AI).

The Complainant has used the trademark ACCENTURE since January 1, 2001, and has registered it in multiple jurisdictions, including the United States of America (Registration No. 3,091,811, registered on May 16, 2006), India (Registration No. 373189, registered on November 1, 1993), and Egypt (Registration No. 138274, registered on April 17, 2007).

The Respondent registered the disputed domain name <svaiaccenture.com> on July 3, 2025, over 20 years after Complainant first used its trademark. The disputed domain name webpage displays Complainant's logo in the upper left corner of a login screen.

#### **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:

##### **1. Identical or confusingly similar**

The Complainant asserts that its trademark is distinctive and well-known globally. That its trademark is not distinctive or generic but rather, comprised of a coined term. That its trademark is the distinctive element of the disputed domain name. That the addition of the letters "sv" and "ai" should not confer distinctiveness. The letters "A" and "I" stand for Artificial Intelligence. Therefore, Internet users will likely be confused whether an association exists between the disputed domain name and the Complainant.

##### **2. No rights or legitimate interests**

The Complainant's trademark is globally well known and has acquired secondary meaning through its exclusive and continuous use. The Whois information for the disputed domain name does not provide any valid registrant details.

The Respondent is not commonly known by the disputed domain name. Moreover, the disputed domain name <svaiaccenture.com> resolves to a seemingly fraudulent website in the Swedish language that displays the Complainant's ACCENTURE trademark and logo in the upper left corner of the login page.

The disputed domain name is neither authorized by nor associated with the Complainant. The Respondent is attempting to pass off its services as those of the Complainant in order to mislead Internet users through dishonest impersonation.

### **3. Registered and used in bad faith**

Given the Complainant's worldwide reputation and the widespread presence of the ACCENTURE trademark on the Internet, combined with the display of the Complainant's trademark on the disputed website, it is evident that the Respondent was aware of the ACCENTURE trademark prior to registering the disputed domain name. By reproducing the Complainant's trademark, the Respondent is engaging in passing off and disrupting the Complainant's business, which constitutes bad faith. The Respondent's conduct is clearly intended to create the false impression of an association or affiliation with the Complainant.

Consequently, the Respondent's use of the disputed domain name is designed to mislead Internet users seeking the Complainant's genuine website.

### **B. Respondent**

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

## **6. Discussion and Findings**

The case record shows the Center verified the Complaint's formal compliance and formally commenced the proceeding on August 27, 2025 (with a 20-day Response deadline that fell on September 16, 2025). The Center then notified the Respondent of default on September 17, 2025.

The Center employed all reasonably available means to contact the Respondent, pursuant to paragraph 2(a) of the UDRP Rules.

The record reflects service consistent with the Rules and WIPO Supplemental Rules. In the absence of a Response, the Panel may draw appropriate inferences from the Respondent's default (Rules, paragraph 14), as the Center's default notice also notes.

### **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 entirety of the mark is reproduced 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](#), section 1.7.

Although the addition of other terms here, "svai" may bear on assessment of the second and third elements, the Panel finds the addition of such term 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 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 Respondent has not demonstrated any bona fide offering of goods or services, nor is the Respondent commonly known by the disputed domain name. The Complainant has established that the Respondent is not affiliated with, licensed by, or otherwise authorized to use the Complainant’s trademark.

The disputed domain name resolves to what appears to be a fraudulent website displaying the ACCENTURE trademark and logo on a login page. The use of the Complainant’s trademark in this manner suggests that the Respondent is attempting to mislead Internet users into believing that the disputed domain name is legitimate or connected to the Complainant.

The Respondent’s use of the disputed domain name constitutes an act of passing off and an attempt to impersonate the Complainant by displaying its trademark and purporting to offer login access or resources associated with the Complainant. The Panel finds that such conduct is intended to deceive Internet users and may expose them to harm.

Panels have held that the use of a domain name for illegitimate activity here, claimed impersonation/passing off, can never confer rights or legitimate interests on a respondent. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 2.13.1.

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.

In the present case, the Panel notes that the Respondent had, at a minimum, constructive knowledge of the Complainant’s ownership of the ACCENTURE trademark. Given the worldwide reputation and extensive online presence of the ACCENTURE mark, the Panel finds it very unlikely that the Respondent was unaware of the Complainant’s rights prior to registering the disputed domain name. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 3.1.4.

By displaying the Complainant's logo on the website to which the disputed domain name resolves, the Respondent is creating a false impression of affiliation with the Complainant, thereby misleading Internet users. Such conduct constitutes an act of passing off and is likely to disrupt the Complainant's business, and evidences bad faith within the meaning of paragraph 4(b)(iv) of the Policy.

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.

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. Having reviewed the record, 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 <svaiaaccenture.com> be transferred to the Complainant.

*/Christelle Vaval/*

**Christelle Vaval**

Sole Panelist

Date: October 13, 2025