

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

Bureau Veritas (Société Anonyme) v. Phineas, NextNewEnergy
Case No. D2025-3391

1. The Parties

The Complainant is Bureau Veritas (Société Anonyme), France, represented by Denneweyer & Associates SAS, France.

The Respondent is Phineas, NextNewEnergy, China.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <bureauveritas.lol> is registered with Dominet (HK) Limited (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 26, 2025, the Registrar transmitted by email to the Center its verification disclosing registrant and contact information for the disputed domain name which partly differed from the named Respondent (NextNewEnergy, redacted for privacy) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on August 26, 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 26, 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 28, 2025. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was September 17, 2025. The Respondent sent an email communication to the Center on September 11, 2025. Accordingly, the Center notified the Parties of the Commencement of Panel Appointment Process on September 19, 2025.

The Center appointed Nayiri Boghossian as the sole panelist in this matter on September 23, 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 leader in the field of testing, inspection and certification services. It owns trademark registrations for BUREAU VERITAS in numerous jurisdictions such as the following:

1. European Union Trade Mark Registration No. 004518544, registered on June 1, 2006;
2. European Trademark Registration No. 005927711, registered on February 6, 2008.

The disputed domain name was registered on August 11, 2025, and resolves to a page that purports issuing certification. At the bottom of the page, the visitor is invited to visit “Verigates website”.

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 is identical or confusingly similar to the Complainant’s trademark. The disputed domain name reproduces, without modification, the two elements constituting the Complainant’s trademark.

The Complainant contends that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name. The Complainant did not authorize the Respondent to register a domain name similar to its trademark. The disputed domain name resolves to a page that allows issuing a certificate that the Complainant did not originate. At the bottom of the page, a link redirects to the Complainant’s official site, “www.verigates.bureauveritas.com”.

The Complainant contends that the disputed domain name was registered and is being used in bad faith. The Respondent had knowledge of the Complainant as the disputed domain name reproduces the two elements of the Complainant’s trademark. The website to which the disputed domain name resolves offers services and certificates which appear authentic but they are not. There is an intent to deceive visitors as the page also has a link to the Complainant’s official page.

B. Respondent

The Respondent sent an email on September 11, 2025, which shows a marking of a tick-box that says, “The disputed domain name(s) should be transferred from the Respondent’s control to the Complainant.”

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 entirety of the mark is reproduced within the disputed domain name. Accordingly, the disputed domain name is identical to the mark 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 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. Instead, upon notice of the dispute, the Respondent sent an email, which seems to indicate his approval to transfer the domain name to the Complainant. The Panel infers from this conduct that the Respondent does not have any rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name, and that the Respondent does not object to the transfer of the disputed domain name to the Complainant.

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 must have been aware of the Complainant’s trademark as the disputed domain name resolves to a website that purports to offer certification, which is the Complainant’s activity and it seems to include a link that directs to the Complainant’s website. Also, the Complainant’s trademark was registered almost two decades before the creation of the disputed domain name.

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 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 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 name <bureauveritas.lol> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Nayiri Boghossian/

Nayiri Boghossian

Sole Panelist

Date: September 26, 2025