

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

Veolia Environnement SA v. Host Master, Njalla Okta LLC
Case No. D2025-3542

1. The Parties

The Complainant is Veolia Environnement SA, France, represented internally and by IP Twins, France.

The Respondent is Host Master, Njalla Okta LLC, Saint Kitts and Nevis.

2. The Domain Names and Registrar

The disputed domain names <particulier-veolia-eau.com> and <veolia-mes-facturations.com> (the “Domain Names”) are registered with Tucows Domains Inc. (the “Registrar”).

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the “Center”) on September 2, 2025. On September 2, 2025, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the Domain Names. On September 2, 2025, the Registrar transmitted by email to the Center its verification response, disclosing registrant and contact information for the Domain Names which differed from the named Respondent (Redacted for privacy) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on September 3, 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 September 8, 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 September 9, 2025. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was September 29, 2025. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent’s default on October 2, 2025.

The Center appointed Gregor Vos as the sole panelist in this matter on October 7, 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.

The Panel notes that the Complainant in the Amended Complaint added the Respondent to the originally named respondent "Redacted for privacy". The Panel finds it appropriate in the present matter to not record the originally named respondent "Redacted for privacy" as the name of the Respondent in the present panel Decision, in view of the Registrar's timely disclosure of the underlying registrant details. The Panel will therefore consider the Registrar-confirmed registrant "Host Master, Njalla Okta LLC" as the Respondent for the purposes of these proceedings.

4. Factual Background

The Complainant is the holding company of the Veolia group of companies active in the field of ecological transformation. The group employs nearly 215,000 employees worldwide.

The Complainant is the owner of inter alia the following trademark registrations (hereinafter jointly referred to as: the "Trademarks"):

- International Trademark Registration No. 814678 for the mark VEOLIA, registered on September 11, 2003; and
- International Trademark Registration No. 919580 for the mark VEOLIA, registered on March 10, 2006.

The Domain Names were registered on August 20, 2025. At least at the time of filing of the Complaint, the Domain Names were purportedly being used for phishing activities – a link to websites at the Domain Names was contained in two different email communications in which the Complainant's logos and Trademarks were being used and a recipient was invited to check its balance after adjustment made based on the recent water bill. The Complainant also provided evidence showing that the Domain Names were flagged by an Internet web browser as malicious and previously resolved to pages displaying the Complainant's Trademark and logo, and asking a visitor to complete a test showing s/he is a human. Currently, the Domain Names do not resolve to an active 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 Domain Names.

Notably, the Complainant contends that the Domain Names are confusingly similar to the Trademarks of the Complainant, the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in the Domain Names, and the Domain Names have been registered and are being used in bad faith.

Firstly, according to the Complainant, the Domain Names are confusingly similar to its well-known Trademarks. The Domain Names incorporate the Trademarks in their entirety with the addition of the French words "particulier" and "eau", and "mes" and "facturations" respectively, which does not prevent a finding of confusing similarity.

Secondly, the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in the Domain Names. The Respondent has never received a license or any other form of authorization from the Complainant to use the Trademarks, has no prior rights to the Domain Names and is not commonly known by the Domain Names. Also, the phishing activities do not confer legitimate rights on the Respondent.

Finally, according to the Complainant, the Respondent has registered and is using the Domain Names in bad faith. In light of the well-known character of the Complainant's Trademarks, it is inconceivable that the Respondent registered the Domain Names without knowledge of the Complainant and its Trademarks. Therefore, the registration and use of the Domain Names qualifies as opportunistic bad faith. Also, according to the Complainant, the Domain Names are being used in bad faith. The Respondent is using the Domain Names for phishing activities, thus for financial gain by confusing consumers.

B. Respondent

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

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 Trademarks and the Domain Names. 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 Trademark is reproduced within the Domain Names. Accordingly, the Domain Names are confusingly similar to the Trademark for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 1.7.

Although the addition of other terms, here the French terms "particulier" and "eau", and "mes" and "facturations" respectively, may bear on assessment of the second and third elements, the Panel finds the addition of such terms does not prevent a finding of confusing similarity between the Domain Names and the Trademarks 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 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 Domain Names such as those enumerated in the Policy or otherwise.

In addition, panels have held that the use of a domain name for illegal activity, here claimed phishing, 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.

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 light of the reputation of the Trademarks, the lack of any rights or legitimate interest in the Domain Names by the Respondent, and the manner in which the Domain Names were used, the Panel finds from the present circumstances that the Respondent has intentionally sought to take unfair advantage of, or otherwise abuse, the Trademarks. This is reinforced by the strong reputation of the Complainant's Trademarks, as confirmed by earlier panels (see e.g., *Veolia Environnement SA v. Hartford Vehicle*, WIPO Case No. [D2021-3821](#)). Also, the composition of the Domain Names reinforced by the fact that the Domain Names are used for phishing activities for which inter alia the Trademarks were prominently depicted, carries a risk of implied affiliation with the Complainant.

Further, panels have held that the use of a domain name for illegal activity, here claimed phishing, always 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 Domain Names constitutes bad faith under the Policy.

Finally, even when taking into account the current non-use of the Domain Names, Panels have found that the non-use of a domain name would not prevent a finding of bad faith under the doctrine of passive holding. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 3.3. Having reviewed the available record, the Panel notes the well-known character and the reputation of the Complainants' Trademarks and finds that in the circumstances of this case the passive holding of the Domain Names does not prevent a finding of 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 Domain Names <particulier-veolia-eau.com> and <veolia-mes-facturations.com> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Gregor Vos/

Gregor Vos

Sole Panelist

Date: October 17, 2025