ARBITRATION
AND
MEDIATION CENTER

WIPO
WORLD
INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY
ORGANIZATION

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION
Accenture Global Services Limited v. huang hua hua
Case No. D2025-3614

1. The Parties

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

The Respondent is huang hua hua, China.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <accenture-sap-cloud.com> is registered with Gname.com Pte. Ltd. (the "Registrar").

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed in English with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the "Center") on September 5, 2025. On September 8, 2025, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On September 9, 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) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on September 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 September 15, 2025.

On September 11, 2025, the Center informed the Parties in Chinese and English, that the language of the registration agreement for the disputed domain name is Chinese. On September 15, 2025, the Complainant requested English to be the language of the proceedings. The Respondent did not submit any comment on the Complainant's submission.

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 in Chinese and English of the Complaint, and the proceedings commenced on September 16, 2025. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was October 6, 2025. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent's default on October 7, 2025.

The Center appointed Xu Lin as the sole panelist in this matter on October 9, 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 specializes in management consulting, technology services, outsourcing services, and software solutions with offices and operations in more than 200 cities across 52 countries and regions worldwide.

The Complainant claims that it owns over 1,000 registrations for the ACCENTURE and ACCENTURE & Design marks, as well as many other marks incorporating the ACCENTURE brand, for a variety of products and services in over 140 jurisdictions, including the following:

- United States trademark No. 3091811 for ACCENTURE, registered on May 16, 2006 in classes 9, 16, 35, 36, 37, 41 and 42;
- International Trademark No. 828118 for accenture, registered on February 24, 2004 in classes 9, 16, 18, 25, 28, 35, 36, 37, 41, 42 and 45; and
- Chinese trademark No. 1750663 for ACCENTURE, registered on April 21, 2002 in class 16.

The domain name <accenture.com> resolves to the Complainant's official website displaying its services.

The Respondent is an individual reportedly based in China.

The disputed domain name <accenture-sap-cloud.com> was registered on May 21, 2019, and resolves to a "403 Forbidden" page. The Complainant asserts that it was the initial registrant of the disputed domain name until July 2025, and the latter was acquired by the Respondent thereafter. The Complainant has submitted evidence showing that at the time of filing of the Complaint, the disputed domain name resolved to an error page indicating a mismatch of the SSL (Secure Sockets Layer) security certificate and, when viewed on a mobile phone browser, to a gambling website in Chinese. [1]

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:

Firstly, the domain name is confusingly similar to the ACCENTURE marks.

- The Complainant's ACCENTURE mark has been extensively used, is well-known globally. The disputed domain name is nearly identical and confusingly similar to the Complainant's famous ACCENTURE trademark in both sight and sound.

- The composition of the disputed domain name that fully contains a mark and adds the third-party mark SAP, and "cloud" does not prevent confusing similarity between the domain name and the first mark.

[1] The Panel notes, however, that mobile device evidence provided by the Complainant does not display the full domain name in the browser tab.

In addition to the hyphens and additional terms paired with the ACCENTURE trademark, the addition of a generic Top-Level Domain ("gTLD") to the domain name is "completely without legal significance".

- The Complainant previously held and used the disputed domain name as a testing environment for its SAP-provided software. Six days after the Complainant's team released the domain name on July 21, 2025, the domain name was moved to the Registrar.

Secondly, the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the domain name.

- The Respondent is neither affiliated with, nor has it been licensed or permitted to use the Complainant's ACCENTURE marks or any domain name incorporating the ACCENTURE marks.

- The Respondent is not commonly known by the domain name, nor were they validly known as such prior to the date on which the Respondent registered the disputed domain name to trade on the value of the Complainant's famous trademark.

- The Respondent is not using the domain name in connection with a bona fide offering of goods or services, nor does the Respondent have legitimate rights in respect of the domain name, because the Respondent is using the disputed domain name to host a website for online gambling resources.

Finally, the Respondent has registered and is using the domain name in bad faith.

- The Respondent had constructive notice that the ACCENTURE mark was a registered trademark in the United States and many other jurisdictions worldwide.

- Given the Complainant's worldwide reputation and the ubiquitous presence of the ACCENTURE marks on the Internet, and in view of the Respondent's use of the Complainant's name in the disputed domain name in a typosquatted form, the Respondent clearly was aware of the ACCENTURE marks prior to registering the disputed domain name.

- The Respondent's identity has been shielded from the disputed domain name WhoIs information.

- The Respondent uses the disputed domain name to mislead or redirect Internet users to online gambling website for commercial gain.

- The Complainant owned and actively used the disputed domain name containing its registered ACCENTURE trademark for over six years before the Respondent registered the disputed domain name immediately after the Complainant allowed it to lapse.

B. Respondent

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

6. Discussion and Findings

6.1 Procedural Issue: Language of the Proceedings

The language of the Registration Agreement for the disputed domain name is Chinese. Pursuant to the Rules, paragraph 11(a), in the absence of an agreement between the parties, or unless specified otherwise in the registration agreement, the language of the administrative proceedings shall be the language of the registration agreement.

The Complaint was filed in English. The Complainant requested that the language of the proceedings be English for several reasons, including:

- The Registrar appears to provide an English-language version of its domain registration agreement, as well as an English version of its website, which suggests that the Registrar regularly serves English-speaking customers.
- The disputed domain name is composed entirely of English terms and has no corresponding Chinese or other foreign language translation.
- Allowing the dispute in Chinese could give the Respondent an advantage by forcing the Complainant to incur extra costs for local assistance in China.

The Respondent did not make any submissions with respect to the language of the proceedings.

In exercising its discretion to use a language other than that of the registration agreement, the Panel has to exercise such discretion judicially in the spirit of fairness and justice to both parties, taking into account all relevant circumstances of the case, including matters such as the parties' ability to understand and use the proposed language, time and costs (see WIPO Overview of WIPO Panel Views on Selected UDRP Questions, Third Edition ("WIPO Overview 3.0"), section 4.5.1).

The Panel notes that the Respondent has not objected to the Complainant's request that the proceedings be conducted in English and has not filed any response in either Chinese or English.

Having considered all the matters above, the Panel determines under paragraph 11(a) of the Rules that the language of the proceedings shall be English.

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 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 ACCENTURE 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, "-sap-cloud", 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 Complainant has not granted any license or right to the Respondent to use its trademark, and there is no evidence that the Respondent has been commonly known by the disputed domain name, or used the disputed domain name in connection with a bona fide offering of goods or services. The Panel notes that the disputed domain name currently resolves to a "403 Forbidden" page on either desktop or mobile devices.

The "403 Forbidden" error message means that the access to the webpage one is trying to open has been denied either on purpose or due to misconfiguration. Further, the Complainant has submitted evidence showing that at the time of filing of the Complaint, when viewed on a mobile phone browser, the disputed domain name seemingly resolved to a gambling website in Chinese. Such use of the Complainant's mark cannot constitute a bona fide offering of goods or services or a legitimate noncommercial or fair use of the disputed domain name.

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, given the wide use, distinctiveness, and strong reputation of the ACCENTURE trademark, the Panel finds it highly unlikely that the Respondent registered the disputed domain name without prior knowledge of the Complainant's mark.

The Respondent has provided no explanation for its choice of the disputed domain name, nor is there any immediately apparent legitimate reason for incorporating the famous ACCENTURE mark into the disputed domain name.

The Complainant claims that when accessing the disputed domain name on a laptop or PC, the resulting website displays a security warning stating "516 Upstream Certificate CN Mismatch." When accessed via a mobile browser, the disputed domain name directed to a Chinese-language website apparently associated with gambling and online casino activities. Nonetheless, the mobile evidence provided by the Complainant does not display the full domain name, and the Panel observes that the disputed domain name currently resolves to a "403 Forbidden" page.

It is not clear whether the Respondent is holding the disputed domain name passively or there is some kind of activity behind the disputed domain name to which the Panel has no access. In either case, this use does not amount to use in good faith. Even assuming that the Respondent is passively holding the disputed domain name, passive holding of a domain name cannot prevent a finding of bad faith. WIPO Overview 3.0, section 3.3. Having reviewed the available record, the Panel notes the distinctiveness or reputation of the Complainant's trademark, the composition of the disputed domain name, and lack of response, and finds that in the circumstances of this case the passive holding of the disputed domain name 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 disputed domain name <accenture-sap-cloud.com> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Xu Lin/
Xu Lin
Sole Panelist
Date: October 31, 2025