

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

Accenture Global Services Limited v. Abir Hossain

Case No. D2025-3750

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 Abir Hossain, Bangladesh.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <accenturee.top> (the Domain Name") is registered with NameSilo, LLC (the "Registrar").

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the "Center") on September 16, 2025. On September 16, 2025, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the Domain Name. On September 16, 2025, the Registrar transmitted by email to the Center its verification response disclosing registrant and contact information for the Domain Name which differed from the named Respondent (User #45ec874b Privacy/PrivacyGuardian.org llc) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on September 18, 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 22, 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 24, 2025. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was October 14, 2025. The Respondent sent an email communication to the Center on September 24, 2025.

The Center appointed Ian Lowe as the sole panelist in this matter on October 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 an international business that has provided a broad range of services and solutions in strategy, consulting, digital, technology and operations under the name ACCENTURE since January 2001. It has offices and operations in more than 200 cities in 52 countries. The Complainant has spent considerable sums on advertising and promoting its services under the ACCENTURE mark, with global expenditure amounting to between USD 32 million and USD 132 million annually since 2009. The Complainant was ranked by Brand Finance in 2025 as the "...world's most valuable IT services brand for seventh year running...". It has operated its principal website at "www.accenture.com" promoting and providing information about its services since the <accenture.com> domain name was registered in August 2000.

The Complainant (including its predecessors) is the proprietor of numerous trademark registrations around the world for marks comprising ACCENTURE, including India trademark number 967046 ACCENTURE registered on October 30, 2000; United States trademark number 3091811 registered on May 16, 2006; and International trademark number 828118 "accenture" stylised word mark and device registered on February 24, 2004.

The Domain Name was registered on September 5, 2005. It does not currently resolve to an active website, but the Complainant has adduced evidence that at the time of preparation of the Complaint, it resolved to a webpage, appearing to be in the Bangla language, promoting "Sukriya Lab" with a link to its YouTube channel which carries the description "New Design Power Bank Mining Investment Website And Script Available", and links to Telegram and WhatsApp sites for "Sukriya Lab" and "Coder Abir". Coder Abir appears to be a freelance web designer and developer based in Bangladesh.

5. Parties' Contentions

The Complainant contends that the Domain Name is confusingly similar to its ACCENTURE trademark (the "Mark"), that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the Domain Name, and that the Respondent registered and is using the Domain Name in bad faith.

B. Respondent

The Respondent did not reply formally to the Complainant's contentions. The email to the Center dated September 24, 2025, apparently sent in response to the notification to the parties of the Complaint and commencement of administrative proceeding, stated: "Can you please clarify this issue? I am unable to understand this report. What thinks clients violate? And what should I do from our side and client side too?"

The Panel notes that the Respondent's communication implies that the Domain Name may have been registered for a "client" whose identity has not been disclosed. While no evidence has been provided regarding the Respondent's relationship with this alleged client, even if such a client exists, it does not alter the fact that the Respondent, as the registrant of the Domain Name, has certain obligations by virtue of the registration agreement. Therefore, irrespective of whether the Domain Name is being used by the Respondent directly or by a client of the Respondent, the Panel's analysis of the Respondent's actions and motives regarding the Domain Name shall be construed to encompass both.

6. Discussion and Findings

For this Complaint to succeed in relation to the Domain Name the Complainant must prove that:

- (i) the Domain Name is identical or confusingly similar to a trademark or service mark in which the Complainant has rights; and
- (ii) the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the Domain Name; and
- (iii) the 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.

Ignoring the generic Top-Level Domain ".top", the Domain Name comprises the entirety of the Mark with the addition of the letter "e". As panels have consistently recognized, "a domain name which consists of a common, obvious, or intentional misspelling of a trademark is considered by panels to be confusingly similar to the relevant mark for purposes of the first element". [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 1.9.

Accordingly, the Panel finds that the Domain Name is confusingly similar to a trademark in which the Complainant has rights, and 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. Accordingly, 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.

The Complainant has made out a strong prima facie case that the Respondent lacks rights or legitimate interests in the Domain Name. The Respondent is not authorized by the Complainant to use its trademark, is not commonly known by the Domain Name, and there is no evidence of any trademark or service mark rights in "accenturee" or related terms.

The Domain Name has been used for a web page directing users to Telegram, WhatsApp and YouTube sites apparently promoting in particular a Bangladesh based web designer and developer. The use of a domain name confusingly similar to a complainant's trademark to direct Internet users to a third-party website with no connection to the trademark holder does not constitute a bona fide offering of goods or services or a legitimate noncommercial use under paragraphs 4(c)(i) or (iii) of the Policy. In the Panel's view, the Domain Name is a typical example of typosquatting, whereby the Domain Name was registered with a minor variation of the Mark, with a view to taking advantage of typographical errors by Internet users, or to take unfair advantage of the reputation of the Mark. Such a registration cannot possibly give rise to rights or legitimate interests on the part of the Respondent in this case.

The Respondent has chosen not to respond formally to the Complaint or to provide any evidence of rights or legitimate interests in the Domain Name.

In the circumstances, the Panel finds that the Respondent does not have any rights or legitimate interests in respect of the 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.

The Panel finds that the Respondent must have been aware of the Complainant and the Mark at the time of registration. The ACCENTURE mark is not a dictionary word but rather a coined term invented by the Complainant. The Mark has been used extensively since 2001 and has achieved significant international recognition, ranking highly on multiple global brand value lists. The Complainant has invested tens of millions of dollars annually in promoting the Mark.

The Domain Name was registered on September 5, 2025, more than 24 years after the Complainant began using the Mark. The Domain Name consists of the ACCENTURE mark with a single additional letter “e” – a typosquatting technique designed to capture Internet users who mistype the Complainant's mark.

It is implausible that the Respondent coincidentally chose to register a domain name consisting of the Complainant's distinctive coined trademark with a single letter added without knowledge of the Complainant's rights. (“The apparent lack of a respondent's own rights to a domain name, and its similarity to a widely-known trademark, have been held to support an inference of bad faith” [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 3.2.2).

In addition, the use of the Domain Name confirms bad faith. The Domain Name directs users to a website that appears to offer services under names such as “Sukriya Lab” or “CODER ABIR”, with no disclaimer of any relationship with the Complainant. This use creates a likelihood of confusion with the Complainant's mark as to the source, sponsorship, affiliation, or endorsement of the website, particularly given that Internet users who mistype the Complainant's trademark will arrive at this website.

Given the fame of the ACCENTURE mark, the typosquatting nature of the Domain Name, the timing of registration, and the use of the Domain Name to redirect Internet users to a third-party website with no disclaimer, the Panel finds that the Respondent registered and is using the Domain Name in bad faith in accordance with paragraph 4(b)(iv) of the Policy.

Accordingly, the Panel finds that the Domain Name has been registered and is being used in bad faith, and the third element of the Policy has been established.

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 Name <accenturee.top> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Ian Lowe/

Ian Lowe

Sole Panelist

Date: November 6, 2025