

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

Globant España S.A. v. 312312 3123, A Sa Da Sheng De
Case No. D2025-4057

1. The Parties

The Complainant is Globant España S.A., Spain, represented by Marval O'Farrell & Mairal, Argentina.

The Respondent is 312312 3123, A Sa Da Sheng De, Hong Kong, China.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <glb-finance.com> is registered with GoDaddy.com, LLC (the "Registrar").

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the "Center") on October 3, 2025. On October 6, 2025, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On October 6, 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: information) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on October 20, 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 October 21, 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 October 22, 2025. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was November 11, 2025. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent's default on November 21, 2025.

The Center appointed Wilson Pinheiro Jabur as the sole panelist in this matter on November 25, 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 was founded in 2003 in Argentina, later expanding to other countries around the world and being listed in the New York Stock Exchange. Presently, the Complainant employs over 29,000 professionals and reported a revenue of USD 2.3 billion in the second quarter of 2024.

The Complainant is the owner of the following, amongst other dozens of other trademark registrations (Annexes J and K to the Complaint):

- Argentina trademark registration No. 3278115 for the word mark GLOBANT, filed on December 9, 2020, registered on May 4, 2022, in class 35;
- European Union trademark registration No. 018356639 for the word mark GLOBANT, filed on December 17, 2020, registered on May 21, 2021, in classes 9, 35, 38, 41 and 42; and
- European Union trademark registration No. 018356645 for the word and device mark GLOBANT, filed on December 17, 2020, registered on May 21, 2021, in classes 9, 35, 38, 41 and 42.

The disputed domain name was registered on June 27, 2025, and presently resolves to the Registrar's parked webpage. In the past, the disputed domain name resolved to a website that featured the Complainant's trademark and purportedly promoted a business called "Globant Alquiler" (Annex N to the Complaint) in a manner similar to the use of the domain name <globant.vip>, which has been the subject of an earlier UDRP dispute (*Globant S.A. v. 312312 3123, A Sa Da Sheng De*, WIPO Case No. [D2025-2311](#)).

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 asserts to have received countless awards and recognitions, amongst which the Top 10 of Fortune's 2024 Change the World list (Annex F to the Complaint), as well as having significantly expanded the visibility and recognition of its trademarks through prominent sponsorships with globally renowned organizations such as with Williams Racing in Formula 1, the NBA's franchise L.A. Clippers, and its collaboration with FIFA, what demonstrates the widespread use and exposure of the Complainant's trademarks on an international scale, further solidifying its reputation and influence in the global market.

Under the Complainant's view, the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to the Complainant's GLOBANT trademark since the letters "glb" could be interpreted as an acronym for GLOBANT, and be perceived by Internet users as a reference or abbreviation to refer to the Complainant's trademark, what is further corroborated by the contents of the website to which the disputed domain name resolved prominently displaying the Complainant's GLOBANT trademark in its entirety, making it evident that the Respondent was attempting to pass off as the Complainant and to take unfair advantage of the Complainant's reputation and goodwill, with the apparent purpose of defrauding Internet users.

The Complainant further states that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect to the disputed domain name given that:

- a) the Complainant has not licensed or otherwise permitted the Respondent to use the GLOBANT trademark, or to apply for use of any domain name incorporating, totally or partially, such trademark;
- b) the Complainant has no legal and/or business relationship with the Respondent which would give rise to any license, permission, or authorization for the Respondent to use the disputed domain name;
- c) there is no evidence that the Respondent has been commonly known by the disputed domain name;

- d) the Respondent has not used the disputed domain name in connection with a bona fide offering of goods or services
- e) the Respondent has not made demonstrable preparations to use the disputed domain name in connection with a bona fide offering of goods or services; and
- f) the best Respondent has not made a legitimate noncommercial or fair use of the disputed domain name.

The Complainant further asserts that the Respondent has used the disputed domain name in connection with a fraudulent scheme that has been reported by several users to the Complainant (Annex M to the Complaint) in which the operators of the scam impersonate the Complainant and purport to explain how the purported “business” works, thus having the Respondent the Complainant’s trademark in mind when registering the disputed domain name and using it in an attempt to deceive individuals by means of a fraudulent webpage which appears to have been created for the sole purpose of collecting personal data by encouraging individuals to register and invest, unduly displaying the Complainant’s registered trademark to create a false impression of legitimacy.

B. Respondent

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

6. Discussion and Findings

Paragraph 4(a) of the Policy sets forth three requirements, which have to be met for this Panel to order the transfer of the disputed domain name to the Complainant:

- (i) the disputed 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 disputed domain name; and
- (iii) the disputed domain name has been registered and is being used in bad faith.

The Complainant must prove in this administrative proceeding that each of the aforesaid three elements is present in order to obtain the transfer of the disputed domain name.

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 Panel finds that the mark is recognizable 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. The Panel also took note of the previous content of the website associated with the disputed domain name to confirm confusing similarity. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 1.15.

Although the addition of other terms (here, a hyphen and “finance”) 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 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.

In that sense, and according to the evidence submitted, the Complainant has made a prima facie case against the Respondent who has not been commonly known by the disputed domain name and is neither authorized, licensed, or been allowed to use the Complainant’s trademark, whether in the disputed domain name, or in any other way.

Also, the lack of evidence as to any trademarks registered by the Respondent corresponding to the disputed domain name, corroborates the indication of an absence of rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name.

Furthermore, according to the evidence submitted by the Complainant, the past use of the disputed domain name in connection with a webpage impersonating the Complainant does not constitute a bona fide offering of goods or services, nor a legitimate noncommercial or fair use of the disputed domain name in these circumstances. Panels have held that the use of a domain name for illegal activity here, claimed impersonation and fraud, can never confer rights or legitimate interests on a respondent. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 2.13.1.

Under these circumstances and absent evidence to the contrary, the Panel finds that the Respondent does not have rights or legitimate interests with respect to 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.

This case presents the following circumstances which indicate under the balance of probabilities bad faith registration and use of the disputed domain name:

- a) the Respondent has provided no evidence whatsoever of any actual or contemplated good faith use by it of the disputed domain name;
- b) the Respondent has used the disputed domain name to impersonate the Complainant ([WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 3.4);

- c) the present passive holding of the disputed domain name. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 3.3; and
- d) the indication of false or incomplete address, not being the Center able to deliver the written communication to the Respondent,
- e) the Respondent was subject to a prior UDRP dispute with the Complainant concerning the domain name <globant.vip>.

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 <glb-finance.com> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Wilson Pinheiro Jabur/

Wilson Pinheiro Jabur

Sole Panelist

Date: December 3, 2025