

## **ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION**

Globant España S.A. v. Bauffs Gerry  
Case No. D2025-4310

### **1. The Parties**

The Complainant is Globant España S.A., Spain, represented by Marval, Argentina.

The Respondent is Bauffs Gerry, United Kingdom.

### **2. The Domain Name and Registrar**

The disputed domain name <globant.blog> is registered with Dynadot Inc (the “Registrar”).

### **3. Procedural History**

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the “Center”) on October 20, 2025. On October 21, 2025, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On October 23, 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 October 28, 2025, providing the registrant and contact information disclosed by the Registrar, and inviting the Complainant to submit an amendment to the Complaint. The Respondent sent an email communication to the Center requesting a response extension on October 31, 2025, which was granted. The Complainant filed an amended Complaint on November 2, 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 November 3, 2025. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was extended to November 27, 2025. The Respondent did not send any further communications to the Center, which commenced the panel appointment process on November 28, 2025.

The Center appointed Gonalo M. C. Da Cunha Ferreira as the sole panelist in this matter on December 2, 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 technology and digital transformation company founded in 2003 in Argentina and today operating globally. It provides software development, IT consulting, digital marketing, and related services, working with international clients and employing more than 30,000 professionals worldwide. The Complainant is listed on the New York Stock Exchange under the ticker "GLOB". It also engages in marketing and sponsorship activities and has expanded through acquisitions in recent years.

The Complainant owns multiple trademark registrations for GLOBANT in various jurisdictions. Evidence in the record includes, inter alia:

- European Union Trade Mark No. 18356645 (classes 9, 35, 38, 41, 42), registered May 21, 2021;
- India Trademark Registration No. 4785553 (class 41), registered December 17, 2021;
- United Kingdom Trade Mark No. 3831223 (classes 9, 35, 36, 38, 41, 42), registered January 13, 2023.

The Complainant also operates the domain name <globant.com>.

The disputed domain name <globant.blog> was registered on July 25, 2025. According to the evidence submitted, it resolved to a website displaying the Complainant's mark and offering what appears to be investment-related services, presented in Portuguese as "BEM-VINDO  Globant Para Obter Altos Lucros Altos Rendimientos" (Portuguese for "Welcome to Globant to Obtain High Profits / High Returns"), inviting users to register or log in.

The Respondent is identified in the Registrar's verification as Bauffs Gerry, located in the United Kingdom.

There is no evidence of any relationship between the Parties.

#### **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:

1. the disputed domain name <globant.blog> is "confusingly similar – not to say identical –" to its GLOBANT trademark;
2. the Complainant has not licensed or otherwise permitted the Respondent to use the GLOBANT trademark;
3. the Respondent is not commonly known by the disputed domain name;
4. the disputed domain name redirects to a website displaying "BEM-VINDO  Globant Para Obter Altos Lucros Altos Rendimientos";
5. the Respondent is impersonating the Complainant to offer services and obtain commercial gain;
6. such use cannot constitute a bona fide offering of goods or services nor legitimate noncommercial or fair use;
7. the Respondent registered the disputed domain name in July 2025 and was likely aware of the Complainant's trademark;

8. the Respondent is deceiving users by impersonating the Complainant and collecting personal data;
9. the Respondent has engaged in similar conduct through <globant.vip> and <glb-finance.com>;
10. a previous case between the Parties resulted in a transfer decision against the same Respondent;
11. the Respondent's conduct forms part of a recurring fraudulent scheme;
12. the Respondent registered and is using the disputed domain name to capitalize on the Complainant's trademark rights and reputation.

## **B. Respondent**

Other than the communication on October 31, 2025, requesting an extension to the Response deadline, the Respondent did not submit any further communications and thus did not substantively reply to the Complainant's contentions.

## **6. Discussion and Findings**

The Panel has considered the Complaint, the evidence provided, and the applicable Policy, Rules, Supplemental Rules, and principles of law deemed relevant. The Panel's findings under each element of paragraph 4(a) of the Policy are set out below.

### **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 demonstrated registered rights in the GLOBANT trademark. The disputed domain name <globant.blog> reproduces the GLOBANT mark in its entirety. The ".blog" Top-Level Domain is disregarded for the purposes of the confusing similarity assessment ([WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 1.11).

The Panel finds the first element of the Policy is 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 disputed domain name resolves to a login website that displays the Complainant's denominative mark, and the disputed domain name is identical in its second-level composition to the Complainant's mark.. The Panel notes the Complainant's claim that "the Respondent is impersonating the Complainant in order to offer some type of service and thereby obtain commercial gain", and that a fraudulent impersonation cannot confer rights or legitimate interests ([WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 2.13.1). A claim of impersonation is a serious allegation calling for an answer from the Respondent, but none has been provided.

In any case, the Panel finds that the disputed domain name is identical to the Complainant's mark, which carries a high risk of implied affiliation ([WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 2.5.1).

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.

In the present case, the Panel notes that the disputed domain name was registered in July 2025, long after the Complainant began using its mark and established its trademark rights. The website to which the disputed domain name resolves reproduces the Complainant's GLOBANT denominative mark and refers to purported investment services, without providing any further information on who operates the website. The disputed domain name is identical to the Complainant's mark, being inherently misleading, and Internet users may believe that the website is associated with the Complainant. This conduct falls within paragraph 4(b)(iv) of the Policy.

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.

The record shows that the Respondent was previously the subject of a UDRP decision involving another domain name incorporating the Complainant's trademark, namely <globant.pro>, *Globant S.A. v. Bauffs Gerry*, WIPO Case No. [D2025-2315](#), in which a panel found bad-faith registration and use. The Panel further notes that the disputed domain name was registered one month after the notification of the complaint in *Globant S.A. v. Bauffs Gerry*, WIPO Case No. [D2025-2315](#).

Having reviewed the record, and considering the prior case between the Parties, the Panel finds that the Respondent's registration and use of the disputed domain name constitutes 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 <globant.blog> be transferred to the Complainant.

*/Gonçalo M. C. Da Cunha Ferreira/*

**Gonçalo M. C. Da Cunha Ferreira**

Sole Panelist

Date: December 5, 2025