

## **ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION**

Veolia Environnement SA v. Green International Resource Recycling Group  
Case No. D2025-4379

### **1. The Parties**

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

The Respondent is Green International Resource Recycling Group, United States of America ("United States").

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

The disputed domain name <veolair.com> is registered with Dominet (HK) Limited (the "Registrar").

### **3. Procedural History**

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the "Center") on October 24, 2025. On October 24, 2025, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On October 27, 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 November 4, 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 November 4, 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 12, 2025. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was December 2, 2025. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent's default on December 9, 2025.

The Center appointed Alfred Meijboom as the sole panelist in this matter on December 17, 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 the holding company of the Veolia group, a 170 year old group which represents a total of € 44.692 million ) in revenue in 2024. The Veolia group has nearly 215,000 employees worldwide and operates three core businesses, being water, waste and energy.

The Complainant is owner of many trademark registrations worldwide, including:

- International trademark VEOLIA with registration number 814678 of September 11, 2003 for goods and services in classes 1, 6, 9, 11, 17, 19, 32, 35, 36, 37, 39, 40, 41 and 42 designating, inter alia, Australia and China;
- International trademark VEOLIA with registration number 919580 of March 10, 2006 for goods and services in classes 9, 11, 16, 35, 36, 37, 38, 39, 40, 41 and 42, designating, inter alia, Australia, China and the United States; and
- United States trademark VEOLIA with registration number 3543738 of December 9, 2008 for goods and services in classes 16, 35, 37, 39, 40 and 42.

In addition, the Complainant operates, among others, domain names reflecting its VEOLIA trademark in order to promote its services, including <veolia.com> which was registered on December 30, 2002.

The disputed domain name was registered on July 25, 2025 and is, according to the Complainant's undisputed allegation used for a scam presented on Facebook and Instagram which promises great revenues for low investments, with the objective to lead people to register and login on a platform on a website under the disputed domain name. At the time of the decision, the disputed domain name resolves to an inactive page.

The Complainant's cease and desist letters and reminders to, inter alia, the Respondent remained unanswered.

#### **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 the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to the Complainant's VEOLIA trademark as it contains the VEOLIA trademark, with the mere addition of the letters "jr."

The Complainant alleges that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the disputed domain name as the Respondent cannot reasonably pretend it was intending to develop a legitimate activity through the disputed domain name. Further, the Complainant alleges that it is unlikely that the Respondent is commonly known by the name "veolia", and it is not in any way affiliated with the Complainant, nor authorized or licensed to use the Complainant's VEOLIA trademark, or to seek registration of any domain name incorporating the Complainant's trademark. According to the Complainant, the Respondent's conduct of fraudulent and/or phishing activities via the disputed domain name is also not proof of legitimate interest.

The Complainant contends that the disputed domain name is registered in bad faith because it is implausible that the Respondent was unaware of the Complainant and its well-known VEOLIA trademark when it registered the disputed domain name. According to the Complainant, in light of the reputation of the Complainant's trademark VEOLIA, the Respondent's reproduction in the disputed domain name of the VEOLIA trademark in its entirety with the mere addition of the letter "ir" clearly proves that the Respondent was aware of the existence of the Complainant's trademark. The Complaint further alleges that the disputed domain name is being used in bad faith because it is more likely than not that the Respondent's primary motive in registering and using the disputed domain name was to capitalize on or otherwise take advantage of the Complainant's trademark rights, through the creation of initial interest of confusion and more particularly by conducting conduct fraudulent activities.

## **B. Respondent**

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

## **6. Discussion and Findings**

The Respondent did not file a response. However, as set out in section 4.3 of the WIPO Overview of WIPO Panel Views on Selected UDRP Questions, Third Edition ("[WIPO Overview 3.0](#)"), the Respondent's default does not automatically result in a decision in favor of the Complainant. The Complainant must still establish each of the three elements required by paragraph 4(a) of the Policy. Although the Panel may draw appropriate inferences from the Respondent's default, paragraph 4 of the Policy requires the Complainant to support its assertions with actual evidence in order to succeed in these proceedings. Paragraph 14(b) of the Rules provides that, in the absence of exceptional circumstances, the Panel shall draw such inferences, as it considers appropriate from a failure of a party to comply with a provision or requirement of the Rules. The Panel finds that in this case there are no such exceptional circumstances.

Under the Policy, the Complainant must prove that:

- the disputed domain name is identical or confusingly similar to a trademark or service mark in which the Complainant has rights; and
- the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the disputed domain name; and
- the disputed 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 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 Complainant's VEOLIA trademark is reproduced within the disputed domain name. Accordingly, the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to the Complainant's trademark for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 1.7.

Although the addition of other terms, here the letters "ir", 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.

In the present case, the Complainant has demonstrated that the disputed domain name is being used in connection with fraudulent activities, as the disputed domain name resolves to a website where Internet users can register and leave personal information after being encouraged to do so via associated Facebook and Instagram posts. Panels have held that the use of a domain name for unlawful activities, such as the scam activities in the present case, 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.

In the present case, the Panel is satisfied that the Respondent must have had the Complainant’s VEOLIA trademark in mind when it registered the disputed domain name because the disputed domain name has a specific role in the Internet scam to encourage visitors of the associated Facebook and Instagram posts to register and login on the website under the disputed domain name. Under these circumstances, the Panel cannot conceive of any plausible explanation as to why the Respondent would have been unaware of the Complainant and its VEOLIA trademark at the time of registering the disputed domain name. And what’s more, the VEOLIA trademark is well-known, and the homepage of the website to which the disputed domain name resolved displays an image of a storage container bearing the VEOLIA brand.

As it remained undisputed that the disputed domain name is deployed as part of illegitimate activities, such behavior can never confer rights or legitimate interests on a respondent and is manifestly considered evidence of bad faith. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 3.1.4. The Panel is therefore satisfied that the Complainant showed that the Respondent is also using the disputed domain name in bad faith as meant in paragraph 4(b)(iv) of the Policy.

The Panel finds 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 disputed domain name <veoliar.com> be transferred to the Complainant.

*/Alfred Meijboom/*

**Alfred Meijboom**

Sole Panelist

Date: December 23, 2025