

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

VFS Global Services PLC v. Sergey A Kravchenko
Case No. D2025-4475

1. The Parties

The Complainant is VFS Global Services PLC, United Kingdom, represented by Aditya & Associates, India.

The Respondent is Sergey A Kravchenko, Ukraine.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <vfsglobalservice.com> is registered with Beget LLC (the “Registrar”).

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed in English with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the “Center”) on October 30, 2025. On October 30, 2025, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On October 31, 2025, the Registrar transmitted by email to the Center its verification response confirming that the Respondent is listed as the registrant and providing the contact details.

On November 3, 2025, the Center informed the parties in Russian and English, that the language of the registration agreement for the disputed domain name is Russian. On November 3, 2025, the Complainant confirmed its request that English be the language of the proceedings. The Respondent did not submit any comment on the Complainant’s submission.

The Center verified that the 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 Russian and English of the Complaint, and the proceedings commenced on November 7, 2025. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was November 27, 2025. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent’s default on November 28, 2025.

The Center appointed Alissia Shchichka as the sole panelist in this matter on December 3, 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 forms part of the VFS Global Group, an international outsourcing and technology services group specializing in the provision of administrative and non-judgmental services related to visa processing on behalf of foreign embassies and diplomatic missions worldwide.

The VFS Global Group is today present in over 160 countries, serving the diplomatic missions of 69 sovereign governments across 165 countries on five continents. Since its inception, it has processed more than 514 million transactions and conducted over 219 million biometric enrollments, operating through approximately 3,971 visa application centers worldwide. Its services include visa and passport application processing, biometrics, appointment scheduling, online payment collection, document verification and legalization, translation, logistics, database management, and security solutions.

The Complainant has evidenced to be the registered owner of numerous trademark registrations for VFS GLOBAL, including, but not limited to, the following:

- European Union Trade Mark Registration No. 006923569, registered on June 29, 2009, for the figurative mark VFS GLOBAL, in classes 9, 35 and 38
- Ukrainian Trademark Registration No. 144623, registered on September 12, 2011, for the figurative mark VFS GLOBAL, in classes 9 and 35.

The VFS Global Group is also the owner of the domain name <vfsglobal.com>, which was registered on February 23, 2005, and operates as the official online platform providing visa-related information and services to millions of users globally.

The aforementioned trademarks and domain name were registered prior to the registration of the disputed domain name, which was registered on August 21, 2025. The disputed domain name currently resolves to an inactive website. However, the Complainant has provided evidence demonstrating that the disputed domain name previously resolved to a website entitled "VFS Global Visa Application", which invited Internet users to sign in and to submit sensitive personal information, including their email addresses and passwords.

The Respondent, according to the disclosed Whois information for the disputed domain name, is located in Ukraine.

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.

The Complainant claims that the disputed domain name is identical or confusingly similar to its trademarks, as it incorporates the Complainant's VFS GLOBAL trademark in its entirety.

The Complainant further asserts that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name for several reasons. First, the Respondent is not commonly known by the disputed domain name and holds no trademark or trade name rights in "vfsglobal". Second, the Respondent has not been

licensed, authorized, or otherwise permitted to use the Complainant's VFS GLOBAL trademarks. Third, the Respondent has not used the disputed domain name in connection with any bona fide offering of goods or services; instead, it has adopted the Complainant's trademark to mislead Internet users and falsely suggest an affiliation with the Complainant. The Respondent's conduct demonstrates an intent to exploit the Complainant's reputation and goodwill rather than any legitimate business purpose.

Finally, the Complainant asserts that the Respondent has registered and used the disputed domain name in bad faith. First, the Respondent had actual knowledge of the Complainant's well-known trademarks and global reputation at the time of registration. Second, by using a disputed domain name for a website designed to imitate the Complainant's official website, the Respondent has intentionally attempted to attract Internet users for commercial gain by creating a likelihood of confusion as to source, sponsorship, or affiliation. Third, there are documented cases of consumers being deceived into submitting personal information and making payments under the false belief that they were dealing with the Complainant. Such fraudulent impersonation and passing off constitute evidence of bad faith under the Policy.

The Complainant requests that the disputed domain name be transferred to the Complainant.

B. Respondent

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

6. Discussion and Findings

6.1. Procedural Issues

A. Location of the Respondent

The Panel notes that the information provided by the Registrar shows that the Respondent is located in Ukraine. Ukraine is currently subject to an international conflict at the date of this Complaint and this Decision. The Panel is required to consider under paragraph 10 of the Rules whether the proceedings should continue.

Under paragraph 10 of the Rules, the Panel is required to ensure that the Parties are treated with equality and that each Party is given a fair opportunity to present its case, and that the administrative proceedings take place with due expedition.

The Panel is of the view that the proceedings should continue, having considered all the circumstances of the case. The Panel notes the following factors:

The record shows that the Notification of Complaint was sent by email to the Respondent at the address disclosed by the Registrar. No bounce-back messages suggesting the abovementioned email was not delivered to the Respondent's email address disclosed by the Registrar were received by the Center after commencement of the proceedings. The Center also sent a postal notification to the Respondent's mailing address disclosed by the Registrar, which was reported to have arrived in the destination country on November 19, 2025, and reached its collection point on November 22, 2025. In these circumstances the Panel is satisfied that proper notice has been given to the Respondent.

The Panel further notes that the disputed domain name was registered on August 21, 2025, more than three years after the commencement of the international conflict. This indicates that, at the time of registration, the Respondent was able to provide the Registrar with a functioning address despite the conflict, and therefore appears capable of controlling both the disputed domain name and the related content. Moreover, given that the Respondent evidently has Internet access, it is reasonable to conclude that the Respondent would have received at least electronic notice of this proceeding.

Also as noted later in this Decision, the Panel has no serious doubt (albeit in the absence of any Response) that the Respondent registered and has used the disputed domain name in bad faith with knowledge of the Complainant and with the intention of unfairly targeting the Complainant's trademark and goodwill.

The Panel concludes that the Parties have been given a fair opportunity to present their case. In order that the administration of proceedings takes place with due expedition, the Panel proceeds to a Decision accordingly.

B. Language of the Proceedings

The language of the Registration Agreement for the disputed domain name is Russian. 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.

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 Complaint was filed in English, and the Complainant requested that English be adopted as the language of the proceedings. The Complainant submitted that English is a universally accepted language and the standard language for international commercial and domain name dispute proceedings. The Complainant further argued that translating the Complaint into Russian would cause unnecessary delay, and would be particularly impractical, as neither the Complainant's legal team nor its representatives are conversant in Russian, and suitable Russian-language translators would be difficult to procure in the relevant jurisdictions.

The Complainant also submitted that the Respondent is likely capable of understanding English. In this regard, the Registrar's website is also in English, indicating that both, the Registrar and the Respondent have sufficient familiarity with the English language. The Complainant also notes that English is widely used in trans-border trade and business, and that the Respondent could, if necessary, rely on translation tools or other assistance to understand the Complaint.

The Center transmitted all communications to the Respondent in both English and Russian, and invited the Respondent to comment on the language of the proceedings. The Respondent, however, did not submit any comments on the language of the proceedings or react to the proceedings in any way.

Having considered all relevant circumstances, including the absence of any objection, and the need to avoid undue delay or expenses by translating all materials for the Complainant, the Panel finds it appropriate to exercise its discretion under paragraph 11(a) of the Rules. The Panel concludes that conducting the proceedings in English is fair, reasonable, and efficient and that the Respondent will not be disadvantaged by this decision. Accordingly, the Panel determines that the language of the proceedings shall be English.

6.2. Substantive Issues

Under paragraph 4(a) of the Policy, the Complainant carries the burden of proving:

- (i) that the disputed domain name is identical or confusingly similar to a trademark or service mark in which the Complainant has rights; and
- (ii) that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the disputed domain name; and
- (iii) that the disputed domain name has been registered and is being used in bad faith.

The Respondent's default in the case at hand does not automatically result in a decision in favor of the Complainant, however, paragraph 5(f) of the Rules provides that if the Respondent does not submit a response, in the absence of exceptional circumstances, the Panel shall decide the dispute based upon the Complaint.

Further, according to paragraph 14(b) of the Rules, the Panel may draw such inferences from the Respondent's failure to submit a response as it considers appropriate.

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 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, "service", 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.

Indeed, the Complainant has confirmed that the Respondent is neither affiliated with, nor otherwise authorized or licensed by the Complainant to use the VFS GLOBAL trademarks in connection with the disputed domain name or otherwise. Also, there is no evidence that the Respondent is commonly known by the disputed domain name. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 2.3.

The prior use of the disputed domain name in connection with a website designed to appear as the Complainant's official website further supports this finding. The website invited users to submit their personal information, was titled "VFS Global Visa Application", and displayed the designation "VFS Global

Group” in the footer. Such use demonstrates that the Respondent has not made a legitimate noncommercial or fair use of the disputed domain name, but instead reflects an intent to misleadingly divert consumers for commercial gain. See [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 2.4.

Furthermore, panels have consistently held that the use of a domain name for illegal activity, here, claimed impersonation/passing off, can never confer rights or legitimate interests on a respondent. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 2.13.1.

Finally, the Panel notes that the composition of the disputed domain name creates a risk of implied affiliation with the Complainant and its official website, falsely suggesting sponsorship, endorsement, or authorization by the Complainant. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 2.5.1.

Accordingly, the Complainant has provided evidence supporting its prima facie claim that the Respondent lacks any 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.

Therefore, the Panel concludes that the Respondent does not have any rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name and the Complainant has met its burden under paragraph 4(a)(ii) of the Policy.

The Panel finds the second element of the Policy has been established.

C. Registered and Used in Bad Faith

The third element of paragraph 4(a) of the Policy requires that the Complainant demonstrate that the Respondent registered and is using the disputed domain name in bad faith.

The Panel notes that the Complainant’s VFS GLOBAL trademarks substantially predate the registration of the disputed domain name. At the time of registration, the Complainant’s trademarks were widely known worldwide in connection with visa facilitation and consular services, including through its official website. Therefore, the Respondent knew or should have known the Complainant’s trademarks at the time of registering the disputed domain name. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 3.2.2.

The disputed domain name reproduces the Complainant’s VFS GLOBAL trademark in its entirety together with the term “service”. Given the content of the website to which the disputed domain name resolved, the Panel finds that this composition cannot be coincidental and demonstrates an intent to target the Complaint and seeks to take unfair advantage of the Complainant’s trademark rights.

The Panel further notes that the disputed domain name has been used to operate a website that imitated the Complainant’s website, falsely presenting itself as a platform for visa-related services. According to the Complainant, Internet users were misled into believing that the website was operated or endorsed by the Complainant, resulting in actual consumer harm, including the payment of substantial sums of money and the disclosure of personal information. This conduct demonstrates that the Respondent intentionally attempted to attract Internet users for commercial gain by creating a likelihood of confusion with the Complainant’s trademarks as to source, sponsorship, affiliation, or endorsement of its website. Under paragraph 4(b)(iv) of the Policy, this circumstance shall be evidence of the registration and use of a domain name in bad faith. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 3.1.4.

Finally, Panels have held that the use of a domain name for illegal activity, here, impersonation/passing off constitutes bad faith. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 3.4.

The Panel finds that, in the circumstances of this case, the Respondent’s registration and use of the disputed domain name constitute bad faith within the meaning of paragraph 4(b)(iv) of 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 <vfsglobalservice.com> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Alissia Shchichka/

Alissia Shchichka

Sole Panelist

Date: December 17, 2025