

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

Sapient Corporation v. bradley cosper
Case No. D2025-4494

1. The Parties

The Complainant is Sapient Corporation, United States of America (the “United States”), represented by Neal, Gerber & Eisenberg LLP, United States.

The Respondent is bradley cosper, United States.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <sapientgroup.solutions> 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 30, 2025. On October 31, 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 disclosing registrant and contact information for the disputed domain name which differed from the named Respondent (Registration Private, Domains by Proxy, LLC) 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 amendment to the Complaint on November 4, 2025.

The Center verified that the Complaint together with the amendment to 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 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 Nels T. Lippert as the sole panelist in this matter on December 4, 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 United States corporation. The Complainant is a business and software solutions company with over 50 offices around the world. The Complainant provides business strategy and consulting services, design and development of computer software platforms, and implementation of artificial intelligence systems. The Complainant and its predecessors and related companies have been using the SAPIENT trademark for over 20 years.

The Complainant is the owner of numerous trademark registrations worldwide for trademarks comprised of, or containing the word “Sapient”. Representative examples of registrations of the SAPIENT mark include:

- United States Registration No. 2,012,848, registered on October 29, 1996;
- United States Registration No. 2,555,676, registered on April 2, 2002;
- United States Registration No. 2,638,720, registered on October 22, 2002; and
- Canadian Registration No. TMA541,485, registered on February 23, 2001.

The Complainant additionally operates a website at “www.publicissapient.com”.

The disputed domain name was registered on September 26, 2022. Prior to August 2025, the disputed domain name resolved to a website promoting information technology and business consulting services under the name “Sapient Group” and mark. On August 7, 2023, counsel for the Complainant sent a cease-and-desist letter to the Respondent which demanded transfer of the disputed domain name, followed by a demand letter on October 17, 2023 and an email on July 29, 2025. The Respondent did not respond to any of those communications. Following letters to the Registrar and hosting company, the infringing content was removed from the website as of August 22, 2025. At the time of the Complaint, the disputed domain name resolved to an inactive website.

The Respondent is an individual who resides in the United States.

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 registered trademarks because it consists of the SAPIENT mark along with only the descriptive term “group”. The Complainant also contends that the Respondent cannot establish a legitimate right to, or interest in, the disputed domain name, because the Respondent has no relationship with the Complainant and the Complainant has not consented to the registration of the disputed domain name by the Respondent. Furthermore, the Complainant alleges that the Respondent does not own or have a license to use the SAPIENT mark and is not making a legitimate noncommercial or fair use of the disputed domain name. Rather, the Complainant argues that originally the Respondent used the disputed domain name to attract Internet users to its website by creating confusion and diverting traffic and subsequently to resolve to an inactive website which demonstrates that the Respondent is not making legitimate use of the disputed domain name for the bona fide offering of goods or services. Finally, the Complaint alleges that the Respondent registered and used the disputed domain name in bad faith because it knew or should have known of the Complainant’s SAPIENT mark by virtue of the registrations of that mark. Moreover, the

Complainant argues that bad faith is also evidenced by the Respondent's passive holding of the disputed domain name which could be used to engage in fraudulent and harmful activities against the Complainant including phishing schemes.

B. Respondent

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

6. Discussion and Findings

As noted above, the Respondent did not respond to the Complainant's allegations. Under the Rules, paragraphs 5(f) and 14(a), the effect of a default by the Respondent is that, in the absence of exceptional circumstances, the Panel shall proceed to a decision on the basis of the Complaint. The Panel does not find any exceptional circumstance in this case.

Paragraph 4(a) of the Policy provides that in order to divest a respondent of a domain name, a complainant must demonstrate each of the following:

- (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.

Under paragraph 15(a) of the Rules, "[a] Panel shall decide a complaint on the basis of the statements and documents submitted and in accordance with the Policy, these Rules and any rules and principles of law that it deems applicable".

In this case, the Panel finds that as a result of the Respondent's failure to submit a Response, the Respondent has failed to rebut any of the reasonable factual assertions that are made and supported by evidence submitted by the Complainant. By failing to respond, the Respondent has failed to offer the Panel any of the types of evidence set forth in paragraph 4(c) of the Policy or otherwise, from which the Panel might conclude that the Respondent has any rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name.

Moreover, the Respondent failed to provide any information or reasoning that might rebut the Complainant's arguments that the Respondent has acted 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.

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, "group" 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.

Furthermore, it is well established that the applicable Top-Level Domain in a domain name is viewed as a standard registration requirement and as such is disregarded under the first element confusing similarity test. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 1.11.

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.

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 Respondent initially registered and used the disputed domain name to intentionally attempt to attract for commercial gain Internet users to its website by creating a likelihood of confusion with the Complainant’s mark. This demonstrates registration and use in bad faith per paragraph 4(b)(iv) of the Policy. Panels have consistently found that the mere registration of a domain name that is identical or confusingly similar (particularly domain names comprising typos or incorporating the mark plus a descriptive term) to a famous or widely-known trademark by an unaffiliated entity can by itself create a presumption of bad faith. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 3.1.4. Factors such as “(i) actual confusion, (ii) seeking to cause confusion (including by technical means beyond the domain name itself) for the respondent’s commercial benefit, even if unsuccessful, (iii) the lack of a respondent’s own rights to or legitimate interests in a domain name, [...], and (vi) absence of any conceivable good faith use” further support the Panel’s finding. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 3.1.4.

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.

Panels have found that the non-use of a domain name would not prevent a finding of bad faith under the doctrine of passive holding. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 3.3. Having reviewed the available record, the Panel notes the distinctiveness or reputation of the Complainant’s trademark, and the composition of the disputed domain name, and finds that in the circumstances of this case the passive holding of the disputed domain name does not prevent a finding of bad faith under the Policy.

In the present case, the passive holding of the disputed domain name following demands from the Complainant's counsel further supports the finding of bad faith registration and use.

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 <sapientgroup.solutions> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Nels T. Lippert/

Nels T. Lippert

Sole Panelist

Date: December 18, 2025