

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

Veolia Environnement S.A. v. Charmaine Nason
Case No. D2025-4721

1. The Parties

The Complainant is Veolia Environnement S.A., France, represented internally and by IP Twins, France.

The Respondent is Charmaine Nason, United States of America.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <eau-veolia.com> is registered with Hosting Concepts B.V. d/b/a Registrar.eu. (the “Registrar”).

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the “Center”) on November 14, 2025. On November 14, 2025, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On November 14, 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 19, 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 20, 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 25, 2025. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was December 15, 2025. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent’s default on December 17, 2025.

The Center appointed Halvor Manshaus as the sole panelist in this matter on December 30, 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 Veolia group, which has been in operation for 170 years and conducts business within water management, waste management, and energy services.

The Complainant holds the following trademark registrations for VEOLIA:

- International trademark VEOLIA number 814678, registered September 11, 2003, in classes 1, 6, 9, 11, 17, 19, 32, 35, 36, 37, 39, 40, 41 and 42;
- International trademark VEOLIA number 919580, registered March 10, 2006, in classes 9, 11, 16, 35, 36, 37, 38, 39, 40, 41 and 42; and
- International trademark VEOLIA number 910325, registered March 10, 2006, in classes 9, 11, 16, 32, 35, 36, 37, 38, 39, 40, 41, 42 and 44

Further, the Complainant holds the domain name <veolia.com>, registered on December 30, 2002.

The disputed domain name was registered on June 7, 2025, and redirected to a webpage displaying an alleged unpaid invoice and the Complainant's trademark. Following cease and desist letters issued by the Complainant to relevant parties, the disputed domain name was deactivated.

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 trademark. The disputed domain name includes the Complainant's trademark in its entirety with the inclusion of the generic term "eau". Moreover, the term "eau" means "water" in French, and serves as a reference to one of three core businesses of the Complainant.

Further, the Complainant argues that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the disputed domain name. The Respondent is neither affiliated with nor authorized to use the disputed domain name. The Respondent has no prior rights or legitimate interest in the domain name, as the Complainant's trademark predates the registration of the disputed domain name by several years. Furthermore, the Respondent's use of the disputed domain name for phishing activities cannot constitute a legitimate interest.

Lastly, the Complainant asserts that the disputed domain name has been registered and is being used in bad faith. The Respondent has reproduced the Complainant's trademark in its entirety with the addition of the generic term "eau". Given the Complainant's trademark global reputation and distinctiveness, it is unlikely that the Respondent was unaware of the Complainant's trademark when registering the disputed domain name. Furthermore, the Complainant submits that the Respondent's primary motive in using the disputed domain name was to capitalize on the Complainant's trademark by engaging in fraudulent activity to obtain financial gain.

B. Respondent

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

6. Discussion and Findings

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 "eau", 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.

Panels have held that the use of a domain name for illegal activity here, claimed phishing, 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 notes that the disputed domain name incorporates the Complainant's trademark in its entirety, and that the Complainant's trademark registration predates the registration of the disputed domain name. The Panel therefore finds it unlikely that the Respondent was unaware of the Complainant's trademark at the time of registering the disputed domain name.

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 held that the use of a domain name for illegal activity, here claimed phishing, constitutes bad faith. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 3.4. Having reviewed the record, the Panel finds the Respondent's registration and use of the disputed domain name constitutes bad faith under the Policy.

The Panel further notes that the disputed domain name formerly redirected to a webpage displaying an alleged unpaid invoice and the Complainant's trademark, suggesting phishing-related use. The addition of the term "eau", the French word meaning "water", increases the likelihood of confusion by appearing to refer to one of the Complainant's core business areas. As such, the Panel finds that the disputed domain name was registered and used to attract Internet users, for commercial gain, by creating a likelihood of confusion with the Complainant's trademark.

The current non-use of the disputed domain name does not change the above outcome.

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 <eau-veolia.com> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Halvor Manshaus/

Halvor Manshaus

Sole Panelist

Date: January 13, 2026