

## **ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION**

Accenture Global Services Limited v. Maria Caroline Neocleous, Tencaro Services LTD

Case No. D2025-4825

### **1. The Parties**

The Complainant is Accenture Global Services Limited, Ireland, represented by McDermott Will & Schulte LLP, United States of America ("United States").

The Respondent is Maria Caroline Neocleous, Tencaro Services LTD, Cyprus.

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

The disputed domain name <accenturetechnosolutions.com> is registered with NameCheap, Inc. (the "Registrar").

### **3. Procedural History**

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the "Center") on November 20, 2025. On November 20, 2025, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrant verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On November 20, 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 (Unidentified Registrant) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on November 21, 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 26, 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 28, 2025. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was December 18, 2025. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent's default on December 19, 2025.

The Center appointed Meera Chature Sankhari as the sole panelist in this matter on December 24, 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 an international business that provides a broad range of services and solutions in strategy, consulting, digital, technology and outsourcing services under the mark ACCENTURE. The Complainant has offices and operations in more than 200 cities in over 120 countries.

The Complainant owns registrations for the mark ACCENTURE and ACCENTURE & Design in over 140 jurisdictions, comprising more than 1,000 trademark registrations worldwide ("ACCENTURE Marks"). The Complainant obtained registration for the mark ACCENTURE in multiple classes in the United States on May 16, 2006, under Registration No. 3,091,811.

The Complainant has extensively advertised and promoted the ACCENTURE marks through various media channels and has incurred substantial expenditures in connection therewith.

The Complainant and its ACCENTURE marks have received numerous accolades, including recognition as one of the world's most valuable IT services brands by Brand Finance in 2025. The mark has also been acknowledged in leading brand rankings, such as Interbrand's Best Global Brands report, where it was ranked 31st, and BrandZ's Top 100 Brand Rankings, where it was ranked 58th. In 2025, the Complainant's mark and brand ACCENTURE was ranked 20<sup>th</sup> with the brand valuation of over USD 100 billion.

The Complainant owns and operates the domain name <accenture.com>, registered on August 29, 2000. At this website, the Internet users can find detailed information about the management, consulting, technology services, outsourcing and other services offered by the Complainant and its global offices in connection with the ACCENTURE Marks including the Complainant's services in the areas of digital design, digital marketing, user experience and process design.

The disputed domain name was registered on September 14, 2025. The publicly available WhoIs records for the disputed domain name did not identify the Respondent, which were disclosed by the Registrar after the Complaint was lodged.

The disputed domain name resolves to an active website that and offers digital marketing and business strategy. The website displays "Accenture Technology Solutions" - which is the name of a Complainant's primary registered entity in France - and its contact details (postal address).

#### **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 contains the Complainant's entire ACCENTURE mark, paired only with the descriptive terms "techno" and "solutions". The addition of a generic Top-Level Domain ".com" to the disputed domain name is without legal significance. Thus, the use of the confusingly similar disputed domain name is likely to mislead and deceive Internet users and to cause mistakes as to the source, sponsorship, affiliation or endorsement of the disputed domain name.

The Complainant submits that its ACCENTURE mark is a coined term and not a generic or descriptive term in which the Respondent might have any interest. The Respondent is neither affiliated with, nor has it been licensed or permitted to use the Complainant's ACCENTURE Marks or any domain name incorporating those trademarks. Additionally, the Complainant submits that the Respondent is not commonly known by the disputed domain name. The Complainant submits that the Respondent is using the name "Accenture Technology Solutions", a registered entity of the Complainant in France, along with its address on the website at the disputed domain name. The Complainant alleges that by such use, the Respondent is attempting to create a false impression of affiliation or association with the Complainant, thereby causing confusion among consumers. Further, the Respondent is offering competing goods and services through the disputed domain name. The Complainant contends that the Respondent is seeking to pass off its goods and services as those of the Complainant. Thus, there is no evidence of legitimate noncommercial or fair use of the disputed domain name.

The Complainant contends that the Respondent had constructive notice that the ACCENTURE Mark was a registered trademark in the United States and many other jurisdictions worldwide. The Complainant submits that the Respondent is trying to mislead Internet users who are searching for the Complainant, but instead reach the disputed domain name, where the Respondent is holding itself out as offering, competing with, or having the potential to compete with, the Complainant's goods and services in relation to digital marketing and design. The Complainant argues that the Respondent has registered and is using the disputed domain name to attract for commercial gain Internet users to its website by creating a likelihood of confusion with the Complainant's ACCENTURE Marks as to the source, sponsorship, affiliation or endorsement of the website.

## **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. The Panel finds the mark is recognizable 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, "techno" and "solutions" may bear on assessment of the second and third elements, the Panel finds the addition of such terms 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 impersonation/passing off 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 concurs with the Complainant’s contentions that the Respondent is using the name and address of the Complainant’s primary entity in France (and the Panel notes that the Respondent has also reproduced this name in the copyright notice) on the website at the disputed domain name with the intent to deceive Internet users and create confusion as to the source, sponsorship, or affiliation with the Complainant and its ACCENTURE Marks for commercial gain. The Panel further notes that the disputed domain name offers services similar to, and competing with, those of the Complainant and is therefore intended to disrupt the Complainant’s business.

Panels have held that the use of a domain name for illegal activity here, claimed impersonation/passing off 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 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 <accenturetechnosolutions.com> be transferred to the Complainant.

*/Meera Chature Sankhari/*

**Meera Chature Sankhari**

Sole Panelist

Date: January 7, 2026