

## **ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION**

**VFS Global Services PLC v. sammons sammons**  
**Case No. D2025-4869**

### **1. The Parties**

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

The Respondent is sammons sammons, India.

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

The disputed domain name <vfhelpline.com> is registered with Gransy, s.r.o. d/b/a subreg.cz (the "Registrar").

### **3. Procedural History**

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the "Center") on November 22, 2025. On November 24, 2025, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On November 26, 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 (Not Available) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on November 26, 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 27, 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 December 4, 2025. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was December 24, 2025. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent's default on December 26, 2025.

The Center appointed Adam Taylor as the sole panelist in this matter on December 31, 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's group has supplied visa administration and processing services under the marks VFS and VFS GLOBAL for over 20 years. The group operates approximately 4,000 visa application centres in some 165 countries.

The Complainant's group own many registered trade marks for VFS including the Indian trade mark No. 1255698, registered on December 16, 2003, in class 35.

The Complainant's group operates a website at "www.vfsglobal.com". The Complainant also owns the domain name <vfshelpline.com>, registered on September 3, 2007, which is used for the Complainant's helpline email addresses<sup>1</sup>.

The disputed domain name was registered on June 5, 2025.

The Complainant has provided a complaint from a visa applicant stating that, on or around November 3, 2025, he was directed to an email address associated with the disputed domain name that was used to induce him to pay a bogus application fee.

When reviewed by the Panel, the disputed domain name resolved to a webpage with a maintenance message.

#### **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.

##### **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 trade mark and the disputed domain name. WIPO Overview of WIPO Panel Views on Selected UDRP Questions, Third Edition ("WIPO Overview 3.0"), section 1.7.

---

<sup>1</sup> Noting the general powers of a panel articulated in paragraphs 10 and 12 of the Rules, it is commonly accepted that a panel may undertake limited factual research into matters of public record, as the Panel has done in this proceeding.

The Complainant has shown rights in respect of a trade mark or service mark for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 1.2.1.

The Panel finds that a dominant feature of the mark, namely “VF” is recognisable 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.

Furthermore, the broader case context, including use of the disputed domain name to impersonate the Complainant for fraudulent purposes (see under the third element below), supports a finding of confusing similarity as it indicates that the Respondent registered the disputed domain name precisely seeking to target the Complainant’s mark.

Although the addition of other terms (here, “helpline”) 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 recognised 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.

Furthermore, Panels have held that the use of a domain name for illegal activity (here, claimed impersonation/fraud) can never confer rights or legitimate interests on a respondent. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 2.13.1. See further under the third element below.

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

## **C. Registered and Used in Bad Faith**

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 impersonation/fraud) 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. In particular, as mentioned in section 4 above, the disputed domain name, which is very similar to the domain

name used by the Complainant for its helpline email addresses, has been used for an email address that impersonated the Complainant in order to induce a visa applicant to pay a bogus application fee.

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 <vfhelpline.com> be transferred to the Complainant.

*/Adam Taylor/*

**Adam Taylor**

Sole Panelist

Date: January 14, 2026