

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

Veolia Environnement SA v. Luka Cantero

Case No. D2025-5023

1. The Parties

The Complainant is Veolia Environnement SA, France, represented by IP Twins, France.

The Respondent is Luka Cantero, Spain.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <veolia.cat> is registered with Soluciones Corporativas IP, LLC (the “Registrar”).

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the “Center”) on December 3, 2025. On December 4, 2025, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On December 4, 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 (Unknown) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on December 5, 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 December 8, 2025.

On December 5, 2025, the Center informed the parties in Spanish and English, that the language of the registration agreement for the disputed domain name is Spanish. On December 8, 2025, the Complainant requested English to be the language of the proceeding. The Respondent did not submit any comment on the Complainant’s submission.

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 December 12, 2025. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was January 1, 2026. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent's default on January 7, 2026.

The Center appointed Edoardo Fano as the sole panelist in this matter on January 12, 2026. 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.

The Panel has not received any requests from the Complainant or the Respondent regarding further submissions, waivers or extensions of deadlines, and the Panel has not found it necessary to request any further information from the Parties.

Having reviewed the communication records in the case file provided by the Center, the Panel finds that the Center has discharged its responsibility under the Rules, paragraph 2(a), "to employ reasonably available means calculated to achieve actual notice to [the] Respondent". Therefore, the Panel shall issue its Decision based upon the Complaint, the Policy, the Rules and the Supplemental Rules and without the benefit of a response from the Respondent.

4. Factual Background

The Complainant is Veolia Environnement SA, the French holding company of the 170 years old Veolia Group, operating in the fields of water, waste and energy, and owning several trademark registrations worldwide for VEOLIA, among which:

- International Trademark Registration No. 814678 for VEOLIA, registered on September 11, 2003;
- International Trademark Registration No. 919580 for VEOLIA, registered on March 10, 2006;
- European Union Trademark Registration No. 0910325 for VEOLIA, registered on March 10, 2006.

The Complainant also operates on the Internet, its main website being "www.veolia.com".

The Complainant provided evidence in support of the above.

According to the Whois records, the disputed domain name was registered on December 30, 2024, and it currently resolves to a parking page with pay-per-click ("PPC") links ¹, although when the Complaint was filed it resolved to a Registrar's parking page.

On November 19, 2025, the Complainant sent a cease-and-desist letter to the registrant of the disputed domain name via the contact form of "domini.cat", requesting to be provided with the identity of the registrant: "domini.cat" replied that they had forwarded the Complainant's communication to the registrant of the disputed domain name, from which the Complainant did not receive any reply.

¹ Noting in particular the general powers of a panel articulated *inter alia* in paragraphs 10 and 12 of the UDRP Rules, it has been accepted that a panel may undertake limited factual research into matters of public record if it would consider such information useful to assessing the case merits and reaching a decision. This may include visiting the website linked to the disputed domain name. WIPO Overview of WIPO Panel Views on Selected UDRP Questions, Third Edition ("[WIPO Overview 3.0](#)"), section 4.8.

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 disputed domain name is identical to its trademark VEOLIA.

Moreover, the Complainant asserts that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the disputed domain name, since it has not been authorized by the Complainant to register the disputed domain name or to use its trademark within the disputed domain name, it is not commonly known by the disputed domain name, and it is not making either a bona fide offering of goods or services or a legitimate noncommercial or fair use of the disputed domain name. When the Complaint was filed, the disputed domain name resolved to a Registrar's parking page.

The Complainant submits that the Respondent has registered the disputed domain name in bad faith, since the Complainant's trademark VEOLIA is well known in the fields of water, waste and energy. Therefore, the Respondent targeted the Complainant's trademark at the time of registration of the disputed domain name and the Complainant contends that the passive holding of the disputed domain name qualifies as bad faith registration and use.

B. Respondent

The Respondent has made no reply to the Complainant's contentions and is in default. In reference to paragraphs 5(f) and 14 of the Rules, no exceptional circumstances explaining the default have been put forward or are apparent from the record.

A respondent is not obliged to participate in a proceeding under the Policy, but if it fails to do so, reasonable facts asserted by a complainant may be taken as true, and appropriate inferences, in accordance with paragraph 14(b) of the Rules, may be drawn. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 4.3.

6. Discussion and Findings

6.1 Language of Proceeding

According to paragraph 11(a) of the Rules, the Panel decides that the language of the proceeding will be English. The language of the Registration Agreement of the disputed domain name is Spanish. The Complainant has requested English to be the language of the proceeding and the Respondent did not comment to the Complainant's request to use English.

The Panel finds that it would be not only unnecessary but also unfair, both economically and timewise, to request the Complainant to translate the Complaint. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 4.5.1. For this reason, the proceedings will be conducted in English.

6.2 Substantive Issues

Paragraph 4(a) of the Policy lists three elements, which the Complainant must satisfy in order to succeed:

- (i) the disputed 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 disputed domain name; and

(iii) the disputed domain name has been registered and is being used 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 3.0](#), section 1.7.

Based on the available record, the Panel finds 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 Panel finds the entirety of the mark is reproduced within the disputed domain name. Accordingly, the disputed domain name is identical similar to the mark for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 1.7.

It is well-accepted that a generic Top-Level Domain ("gTLD"), in this case ".cat", is typically ignored when assessing the similarity between a trademark and a domain name. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 1.11.1.

Based on the available record, 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.

While 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 often impossible 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. 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 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. When the Complaint was filed the disputed domain name resolved to a Registrar's parking page. The disputed domain name currently resolves to a parking page with PPC links. The use of a disputed domain name to host a parked page comprising PPC links does not represent a *bona fide* offering where such links compete with or capitalize on the reputation and goodwill of the Complainant's trademark. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 2.9.

Moreover, the Panel finds that the composition of the disputed domain name carries a risk of implied affiliation as it effectively impersonates or suggests sponsorship or endorsement by the Complainant. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 2.5.1.

Based on the available record, 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, regarding the registration in bad faith of the disputed domain name, the reputation of the Complainant's trademark VEOLIA in the fields of water, waste and energy is clearly established, and the Panel finds that the Respondent knew more likely than not of the Complainant, and deliberately registered the disputed domain name in bad faith.

As regards the use in bad faith, when the Complaint was filed the disputed domain name resolved to a Registrar's parking page. In the circumstances of this case, the Panel finds that the previous passive holding of the disputed domain name does not prevent a finding of bad faith. Currently, the website at the disputed domain name is a page with several PPC links, possibly automatically generated, some of them referring to the field of water, among the main business activities of the Complainant. Therefore, the Panel considers that this use of the website associated with the disputed domain name must be considered in bad faith since some of the links on the website at the disputed domain name, even in the case they are automatically generated, are referring to one of the main business activities of the Complainant and are therefore likely to create confusion. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 3.5.

The above suggests to the Panel that the Respondent intentionally registered and is using the disputed domain name in order to attract, for commercial gain, Internet users to its website in accordance with paragraph 4(b)(iv) of the Policy.

Furthermore, the Panel considers that the nature of the inherently misleading disputed domain name, which is identical to the Complainant's trademark, further supports a finding of bad faith. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 3.2.1.

Based on the available record, the Panel finds the third element of the Policy has been established.

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, <veolia.cat> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Edoardo Fano/

Edoardo Fano

Sole Panelist

Date: January 20, 2026