

## **ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION**

VFS Global Services PLC v. Luke man, FloaterPay  
Case No. D2026-0155

### **1. The Parties**

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

The Respondent is Luke man, FloaterPay, Nigeria.

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

The disputed domain name <vfsservices.org> is registered with Tucows Domains Inc. (the “Registrar”).

### **3. Procedural History**

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the “Center”) on January 14, 2026. On January 15, 2026, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On January 15, 2026, 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 January 16, 2026, 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 January 16, 2026.

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 January 19, 2026. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was February 8, 2026. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent’s default on February 9, 2026.

The Center appointed Assen Alexiev as the sole panelist in this matter on February 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.


#### 4. Factual Background

The Complainant was incorporated in 2010 in the United Kingdom. It is part of the VFS GLOBAL group of companies, which provides business process outsourcing, technology, and logistics support services related to the processing of visa applications under the brand VFS to the diplomatic missions of 69 governments in 165 countries. The Complainant submits that the VFS GLOBAL group has successfully processed over 514 million transactions since 2001 and over 219 million biometric enrolments since 2007 through 3971 visa application centres in Asia, Africa, the Middle East, and Europe. The Complainant operates its official website at the domain name <vfsglobal.com>, registered since February 23, 2005.

The Complainant is the owner of numerous trademark registrations for VFS (the “VFS trademark”) in various jurisdictions, including the following representative registrations:

- the Indian trademark VFS with registration No.1126304, registered on August 14, 2002 for goods in International Class 16;

- the International trademark  with registration No. 1752806, registered on July 18, 2023 for services in International Classes 35, 39, and 42; and

- the Chinese trademark  with registration No. 4307721, registered on March 28, 2008 for services in International Class 35.

The disputed domain name was registered on June 9, 2025. It currently resolves to a webpage with the text “This Account has been suspended.”

#### 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.

The Complainant states that the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to its VFS trademark, because its dominating element is identical to this trademark.

According to the Complainant, the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the disputed domain name, because it does not reflect the Respondent’s name and the Respondent has no relevant trademark registrations, and because the Complainant has not authorised the Respondent to use the VFS trademark.

The Complainant states that it has been appointed by the governments of various countries to carry out visa administration and management services in many countries on their behalf, and points out that visa applications and issuance comprise highly confidential data and information. The Complainant notes that the Respondent has no justification for adopting the disputed domain name, and it has done so in attempt to deceive consumers by misrepresenting the origin of the services that it offers. According to the Complainant, such unauthorised and fraudulent use trades off the goodwill of the Complainant’s VFS trademark.

The Complainant contends that the disputed domain name was registered and is being used in bad faith. According to it, the Respondent must have been aware of the Complainant’s VFS trademark when

registering the disputed domain name, and has intentionally registered it to deceive the public. The Complainant submits that Internet users would be confused into believing that the disputed domain name is related to the Complainant and would submit their personal information to the Respondent. The Complainant states that the disputed domain name does not host an active website, but the Respondent has activated email accounts associated with it and has sent email messages from them, representing itself as “VFS GLOBAL APPLICATION CENTER” and demanding money for processing visa applications and work permits, including payments towards biometric fees, processing fees, and insurance charges. The Complainant maintains that the Respondent’s actions represent impersonation, phishing, and financial fraud, carried out by exploiting the goodwill of the Complainant’s VFS trademark.

## **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 (“[WIPO Overview 3.1](#)”), section 1.7.

The Complainant has shown rights in respect of the VFS trademark for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.2.1.

The Panel finds the VFS trademark is recognisable within the disputed domain name. Accordingly, the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to the VFS trademark for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.7.

Although the addition of other terms (here, “services”) 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 VFS trademark for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), 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 that 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 3.1](#), 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 illegitimate activity (here, claimed impersonation of the Complainant, phishing of personal information, and other types of fraud) can never confer rights or legitimate interests on a respondent. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 2.13.1.

The disputed domain name is confusingly similar to the Complainant's VFS trademark and does not resolve to an active website. The Complainant claims that it has been used for the transmission to third parties of fraudulent emails that impersonate the Complainant and demand payments. The Respondent has not denied this and has not provided any plausible explanation why it registered the disputed domain name and how it intends to use it.

Considering the above, the Panel accepts as more likely than not that the Respondent is not using the disputed domain name in connection with a bona fide offering of goods or services and is not making a legitimate noncommercial or fair use of it. Rather, it appears the disputed domain name has been used for illegitimate purposes, which cannot give rise to rights or legitimate interests of the Respondent.

The Panel therefore finds that 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.

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 3.1](#), section 3.2.1.

Panels have held that the use of a domain name for illegitimate activity (here, claimed impersonation of the Complainant, phishing of personal information, or other types of fraud) constitutes bad faith. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), 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 disputed domain name is confusingly similar to the Complainant's trademark and its composition creates an appearance that it represents an official online location of the Complainant. It does not resolve to an active website, but the Complainant submits that the Respondent has set up and is using email accounts associated with it for the distribution of fraudulent email communications impersonating the Complainant and attempting to collect personal information and receive payments. The Respondent does not deny this and does not allege that it is using the disputed domain name for legitimate activities.

It therefore appears as more likely than not that the Respondent is using the disputed domain name to impersonate the Complainant in order to mislead Internet users that they are dealing with the Complainant in attempt to collect their personal information or receive payments from them for purported services that they would believe are provided by the Complainant. Such conduct constitutes bad faith use even though the disputed domain name is not operated in connection with an active website. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 3.4.

The Panel therefore 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 <vfsservices.org> be transferred to the Complainant.

*/Assen Alexiev/*

**Assen Alexiev**

Sole Panelist

Date: February 19, 2026