

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

Accenture Global Services Limited v. Valeriy Kipelov
Case No. D2026-0190

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 Valeriy Kipelov, Ukraine.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <accenture-marketing.online> is registered with Hostinger Operations, UAB (the “Registrar”).

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the “Center”) on January 16, 2026. On January 19, 2026, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On January 20, 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 (Unidentified Registrant of Accenture-Marketing.Online) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on January 21, 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 amended Complaint on January 23, 2026.

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 January 27, 2026. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was February 16, 2026. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent’s default on February 17, 2026.

The Center appointed Francisco Castillo-Chacón as the sole panelist in this matter on February 23, 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. Further Procedural Considerations

Under paragraph 10 of the Rules, the Panel is required to conduct the proceeding in a manner that ensures that the Parties are treated with equality, that each Party is given a fair opportunity to present its case, and that the proceeding is carried out with due expedition.

In the present case, the Respondent's postal address is indicated as being located in Ukraine. While the accuracy of this address cannot be confirmed, the Panel notes that Ukraine is currently affected by an ongoing international conflict which could potentially affect the effectiveness of case notification. In these circumstances, the Panel considers it appropriate, pursuant to its discretion under paragraph 10 of the Rules, to determine whether the proceeding should nevertheless continue.

Having reviewed the record, the Panel is satisfied that the Center has taken the steps required under the Rules to notify the Respondent of the Complaint. In particular, the Center sent the Notification of Complaint by email to the Respondent using the email address provided by the Registrar. There is no indication in the case file that the notification email failed to be delivered.

The Panel further notes that, for the reasons discussed below in this Decision, the evidence on record strongly supports a finding that the Respondent registered and used the disputed domain name in bad faith, with the intention of taking unfair advantage of the Complainant's trademark rights.

In light of the foregoing, the Panel finds that the requirements of paragraph 10 of the Rules have been satisfied and that the Parties have been afforded a fair opportunity to present their respective cases. The Panel therefore proceeds to render its decision on the merits of the dispute.

5. Factual Background

The Complainant is an international business that provides a broad range of services and solutions in strategy, consulting, digital, technology and operations under the name ACCENTURE and is the owner of the ACCENTURE trademark and company name, and marks fully incorporating the ACCENTURE trademark (collectively the "ACCENTURE Marks"). The Complainant is the owner of the trademark ACCENTURE since October 6, 2000, Complainant filed a United States trademark application (Application Serial No. 76/154,620) for the mark ACCENTURE, covering computer software, pamphlets, business consulting services, financial services, computer installation services, educational services and computer consulting services, among many other goods and services. This application matured to registration (Reg. No. 3,091,811) on May 16, 2006. The Complainant owns registrations for the ACCENTURE mark and ACCENTURE & Design mark in more than 140 countries. The Complainant owns more than 1,000 registrations for the marks ACCENTURE, ACCENTURE & Design and many other marks incorporating the ACCENTURE brand for a variety of products and services. The Complainant has developed substantial goodwill in its ACCENTURE name and its ACCENTURE Marks, as well as its official domain name, <accenture.com>.

The disputed domain name was registered on January 7, 2026, and it resolves to a website advertising services such as digital marketing, cloud and cybersecurity services. The website displays the name of the Complainant's affiliate entity in the United Kingdom and lists the Complainant's physical address.

6. 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 submits that the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to its ACCENTURE trademark. The disputed domain name incorporates the ACCENTURE mark in its entirety, which remains clearly recognizable within the disputed domain name and is sufficient to establish confusing similarity for purposes of the Policy.

The Complainant states that it owns extensive trademark rights in the ACCENTURE mark. In the United States, the Complainant filed a trademark application for ACCENTURE on October 6, 2000 (Application Serial No. 76/154,620), which matured to registration on May 16, 2006 (Registration No. 3,091,811). The Complainant also owns numerous additional United States registrations for ACCENTURE and ACCENTURE & Design marks covering goods and services in multiple international classes. These registrations constitute prima facie evidence of the validity of the mark and of the Complainant's ownership and exclusive rights therein. The Complainant further owns more than 1,000 trademark registrations for ACCENTURE and related marks in over 140 jurisdictions worldwide.

The Complainant indicates that it has used the ACCENTURE mark in commerce since at least 2001 and that it has developed substantial goodwill and global recognition in connection with its consulting, technology and outsourcing services. The Complainant operates its principal website at <accenture.com>, registered on August 30, 2000, through which it promotes its services worldwide.

According to the Complainant, the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name. The Respondent is not affiliated with the Complainant and has not been authorized to use the ACCENTURE mark in any manner. The Complainant further contends that, given the worldwide reputation of the ACCENTURE mark and its extensive promotion, the Respondent must have been aware of the Complainant and its trademark rights when registering the disputed domain name.

The Complainant therefore submits that the disputed domain name was registered and is being used in bad faith with the intention of taking unfair advantage of the reputation and goodwill associated with the ACCENTURE mark.

B. Respondent

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

7. Discussion and Findings

Under paragraph 4(a) of the Policy, the Complainant must establish each of the following elements in order to obtain the requested remedy:

- (i) that the disputed domain name is identical or confusingly similar to a trademark or service mark in which the Complainant has rights;
- (ii) that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the disputed domain name; and
- (iii) that the disputed domain name has been registered and is being used in bad faith.

The Panel is satisfied that the Center has taken the steps required under the Rules to give the Respondent proper notice of the Complaint and a fair opportunity to respond. In accordance with paragraph 5(c)(i) of the Rules, a respondent is expected to address specifically the allegations set out in the complaint and to set forth any grounds on which it claims a right to retain the domain name registration. In the present case,

however, the Respondent did not submit any Response and has therefore failed to rebut the Complainant's assertions or to advance any basis upon which it might claim rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name.

The Panel accordingly proceeds to consider whether the Complainant has established the three elements required under paragraph 4(a) of the Policy.

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 Select UDRP Questions ("[WIPO Overview 3.1](#)"), section 1.7.

The Complainant has shown rights in respect of a trademark or service mark for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), 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 3.1](#), section 1.7.

Although the addition of other terms here, "marketing" 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 3.1](#), 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 recognized 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.

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 non-exhaustive list of circumstances that may evidence registration and use of a domain name in bad faith, including where a respondent intentionally attempts to attract, for commercial gain, Internet users to its website by creating a likelihood of confusion with the complainant's mark as to the source, sponsorship, affiliation, or endorsement of the website or of the services offered there.

In the present case, the disputed domain name incorporates the Complainant's distinctive ACCENTURE trademark in its entirety, combined only with the descriptive term "marketing". The Panel notes that the ACCENTURE mark is a coined term that has been extensively used by the Complainant for many years in connection with its global consulting, technology, and digital services and that the Complainant owns numerous trademark registrations for ACCENTURE worldwide. The disputed domain name was registered on January 7, 2026, long after the Complainant had established its trademark rights and long after the ACCENTURE mark had become widely recognized internationally.

The record further indicates that the disputed domain name resolves to a website offering services such as digital marketing, cloud, and cybersecurity services, which overlap with areas in which the Complainant operates. The website further lists the Complainant's affiliate's name and address on the website. In the Panel's view, the composition of the disputed domain name and the nature of the website strongly suggest that the Respondent registered the disputed domain name with knowledge of the Complainant and its ACCENTURE mark, and with the intention of creating an association with the Complainant in order to attract Internet users.

In these circumstances, the Panel finds that the Respondent has intentionally attempted to attract, for commercial gain, Internet users to its website by creating a likelihood of confusion with the Complainant's ACCENTURE mark as to source, affiliation, or endorsement. Such conduct falls squarely within paragraph 4(b)(iv) of the Policy.

Accordingly, the Panel concludes that the disputed domain name has been registered and is being used in bad faith.

8. 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 <accenture-marketing.online> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Francisco Castillo-Chacón/

Francisco Castillo-Chacón

Sole Panelist

Date: March 11, 2026