

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

Accenture Global Services Limited v. Raj kumar, Raj kumar
Case No. D2026-0287

1. The Parties

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

The Respondent is Raj kumar, Raj kumar, India.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <webaccenture.com> 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 23, 2026. On January 26, 2026, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On January 26, 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 (Redacted for Privacy) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on January 27, 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 29, 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 February 2, 2026. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was February 22, 2026. The Respondent did not submit any formal response. The Respondent sent email communications to the Center on January 30, 2026.

The Center appointed Aaron Newell as the sole panelist in this matter on March 2, 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 is a subsidiary of Accenture plc. It provides information technology and management consulting services from offices in more than 200 cities across 49 countries around the world, and has used the trademark ACCENTURE as the name of its business since January 2001, including at the domain name <accenture.com>.

The Complainant has provided voluminous evidence demonstrating its international reputation. It asserts that it has supported this reputation with annual advertising and marketing spend of at least USD 54 million since 2009. The Complainant has earned multiple awards and widespread media recognition in respect of its business, including from organisations specialising in brand value such as Interbrand and Brand Finance.

The Complainant asserts that it owns registered trademark rights that protect its ACCENTURE mark in more than 140 countries, and provides a selection of trademark registration certificates to support this. Included amongst these rights are:

- (i) United States of America Trademark Registration No. 3091811 for the mark ACCENTURE (registered May 16, 2006) in classes 9, 16, 35, 36, 37, 41 and 42;
- (ii) United States of America Trademark Registration No. 7266256 for the mark ACCENTURE (registered January 9, 2024) in classes 9, 35, 36, 37, 41 and 42;
- (iii) United States of America Trademark Registration No. 2665373 for the mark ACCENTURE (design) (registered December 24, 2002) in classes 35, 36, 41 and 42.

The Complainant has succeeded in a large number of UDRP disputes from at least as early as 2007, having filed over two hundred cases since this time. In a number of the rendered UDRP decisions, its ACCENTURE trademark has been acknowledged as having an international reputation. See for example *Accenture Global Services Limited v. Neiman Hatcher*, WIPO Case No. [D2025-0231](#) in respect of <myaccenture.org> in which the panel determined “that its trademark, ACCENTURE, which is registered and widely recognized, enjoys global public awareness”.

The disputed domain name was registered July 1, 2025. There is evidence in the case file that the disputed domain name, at the time of filing of the Complaint, resolved to a website that markets and promotes digital marketing consultancy services by reference to the name WEBACCENTURE. At the time of this Decision, the disputed domain name resolves to an error page displaying the following notification that “The resource requested could not be found on this server!”.

The Respondent appears to be an individual based in India. It did not file a formal response to the Complaint.

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:

- i) the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to its registered trademarks because the disputed domain name contains its ACCENTURE trademark in its entirety, and the only additional term in the disputed domain name is the descriptor “web”;
- ii) the Respondent does not have rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain names because the Complainant’s ACCENTURE trademark is “globally famous” and has acquired secondary meaning through continuous exclusive use by the Complainant, the Respondent is unknown to the Complainant and has never been authorised to use the Complainant’s ACCENTURE trademark and this is prima facie proof of the Respondent’s lack of rights or a legitimate interest, the Respondent is not commonly known by the disputed domain name, the Respondent is not making legitimate noncommercial fair use of the disputed domain name, the Respondent’s activities are unlawful as they constitute a passing off and therefore cannot give rise to rights or a legitimate interest, and the Respondent is not making legitimate noncommercial or fair use of the disputed domain name but rather is using the disputed domain name to pose as the Complainant for financial gain;
- iii) the disputed domain name was registered and is being used in bad faith because the Respondent had actual prior knowledge and/or constructive notice (by virtue of the Complainant’s international fame and reputation over decades) of the Complainant and its trademark rights in the ACCENTURE name, the Respondent registered and has used the disputed domain name to hold itself out as being the Complainant or being associated with it, and in doing so 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 marks as to the source, sponsorship, affiliation or endorsement of the Respondent’s website.

B. Respondent

The Respondent did not submit any formal response. On January 30, 2026, the Respondent stated:

“[...]

I wish to clarify that the domain name was purchased inadvertently and without any prior knowledge of, or intent to reference, the website or trademark associated with accenture.com. At the time of registration, I had no awareness of any potential association or conflict with the Complainant’s brand.

The website associated with the domain <webaccenture.com> has been completely shut down and is no longer active. The domain is not being used for any commercial purpose, content publication, redirection, or any activity of any kind. Upon receiving notice of this matter, I acted immediately and in good faith by closing the website entirely. A screenshot confirming the inactive status of the website is attached for reference.

There was no intention to infringe upon any trademark rights, mislead users, or derive any unfair benefit. I have cooperated fully since receiving notice.

At this stage, I do not wish to engage in any further notices, correspondence, or discussions regarding this matter beyond what is required under the applicable procedure. I trust that the above clarification and attached evidence will be taken into consideration.

[...]”

“[...]

I confirm that the domain has already been closed and, as previously explained, it was registered without any awareness of the disputed name. I do not wish to pursue any settlement discussions, and I am content for the proceeding to continue in accordance with the applicable Rules.

[...]”

6. Discussion and Findings

Under paragraph 4(a) of the Policy, the Complainant carries the burden of proving:

- i) that the disputed domain name is identical or confusingly similar to a trademark or service mark in which it 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.

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 “web”) may bear on assessment of the second and third elements, the Panel finds the addition of this 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 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.

The Panel considers that the composition of the disputed domain name when considered together with its use, to redirect to a website that advertises digital marketing and related consulting services, competing directly with the services offered by the Complainant, creates a risk of implied affiliation with the Complainant and does not demonstrate rights or legitimate interests. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), sections 2.5.1 and 2.5.3.

The Panel finds that the Respondent has failed to rebut the Complainant's allegations and related supporting evidence in respect of the Respondent's conduct.

The Panel 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.

These circumstances include, but are not limited to, the following:

(iv) by using the domain name, the respondent has intentionally attempted to attract, for commercial gain, Internet users to its website or other on-line location, by creating a likelihood of confusion with the complainant's mark as to the source, sponsorship, affiliation, or endorsement of the respondent's website or location or of a product or service on the respondent's website or location.

Panels have consistently found that the mere registration of a domain name that is identical or confusingly similar (particularly domain names comprising typos or incorporating the mark plus a descriptive term) to a well-known trademark, and particularly in the case of coined or fanciful marks, can by itself create a presumption of bad faith. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 3.1.4.

Panels have moreover found the following types of evidence to support a finding that a respondent has registered a domain name to attract, for commercial gain, Internet users to its website by creating a likelihood of confusion with the complainant's mark: (i) actual confusion, (ii) seeking to cause confusion (including by technical means beyond the domain name itself) for the respondent's commercial benefit, even if unsuccessful, (iii) the lack of a respondent's own rights to or legitimate interests in a domain name, (iv) redirecting the domain name to a different respondent-owned website, even where such website contains a disclaimer, (v) redirecting the domain name to or mimicking the complainant's (or a competitor's) website, and (vi) absence of any conceivable good faith use. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 3.1.4.

In the present case, the Complainant alleges that the Respondent had notice of the Complainant's rights in the ACCENTURE trademark at the time of registration of the disputed domain name. As noted above, the Respondent states that it registered the disputed domain name without any prior knowledge of the website or trademark associated with the Complainant's domain name <accenture.com>. The Panel finds that on the balance of probabilities the Respondent more likely than not would have known of the Complainant's internationally-reputed and multi-awarded business under the ACCENTURE trademark before it registered the disputed domain name, and that it registered the disputed domain name to take unfair advantage of the Complainant's rights, goodwill and reputation in the ACCENTURE trademark.

In this regard, the Panel further notes from the available evidence that the Respondent has used the ACCENTURE trademark by itself as a standalone trademark on the website at the dispute domain name, specifically as “Web Accenture” rather than “Webaccenture”. The impression given is that the Respondent intended to suggest sponsorship or endorsement of its website by the Complainant.

In addition, the Panel also notes that this use of the ACCENTURE trademark on the Respondent’s website was accompanied by promotional statements intended to give the impression that the business has “20+ years of experience” and that it has completed “500+” projects, all despite the disputed domain name having been registered in July 2025, just over six months before the filing of the Complaint.

The trademark ACCENTURE is a well-known trademark and coined term (rather than a dictionary term). In these circumstances, the Panel finds that the Respondent has registered and used the disputed domain name with the intention of taking unfair advantage of the Complainant’s rights and reputation in its ACCENTURE trademark, by creating a likelihood of confusion with the Complainant’s mark as to the source, sponsorship, affiliation, or endorsement of the Respondent’s website, to attract Internet users to its website for commercial gain. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 3.1.4. The fact that the disputed domain name currently resolves to an error page does not prevent a finding of bad faith in the circumstances of this case.

These are circumstances which, under paragraph 4(b) of the Policy, constitute evidence of the registration and use of a domain name in bad faith. Accordingly, 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 <webaccenture.com> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Aaron Newell/

Aaron Newell

Sole Panelist

Date: March 16, 2026