

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

Bureau Veritas v. nova teq
Case No. D2026-0296

1. The Parties

The Complainant is Bureau Veritas, France, represented by Denнемeyer & Associates SAS, France.

The Respondent is nova teq, India.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <bureauveritasae.com> (the “Disputed Domain Name”) is registered with GoDaddy.com, LLC (the “Registrar”).

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the “Center”) on January 26, 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 (Unknown (redacted for privacy)) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on January 28, 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 28, 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 amended Complaint, and the proceedings commenced on January 30, 2026. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was February 19, 2026. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent’s default on February 20, 2026.

The Center appointed Monica Novac as the sole panelist in this matter on February 27, 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

Founded in 1828, the Complainant is a global leader in testing, inspection and certification (TICS) services, with numerous subsidiaries worldwide. The Group employs more than 82,000 people in more than 1,600 offices and laboratories. The Complainant assists its clients with improving their performance by providing services and innovative solutions to ensure that their assets, products, infrastructures and processes comply with the standards and regulations on quality, health and safety, environmental protection and social responsibility.

The Complainant holds several trademark registrations for BUREAU VERITAS in various jurisdictions, including the following:

- India Trademark Registration No. 491389 BUREAU VERITAS (word), registered on May 20, 1988, for goods in class 16; and
- European Union Trademark Registration No. 004518544 BUREAU VERITAS (word), registered on June 1, 2006, for services in classes 38 and 42.

The Complainant holds several domain names comprising the BUREAU VERITAS trademark, including the domain name <bureauveritas.com> (registered on June 20, 1996) which resolves to the Complainant's main website.

The Respondent is nova teq, reportedly located in India. The Respondent registered the Disputed Domain Name on January 21, 2026. According to the information and evidence provided by the Complainant, the Respondent used the Disputed Domain Name to pass itself off as an employee of the Complainant's United Arab Emirates subsidiary and send deceptive communications via email to third parties. On the dates of filing the Complaint and respectively, of this Decision, the Disputed Domain Name resolves to a website displaying the message "Launching Soon".

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:

- the Disputed Domain Name is confusingly similar to the Complainant's BUREAU VERITAS trademark;
- the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in the Disputed Domain Name; and
- the Disputed Domain Name has been registered and it is being used in bad faith.

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 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 BUREAU VERITAS mark is reproduced within the Disputed Domain Name. Accordingly, the Disputed Domain Name is confusingly similar to the Complainant's mark for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.7.

The Disputed Domain Name also contains the sign "ae", which may represent the abbreviation for the United Arab Emirates, however the Panel finds that the addition of this element does not prevent a finding of confusing similarity between the Disputed Domain Name and the Complainant's trademark for the purposes of the Policy. According to the [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.8, where the relevant trademark is recognizable within the Disputed Domain Name, the addition of other terms (whether descriptive, geographical, pejorative, meaningless, or otherwise) would not prevent a finding of confusing similarity under the first element.

According to the [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.11.1, the gTLD ".com" in the Disputed Domain Name is viewed as a standard registration requirement and as such is disregarded under the first element confusing similarity test.

Further to all the above, 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.

It is accepted by the Panel that the Respondent is not related to the Complainant in any way and that the Complainant has not authorized nor licensed the Respondent to register or use the Disputed Domain Name. There is also no evidence that the Respondent is commonly known by the Disputed Domain Name.

The Disputed Domain Name consists of the Complainant's BUREAU VERITAS trademark, plus the sign "ae" (which may be the abbreviation for the United Arab Emirates). The Panel notes that the composition of the Disputed Domain Name carries a risk of implied affiliation. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 2.5.1. In view of the above, the Panel is of the opinion that the Respondent registered the Disputed Domain Name only for the purpose of misleading or causing confusion with the Complainant, its business and the goods/services offered by the Complainant.

As of the date of this Decision, the Disputed Domain Name resolves to a website displaying the message "Launching Soon". However, as per the evidence filed by the Complainant, the Disputed Domain Name was used to send fraudulent employment-related communications to third parties via email, masking the real identity of the Respondent who deceitfully presented himself as the Talent Acquisition Manager of the Complainant's subsidiary in the United Arab Emirates. The Respondent's use of the Disputed Domain Name for illegal activities (e.g. phishing/identity theft, passing off or other types of fraud) does not confer rights or legitimate interests to the Respondent. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 2.13.1.

Further to the above, the Panel is of the opinion that the Respondent does not use the Disputed Domain Name in connection with a bona fide offering of goods or services, nor does it make a legitimate noncommercial or fair use of the Disputed Domain Name as per the Policy.

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.

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.

In the present case, the Panel notes that the Complainant registered and used its BUREAU VERITAS trademark long before the Respondent registered the Disputed Domain Name. In view of the worldwide presence of the Complainant, the composition of the Disputed Domain Name, as well as its use (as explained above), it is unlikely that the Respondent was not aware of the Complainant's trademark and business when registering the Disputed Domain Name.

The Panel believes that the Respondent targeted the Complainant when registering the Disputed Domain Name. Moreover, the Panel considers that the Respondent's registration of the Disputed Domain Name which is confusingly similar to the Complainant's trademark creates a false association or affiliation with the Complainant and it is a clear proof of the Respondent's bad faith.

The evidence presented in this case shows that the Respondent, masking his real identity and deceitfully presenting himself as the Talent Acquisition Manager of the Complainant's subsidiary in the United Arab Emirates, used the Disputed Domain Name to send fraudulent employment-related communications to third parties via email. The Panel considers that the Respondent's acts mislead the third parties who erroneously believe that the communications originate from the Complainant or are endorsed by the Complainant.

As provided under section 3.4 of the [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), the Respondent's use of the Disputed Domain Name in connection to illegitimate activities such as sending deceptive emails, phishing/identity theft, passing off or other types of fraud, constitutes bad faith. Furthermore, section 3.1.4 of the [WIPO Overview 3.1](#) states that "given that the use of a domain name for per se illegitimate activity such as [...] phishing can never confer rights or legitimate interests on a respondent, such behavior is manifestly considered evidence of bad faith".

The Panel also notes the Respondent's failure to submit a response in the present proceeding, which may be considered as a further indication of the Respondent's bad faith.

In view of the above, the Panel finds the Respondent's registration and use of the Disputed Domain Name constitute bad faith under the Policy.

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 <bureauveritasae.com> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Monica Novac/

Monica Novac

Sole Panelist

Date: March 12, 2026