

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

Globant España S.A. v. Empresa Botconversa
Case No. D2026-0379

1. The Parties

The Complainant is Globant España S.A., Spain, represented by Marval, O'Farrell & Mairal, Argentina.

The Respondent is Empresa Botconversa, Brazil.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <globantinvestors.com> 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 29, 2026. On January 29, 2026, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On February 2, 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: information unavailable) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on February 2, 2026, providing the registrant and contact information disclosed by the Registrar, and inviting the Complainant to submit an amendment to the Complaint. The Complainant informed on February 11, 2026, that it chose not to file an amendment to the complaint.

The Center verified that 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 February 13, 2026. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was March 5, 2026. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent's default on March 9, 2026.

The Center appointed Kiyoshi Tsuru as the sole panelist in this matter on March 16, 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 company founded in Argentina in 2003, operating globally in the technology and digital transformation sector. It provides services including software development, IT consulting, and digital marketing, and maintains operations worldwide.

The Complainant is the owner of numerous trademark registrations for the mark GLOBANT, holding more than fifty registrations worldwide.

The Complainant owns registrations for the GLOBANT trademark in multiple jurisdictions, including the following registrations:

Territory	Reg. No.	Reg. Date	Class(es)
European Union	018356645	May 21, 2021	9, 35, 38, 41, and 42
European Union	18356639	May 21, 2021	9, 35, 38, 41, and 42
Mexican	2299689	September 20, 2021	35
United Kingdom	3831223	January 13, 2023	9, 35, 36, 38, 41, and 42
India	4785553	December 17, 2020	41
Brazil	830195017	September 6, 2011	42
Argentina	3278119	May 4, 2022	42
Argentina	3278118	May 4, 2022	41
Argentina	3278117	May 4, 2022	38

The Complainant has used the trademark GLOBANT in connection with its services since 2003. The mark has been widely promoted and has acquired significant recognition worldwide, including through substantial Internet presence and international business partnerships.

The disputed domain name <globantinvestors.com> was registered on October 25, 2025.

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 the following:

I. Identical or confusingly similar

That the disputed domain name <globantinvestors.com> is confusingly similar to its well-known and worldwide registered trademark GLOBANT, in which the Complainant holds extensive and longstanding rights. That the Complainant owns more than fifty trademark registrations for GLOBANT globally, including multiple registrations in Argentina, where its business originated, as well as registrations in key jurisdictions such as the European Union, Mexico, the United Kingdom, and India.

That the disputed domain name fully incorporates the Complainant's trademark GLOBANT, which is clearly recognizable as the dominant and distinctive element of the disputed domain name. That, the reproduction of a trademark in its entirety within a domain name is sufficient to establish confusing similarity.

That the addition of the descriptive term "investors" does not avoid the risk of confusion; rather, it heightens it, as the term is closely associated with the Complainant's corporate, financial, and investor relations activities. That Internet users are therefore likely to assume that the disputed domain name refers to an official investor-related platform of the Complainant.

That the generic Top-Level Domain ("gTLD") ".com" is a standard registration requirement and is irrelevant for purposes of the confusing similarity analysis.

II. Rights or legitimate interests

That the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name. Under established UDRP practice, while the overall burden of proof rests with the Complainant, it is sufficient for the Complainant to make a prima facie showing that the Respondent lacks such rights or legitimate interests, at which point the burden shifts to the Respondent to produce concrete evidence to the contrary.

That it has never licensed, authorized, or otherwise permitted the Respondent to use the GLOBANT trademark or to register any domain name incorporating it, nor does any legal or business relationship exist between the parties that could give rise to such authorization.

That the Respondent has not been commonly known by the disputed domain name, has not used the disputed domain name in connection with any bona fide offering of goods or services, and has not made any legitimate noncommercial or fair use of the disputed domain name.

That the Respondent's registration and use of the disputed domain name were undertaken without rights or legitimate interests, and solely to seek commercial advantage from the Complainant's prior rights in the GLOBANT trademark.

III. Registered and used in bad faith

That the disputed domain name <globantinvestors.com> was registered and is being used in bad faith under paragraph 4(a)(iii) of the Policy.

That the GLOBANT trademark has been widely used and is globally well-known since 2003, making it inconceivable that the Respondent was unaware of the Complainant's rights when registering the disputed domain name in October 2025.

That previous UDRP panels consistently recognize that registration of a domain name incorporating a famous mark constitutes bad faith where the respondent knew or should have known of the mark.

That the disputed domain name resolves to an inactive webpage, and under the doctrine of passive holding, such nonuse does not prevent a finding of bad faith.

That, given the notoriety of the GLOBANT mark, the Respondent's concealment of identity, the absence of any evidence of good faith use, and the implausibility of any legitimate use, the Respondent's conduct demonstrates bad faith registration and use.

B. Respondent

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

6. Discussion and Findings

Paragraph 4(a) of the Policy sets out the three requirements that the complainants must prove in order to successfully request remedies:

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

Given the Respondent's default and therefore, failure to specifically address the case merits as they relate to the three UDRP elements, the Panel may decide this proceeding based on the Complainant's undisputed factual allegations under paragraphs 5(f), 14(a), and 15(a) of the Rules (see *Alternative Identity, Inc., and Kentech*, WIPO Case No. [D2006-0292](#); *Groupe Auchan v. Roberto La Palombara*, WIPO Case No. [D2014-0660](#); and *Croatia Airlines d.d. v. Modern Empire Internet Ltd.*, WIPO Case No. D2003-0455; see also [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 4.3).

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 Panel finds that the Complainant has established rights in the trademark GLOBANT, including registrations in Argentina, as well as in the European Union, Mexico, the United Kingdom, and India.

The disputed domain name <globantinvestors.com> incorporates the Complainant's trademark GLOBANT in its entirety. The additional term "investors" is clearly descriptive and does not prevent the Complainant's trademark from being recognizable within the disputed domain name. See *LEGO Juris A/S v. DBA David*

Inc/ DomainsByProxy.com, WIPO Case No. [D2011-1290](#).

The gTLD (".com") is viewed as a standard registration requirement and is disregarded in the assessment under the first element of the Policy. See *CARACOLITO S SAS v. Nelson Brown, OXM.CO*, WIPO Case No. [D2020-0268](#); and *Bentley Motors Limited v. Domain Admin / Kyle Rocheleau, Privacy Hero Inc.*, WIPO Case No. [D2014-1919](#).

The Panel finds that the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to the Complainant's trademark. Therefore, 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. See *Accor v. Eren Atesmen*, WIPO Case No. [D2009-0701](#).

In the present case, the Panel finds that there is no evidence in the record that the Respondent has been commonly known by the disputed domain name, or that it has acquired any trademark or service mark rights corresponding to it. The Respondent has not used the disputed domain name in connection with a bona fide offering of goods or services, nor has it made legitimate noncommercial or fair use of the disputed domain name. Rather, the circumstances of the registration and use of the disputed domain name point to an intent to take unfair advantage of the Complainant's trademark.

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, the Panel notes that the GLOBANT trademark has been globally well known since 2003 and has registered trademarks in Argentina and Brazil, among other jurisdictions. Given this notoriety, the Panel finds it inconceivable that the Respondent was unaware of the Complainant's rights when the Respondent registered the disputed domain name <globantinvestors.com> in October 2025.

Panels have found that the non-use of a domain name (including a blank or "coming soon" page) would not by itself prevent a finding of bad faith under the doctrine of passive holding. On the contrary, in looking at the totality of circumstances in each case, panels have found that the registration and non-use of a domain name can still constitute bad faith for purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 3.3.

Having reviewed the available record, the Panel notes the distinctive nature of the Complainant's trademark, and the composition of the disputed domain name, and finds that in the circumstances of this case the passive current holding of the disputed domain name does not prevent a finding of bad faith under the Policy. The Respondent has not produced any explanation of why it chose to register a domain name that fully incorporates the Complainant's distinctive GLOBANT trademark, in addition to the term "investors" which directly refers to the services that the said Complainant renders in the global market. The Respondent has not filed any evidence showing any actual or plausible of the disputed domain name that would not serve illegitimate purposes. See *Telstra Corporation Limited v. Nuclear Marshmallows*, WIPO Case No. [D2000-0003](#).

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 <globantinvestors.com> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Kiyoshi Tsuru/

Kiyoshi Tsuru

Sole Panelist

Date: March 30, 2026