

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

Oceanet Technology v. MARIA CAROLINE NEOCLEOUS, Tencaro Services LTD

Case No. D2026-0479

1. The Parties

The Complainant is Oceanet Technology, France, represented by MIIP MADE IN IP, France.

The Respondent is MARIA CAROLINE NEOCLEOUS, Tencaro Services LTD, Cyprus.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <oceanet-techno.com> is registered with NameCheap, Inc. (the “Registrar”).

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the “Center”) on February 4, 2026. On February 5, 2026, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On February 6, 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, Privacy service provided by Withheld for Privacy ehf) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on February 6, 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 February 11, 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 11, 2026. The Complainant submitted a new Annex 6 to the amended Complaint on the same day. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was March 3, 2026. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent’s default on March 4, 2026.

The Center appointed Mihaela Maravela 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

According to information in the Complaint, the Complainant is a French company founded in 1996, specializing in a wide range of IT solutions such as hosting, securing, managing services and Cloud architectures for businesses of all sizes. Since 2021, the Complainant is part of the Celeste Group, one of the leading providers of telecommunications, cloud, and cybersecurity solutions for businesses in France.

The Complainant is the registered owner of a number of trademarks, including the following:

- the French Trademark Registration No. 3604192 for OCEANET TECHNOLOGY (combined), registered on March 20, 2009, for services in international classes 35, 38, 41, and 42, and
- the French Trademark Registration No. 3815559 for OCEANET TECHNOLOGY (combined), registered on July 8, 2011, for services in international classes 35, 38, and 42.

The Complainant has been the registrant of the domain name <oceanet-technology.com> since November 27, 2000, which it used for its official website and currently redirects users to the website of the Celeste Group and presents the Complainant's company. The Complainant has also registered the domain name <oceanettechnology.fr> since June 14, 2012.

The disputed domain name was registered on April 14, 2025, and resolves to a website displaying the Complainant's OCEANET TECHNOLOGY trademark and the Complainant's postal address and company registration number, and pretending to be a digital marketing agency tailored for tech and manufacturing businesses.

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 highly similar to the Complainant's earlier trademarks and company name. As such, the Complainant contends that the term "oceanet" which has no meaning and is therefore highly distinctive and dominant, is reproduced in its entirety at the beginning of the disputed domain name, with the addition of the term "techno", which is a generic term, a diminutive of the term "technology". Furthermore, the disputed domain name is phonetically almost identical to the Complainant's trademarks in that it will be pronounced practically in the same way, except for the suffix "-logy" which is absent. However, the Complainant contends that it is established case law that consumers pay more attention to the beginning of a sign than to its end.

As regards the second element, the Complainant argues that the Respondent has no trademark rights in the term "oceanet techno". Also, the Complainant submits that there is no business or legal relationship between the Complainant and the Respondent. The Complainant has neither authorized nor licensed the Respondent to use its trademarks or similar trademarks in any way. Furthermore, the Complainant submits that a search on Google with the word "oceanet techno" displays only results related to the Complainant, its network or its acquisition by the CELESTE Group, which means that the Respondent is not commonly known by the disputed domain name nor, more broadly, by the sign "oceanet techno".

Furthermore, as regards the use, the Complainant contends that the disputed domain name points to a fraudulent website which impersonates the Complainant: (i) by reproducing the Complainant's trademark OCEANET TECHNOLOGY in its entirety on the home page and within the Terms of use, (ii) by indicating the address of the Complainant's company headquarters located in France, (iii) by reproducing the identity number of the Complainant's company at the bottom of the home page, (iv) by offering services as a digital agency, similar to those of the Complainant. Having such use in mind, the Complainant argues that such impersonation reflects the absence of any right or legitimate interest of the Respondent except for taking unfair advantage of the reputation of the Complainant's trademark and divert the Complainant's customers for its own advantage.

Regarding the third element, the Complainant submits that it has built more than 25 years of expertise in hosting, securing and managing IT infrastructures for businesses and that it is also active at international level. In addition, the disputed domain name points to an active website that displays the Complainant's OCEANET TECHNOLOGY trademark in its entirety, as well as the company identification number and the address of the registered office of the Complainant, which shows clearly that the Respondent was aware of the Complainant's identity and prior rights and has tried to impersonate the latter to mislead Internet users. Furthermore, the Complainant contends that the Respondent has engaged in a pattern of cybersquatting behavior, as the Respondent seems to have been engaged in at least one other URDP proceeding, namely *Accenture Global Services Limited v. Maria Caroline Neocleous, Tencaro Services LTD*, WIPO Case No. [D2025-4825](#), in which the domain name has been transferred to the complainant.

B. Respondent

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

6. Discussion and Findings

Paragraph 15(a) of the Rules instructs this Panel to "decide a complaint on the basis of the statements and documents submitted and in accordance with the Policy, these Rules and any rules and principles of law that it deems applicable". Likewise, paragraph 10(d) of the Rules, provides that "the Panel shall determine the admissibility, relevance, materiality and weight of the evidence".

No response has been received from the Respondent in this case. Even if the Respondent has not replied to the Complainant's contentions, the Complainant still bears the burden of proving that all requirements are fulfilled. To succeed, the Complainant must demonstrate that all of the elements listed in paragraph 4(a) of the Policy have been satisfied: (i) the disputed domain name is identical or confusingly similar to a trademark or service mark in which the Complainant has rights, (ii) the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the disputed domain name, and (iii) the disputed domain name has been registered and is being used in bad faith.

The applicable standard of proof in UDRP cases is the "balance of probabilities" or "preponderance of the evidence", and the Panel can draw certain inferences in light of the particular facts and circumstances of the case. WIPO Overview of WIPO Panel Views on Select UDRP Questions ("[WIPO Overview 3.1](#)"), section 4.2. Concerning the uncontested information provided by the Complainant, the Panel may, where relevant, accept the reasonable factual allegations in the Complaint as true. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 4.3.

The Panel has taken note of the [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), and, where appropriate, will decide consistently with the consensus views stated therein.

A. Identical or Confusingly Similar

Under paragraph 4(a)(i) of the Policy, the Complainant must prove that it has rights to a trademark, and that the disputed domain name is identical or confusingly similar to that trademark. This first element under the Policy functions primarily as a standing requirement. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.7.

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

As regards the second limb of the first element, the test for confusing similarity involves a reasoned but relatively straightforward comparison between the trademark and the disputed domain name. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.7. It has also long been held that generic Top-Level Domains are generally disregarded when evaluating the confusing similarity between a disputed domain name and a trademark. See section 1.11.1 of the [WIPO Overview 3.1](#).

The Panel finds the mark is recognizable 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. The abbreviation of “technology” to “techno” in the disputed domain name does not prevent a finding of confusing similarity. The content of the website connected to the disputed domain name, which displays the trademark OCEANET TECHNOLOGY, confirms the Panel’s findings on confusing similarity. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.15.

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 appears that the disputed domain name is being used without permission to divert traffic to a website most likely for commercial gain as described above. The Panel does not find this to be a legitimate or bona fide conduct. Panels have held that the use of a domain name for illegitimate activity (here, claimed passing off, or other types of fraud) can never confer rights or legitimate interests on a respondent. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 2.13.1.

The Respondent is named “MARIA CAROLINE NEOCLEOUS, Tencaro Services LTD”, as was disclosed by the Registrar, and there is no evidence that the Respondent is commonly known by the disputed domain name within the meaning of paragraph 4(c)(ii) of 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 finds that the evidence in the case shows the Respondent registered and has used the disputed domain name in bad faith.

The Panel finds it highly unlikely that the disputed domain name was registered without knowledge of the Complainant and its trademarks, given the long use of the Complainant's trademark and the composition of the disputed domain name, and also given the Respondent's use of the disputed domain name to resolve to a website purporting to provide services in the same field as those offered by the Complainant, displaying the Complainant's trademark and contact data of the Complainant. The Panel finds that the Respondent most likely registered the disputed domain name with the expectation of taking advantage of the reputation of the Complainant's trademark.

As regards the use, as described above, the evidence shows that the disputed domain name resolves to an active website that allegedly offers services that are similar to the services offered by the Complainant, displaying the Complainant's trademark and contact information (the Respondent has also reproduced the Complainant's trademark and corporate name in the copyright notice) on the website at the disputed domain name. The Respondent does not dispute the statements of the Complainant and the evidence in the case file. Taking the above into account, the Panel accepts as more likely than not that the Respondent has registered and used the disputed domain name with knowledge of the Complainant and targeting its OCEANET TECHNOLOGY trademarks, without having any authorization to do so by the Complainant. It is likely that by creating a likelihood of confusion with the Complainant's OCEANET TECHNOLOGY trademarks, the Respondent has attempted to attract traffic to the disputed domain name and confuse Internet users that they are reaching an online location affiliated to the Complainant and then offer them services that are similar to the Complainant's services for commercial gain. By doing so, it is clear the Respondent was intentionally seeking to attract Internet users for commercial gain through the creation of a likelihood of confusion with the Complainant's mark. Panels have also held that the use of a domain name for the purposes of passing off, or other type of fraud constitutes bad faith under the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 3.4.

Furthermore, there appears to be a pattern of abusive registrations by the Respondent, as the Respondent was involved in at least one previous UDRP proceeding where similar facts caused the concerned UDRP panel to decide in favor of the complainant (See *Accenture Global Services Limited v. Maria Caroline Neocleous, Tencaro Services LTD*, *supra*). This fact also supports a finding grounded on paragraph 4(b)(ii) of the Policy, referring to a respondent registering "the domain name in order to prevent the owner of the trademark or service mark from reflecting the mark in a corresponding domain name, provided that you have engaged in a pattern of such conduct".

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 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 <oceanet-techno.com> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Mihaela Maravela/

Mihaela Maravela

Sole Panelist

Date: March 23, 2026