

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

Accenture Global Services Limited v. Sheetal Gaikwad, Prodigy Marketing Agency

Case No. D2026-1017

1. The Parties

The Complainant is Accenture Global Services Limited, United States of America (“United States”), represented by McDermott Will & Schulte LLP, United States.

The Respondent is Sheetal Gaikwad, Prodigy Marketing Agency, United Arab Emirates.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <accenturemarine.com> 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 March 10, 2026. On March 10, 2026, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On March 11, 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 (REGISTRATION PRIVATE / DOMAINS BY PROXY, LLC) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on March 13, 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 March 17, 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 March 18, 2026. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was April 7, 2026. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent’s default on April 9, 2026.

The Center appointed Manuel Wegrostek as the sole panelist in this matter on April 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 has offices and operates in more than 200 cities in 49 countries and is using the sign “ACCENTURE” in connection with various services and specialties, including management consulting and business process services, which comprise various aspects of business operations, such as supply chain, logistics services, technology services and outsourcing services, including services pertaining to marine industry and energy consulting services.

The Complainant has been recognized and awarded for its business services and brand recognition. Inter alia, for the past 22 years, it has been listed in the Fortune Global 500, which ranks the world’s largest companies. Further, the Complainant’s brand “ACCENTURE” has been recognized by Kantar Millward Brown, a leading market research and brand valuation company, in its annual “*BrandZ – Top 100 Brand Rankings*” since 2006 when it was ranked 58th. In 2025, the brand “ACCENTURE” ranked 20th, with a brand valuation of over USD 100 billion.

The Complainant is the owner of several trademarks for ACCENTURE (the “ACCENTURE Trademark”), including:

- United States Trademark Registration ACCENTURE No. 3091811, registered on May 16, 2006;
 - United States Trademark Registration ACCENTURE No. 7266256, registered on January 9, 2024;
- and
- European Union Trademark Registration ACCENTURE No. 001925650 registered on October 9, 2002.

The Complainant is also owner of domain names including the ACCENTURE Trademark, in particular the domain name <accenture.com>, registered on August 29, 2000.

The disputed domain name was registered on January 30, 2026. At the time of the Decision and when the Complaint was filed, the disputed domain name resolved to an active website displaying the sign “ACCENTURE MARINE”, offering several services in the oil and gas, marine as well as energy sector, including consulting and advisory.

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.

On the first element of the Policy, the Complainant claims that the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to the ACCENTURE Trademark. In both sight and sound, the disputed domain name is nearly identical or confusingly similar to the distinctive and famous ACCENTURE Trademark. The disputed domain name is comprised entirely of a misspelling of the ACCENTURE Trademark, adding an extra letter “c” to it and ending with the descriptive term “marine”. The ACCENTURE Trademark consists of a coined term and, as such, should be afforded a wide scope of protection. Adding a descriptive term to a trademark in a domain name fails to negate confusing similarity, especially since the descriptive term or terms suggest an affiliation with the Complainant. Under the disputed domain name, the Respondent’s use of the term “marine” is in reference to the oil and gas and marine sectors and via the website, the Respondent purports

to offer services in these sectors, including consulting and advisory services. Thus, the use of the term “marine” in the disputed domain name and in connection with the content on the resolving website suggests a direct relationship with the Complainant who offers consulting and business advisory services to the marine industry and the offshore energy industry, including with respect to oil and gas. The disputed domain name is virtually identical to and is confusingly similar to the ACCENTURE Trademark and is likely to mislead, deceive and cause mistake as to the source, sponsorship, affiliation or endorsement of the disputed domain name. Further, simply adding an extra letter “c” to the ACCENTURE Trademark to form a nearly identical version of the mark in the disputed domain name constitutes “typosquatting” and is insufficient to materially distinguish a domain name from another’s trademark. The ACCENTURE Trademark in the disputed domain name is immediately recognizable (even with the extra “c”) when paired only with the descriptive term “marine”. Internet users are highly likely to be confused as to whether an association exists between the disputed domain name and the Complainant.

On the second element of the Policy, the Complainant contends that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the disputed domain name. The ACCENTURE Trademark is not a generic or descriptive term in which the Respondent might have an interest. The ACCENTURE Trademark is globally famous and has acquired secondary meaning through the Complainant’s substantial, continuous, and exclusive use of the ACCENTURE Trademark in connection with the Complainant’s goods and services.

The Respondent is neither affiliated with, nor has it been licensed or permitted to use the ACCENTURE Trademark or any domain name incorporating the ACCENTURE Trademark. According to Center’s Notice of Registrant Information, the registrant of the disputed domain name is identified as “Sheetal Gaikwad” / “Prodigy Marketing Agency”. Therefore, upon information and belief, the Respondent is not commonly known by the disputed domain name, nor is known as such prior to the date on which the Respondent registered the disputed domain name to trade on the value of the ACCENTURE Trademark.

The Respondent is not making a legitimate non-commercial fair use of the disputed domain name. Rather, the Respondent is using the disputed domain name to advertise consulting services that compete directly with the consulting services of the Complainant. The Complainant provides numerous consulting services to the energy industry, including offshore gas and oil industry and the marine industry. The Respondent’s activities advertised via the website at the disputed domain name constitute passing off, in that the Respondent is trying to pass itself off as the Complainant, a leader known around the world in relation to its consulting and business management services, including in relation to the marine industry and energy consulting services, by using the ACCENTURE Trademark in the disputed domain name and purporting to offer the same services as the Complainant. It appears that the Respondent has chosen the disputed domain name to falsely pose as the Complainant for financial gain, to trade off the reputation and goodwill associated with the ACCENTURE Trademark, and to misleadingly divert Internet traffic from Complainant’s official website. In summary, there is no indication that the Respondent is making a legitimate non-commercial or fair use of the disputed domain name without intent for commercial gain. Instead, the Respondent deliberately chose a domain name that is essentially identical to the ACCENTURE Trademark and appears to be posing as the Complainant, or attempting to seem associated or affiliated with the Complainant.

On the third element of the Policy, the Complainant asserts that the Respondent has registered and used the disputed domain name in bad faith. The Respondent had constructive notice that the ACCENTURE Trademark was a registered trademark in the United States and many other jurisdictions worldwide. Given the Complainant’s worldwide reputation and the ubiquitous presence of the ACCENTURE Trademark on the Internet, and in view of the Respondent’s use of the Complainant’s name in the disputed domain name, the Respondent clearly was aware of the ACCENTURE Trademark prior to registering the disputed domain name. As noted above, the Respondent uses the disputed domain name to mislead Internet users who are searching for the Complainant, but instead reach the website at the disputed domain name, where the Respondent holds itself out as the Complainant or as associated with the Complainant. The Respondent has intentionally attempted to attract for commercial gain Internet users to its website by creating a likelihood of confusion with the ACCENTURE Trademark as to the source, sponsorship, affiliation or endorsement of the website. As such, it appears that the Respondent did not register the disputed domain name to actually

offer services but, instead, registered and is using the disputed domain name for the bad-faith purpose of intentionally misleading the public to believe that the Respondent is associated or affiliated with Complainant. Given the well-known status of the ACCENTURE Trademark, the Complainant's ownership of the domain "<accenture.com>", and Complainant's services related to consulting services, there is no reason for the Respondent to have registered the disputed domain name other than to trade off of the reputation and goodwill of the ACCENTURE Trademark. Additionally, the Respondent has demonstrated an awareness of the ACCENTURE Trademark and a pattern of bad faith conduct, as the Respondent previously has been ordered to transfer a domain name to the Complainant in a prior proceeding (see *Accenture Global Services Limited v. Sheetal Gaikwad*, WIPO Case No. [D2025-1168](#)), where the Respondent was found to have registered and used an ACCENTURE-variant domain in bad faith.

B. Respondent

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

6. Discussion and Findings

Paragraph 15(a) of the Rules requires that the Panel's decision be made "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".

The Complainant must evidence each of the three elements required by paragraph 4(a) of the Policy in order to succeed on the Complaint with respect to each disputed domain name, namely that:

- (i) the disputed domain name is identical or confusingly similar to a trademark or service mark in which the Complainant has rights; and
- (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.

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 applicable Top-Level-Domain in a domain name (e.g., ".com", ".club", ".nyc") is viewed as a standard registration requirement and as such is disregarded under the first element confusing similarity test. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.11.1.

The disputed domain name contains the ACCENTURE Trademark in its entirety, with the only difference of the additional letter "c" as well as the addition of the generic term "marine". The Panel finds the mark is recognizable within the disputed domain name. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.7. The addition of other terms (whether descriptive, geographical, pejorative, meaningless, or otherwise), in this case "marine", does not prevent a finding of confusing similarity under the first element. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.8. Further, a domain name which consists of a variation of a trademark (typically a common, obvious, or intentional misspelling, referred to as typosquatting) is considered by panels to be confusingly similar to the relevant mark for purposes of the first element. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.9.

Accordingly, the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to the mark for the purposes of the Policy.

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.

Panels have categorically held that the use of a domain name for illegal activity (e.g., the sale of counterfeit goods or illegal pharmaceuticals, phishing, distributing malware, unauthorized account access/hacking, impersonation/passing off, or other types of fraud) can never confer rights or legitimate interests on a respondent. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 2.13.

The Complainant has not authorized, licensed, or permitted the Respondent to register or use the disputed domain name or to use the ACCENTURE Trademark. The Panel finds that there are no indications that the Respondent is commonly known by the disputed domain name or otherwise has any rights to or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name. Further, the disputed domain name is not used for a bona fide offering of goods or services. Rather, the Complainant has provided evidence that the disputed domain name resolved to an active website displaying the sign “ACCENTURE MARINE”, offering several services in the oil and gas, marine as well as energy sector, including consulting and advisory, which suggests that the Respondent intended to pass-off the Complainant respectively the distinctive and well-known ACCENTURE Trademark or to misleadingly divert consumers for commercial gain, by misleading them into believing, that the Respondent is affiliated or in a commercial relationship with the Complainant.

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

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.

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 famous or widely-known trademark by an unaffiliated entity can by itself create a presumption of bad faith. Panels also have held that the use of a domain name for illegitimate activity (here, claimed passing off) can never confer rights or legitimate interests on a respondent, such behavior is manifestly considered evidence of bad faith. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 3.1.4.

Further, panels have 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 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.

Moreover, 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 disputed domain name incorporates the ACCENTURE Trademark in its entirety, with the only difference of the additional letter "c" as well as the addition of the generic term "marine", whereas this trademark was registered years before the registration of the disputed domain name. Considering the distinctiveness and public presence of the ACCENTURE Trademark, Internet users may think the disputed domain name is connected to the Complainant and would resolve to a website related to the Complainant or an affiliate because the generic term "marine" included in the disputed domain name merely suggests that the Respondent is offering goods or services in the marine sector, including consulting and advisory services, and thus services that compete with those provided by the Complainant. Further, the website linked to the disputed domain name did not accurately and prominently disclose the relationship, or rather the lack thereof, between the Respondent and the Complainant. The Panel also notes the Respondent's failure to submit a response to the Complaint and, as evidenced by the Complainant, that the Respondent previously registered a domain name, which has been transferred to Complainant, and therefore indicates a pattern of trademark-abusive domain name registrations. Moreover, as shown above, the Respondent lacks rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name.

The Panel finds that the Respondent has intentionally tried to pass-off the Complainant or, at least, attract, for commercial gain, Internet users to its websites by creating a likelihood of confusion with the Complainant and its ACCENTURE Trademark as to the source, sponsorship, affiliation or endorsement of the Respondent's website. 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 <accenturemarine.com> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Manuel Wegrostek/

Manuel Wegrostek

Sole Panelist

Date: April 27, 2026