

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

Bureau Veritas v. Daniel Matthews, MatthewsDaniel International Group
Case No. D2026-2027

1. The Parties

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

The Respondent is Daniel Matthews, MatthewsDaniel International Group, United Kingdom.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <mat-dan.com> is registered with Name SRS AB (the “Registrar”).

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the “Center”) on May 11, 2026. On May 12, 2026, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On May 12, 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 May 15, 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 May 18, 2026. The Respondent sent an email communication to the Center on May 19, 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 May 21, 2026. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was June 10, 2026. The Center commenced the panel appointment process on June 17, 2026. The Respondent sent two further email communications to the Center on June 18, 2026.

The Center appointed Kaya Köklü as the sole panelist in this matter on June 19, 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 from France that internationally provides testing, inspection and certification services. It is operating through 1,600 offices and laboratories worldwide and employs more than 82,000 people. Its roots date back to the year 1828.

The Complainant (via its subsidiary) is the owner of the MATTHEWSDANIEL trademark. Among others, the Complainant is the registered owner of the European Union Trademark Registration No. 013570957, registered on May 4, 2015, for MATTHEWSDANIEL, covering protection for various services as protected in class 36 and 42.

The roots of the MATTHEWSDANIEL trademark date back to a company founded in 1962, which provides pre-risk and post-risk services particularly for offshore and insurance industries. Following the acquisition of that company by the Complainant in 2014, it provides additional services like marine warranty surveys, incident investigations and root cause analyses.

Furthermore, since March 18, 1997, the Complainant's wholly owned subsidiary operates its official website at the domain name <matdan.com>, which meanwhile resolves to the Complainant's website.

The Respondent is reportedly located in the United Kingdom.

The disputed domain name was registered on May 8, 2024.

As evidenced by the Complainant, the disputed domain name previously resolved to a website containing content apparently relating to the provision of certain commercial services, including services in the sustainable technology and energy sectors. On the associated website, the Respondent prominently and repeatedly used the Complainant's MATTHEWSDANIEL trademark with a two-tone blue color scheme that appears to be similar if not identical as that used by the Complainant. In particular, the Respondent repeatedly used the designations "MatthewsDaniel International Group", "MatthewsDaniel International" and "MatthewsDaniel Group" as identifiers.

After notification of the Complaint, the Respondent removed the aforementioned references.

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 its MATTHEWSDANIEL trademark has acquired significant distinctiveness and goodwill particularly among professionals in the marine, energy and insurance sectors.

B. Respondent

The Respondent did not formally reply to the Complainant's contentions. However, the Center received two email communications from the Respondent on May 19 and June 18, 2026. In its first email communication of May 19, 2026, the Respondent notes that it has removed any reference to MATTHEWSDANIEL from its website to avoid confusion, while at the same time asserting that "Daniel Matthews" is its personal name and

that the disputed domain name is based on an abbreviation of this name. The second email communication of June 18, 2026, contains only a reference to its first email communication of May 19, 2026.

6. Discussion and Findings

According to paragraph 15(a) of the Rules, the Panel shall decide the Complaint in accordance with the Policy, the Rules and any rules and principles of law that it deems applicable.

In accordance with paragraph 4(a) of the Policy, the Complainant must prove that each of the three following elements is satisfied:

- (i) the disputed domain name is identical or confusingly similar to a trademark 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.

As per paragraph 4(a) of the Policy, the complainant bears the burden of proving that all these requirements are fulfilled, even if a respondent has not substantively replied to the complainant's contentions. *Stanworth Development Limited v. E Net Marketing Ltd.*, WIPO Case No. [D2007-1228](#).

Concerning the uncontested information provided by a complainant, the Panel may, where relevant, accept the provided un rebutted reasonable factual allegations in a complaint as accurate. Section 4.3 of the WIPO Overview of WIPO Panel Views on Select UDRP Questions ("[WIPO Overview 3.1](#)").

It is further noted that the Panel has taken note of the [WIPO Overview 3.1](#) and, where appropriate, will decide consistently with the consensus views captured therein.

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 3.1](#), section 1.7.

The Complainant has shown rights in respect of the MATTHEWSDANIEL trademark for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.2.1 and 1.4.

The Panel finds the MATTHEWSDANIEL mark is recognizable within the disputed domain name. The disputed domain name comprises a recognizable abbreviation of the Complainant's MATTHEWSDANIEL trademark by incorporating the two elements "mat" and "dan", which are likewise used in the Complainant's official domain name <matdan.com>. Accordingly, the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to the mark for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.7. As discussed in further detail below, the content on the website also supports a finding of confusing similarity with the Complainant's trademark. [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 Complainant has credibly submitted that the Respondent is not affiliated with the Complainant and has not been authorized or licensed to use the Complainant’s MATTHEWSDANIEL trademark.

The Respondent has tried to rebut the Complainant’s prima facie case by asserting, without further substantiation, that his personal name is “Daniel Matthews”. This appears to be confirmed by the registrant details provided to the Center by the Registrar. However, while the use of one’s personal name may, in appropriate circumstances, confer rights or legitimate interests under the Policy, the Panel notes that the disputed domain name does not correspond to a natural or customary representation of the Respondent’s alleged name “Daniel Matthews”, i.e., “dan-mat”, but the inverse. Rather, the Respondent’s previous use of the Complainant’s trademark and its two-tone blue color scheme on the website linked to the disputed domain name, together with the additions “International” and/or “Group” suggests an attempt to create an association with or even impersonate the Complainant. Under these circumstances, the Panel considers the Respondent’s unsupported assertion regarding his alleged personal name to be insufficient to establish rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name.

The Panel also considers that following notification of the Complaint, the Respondent removed the references to the Complainant’s trademark from the associated website. While not determinative in itself, this conduct further supports the Panel’s conclusion that the Respondent lacks rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name.

The Panel finds on balance 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 once again notes that the disputed domain name corresponds, except for the inclusion of a hyphen, to the Complainant’s official domain name <matdan.com>, which itself appears to be derived from the two elements “mat” and “dan” of the Complainant’s MATTHEWSDANIEL trademark.

The Panel also notes that the Respondent used the disputed domain name in connection with a website that prominently displayed the Complainant’s MATTHEWSDANIEL trademark in the same two-tone blue color scheme as applied by the Complainant, including the repeated use of designations like “MatthewsDaniel International Group”, “MatthewsDaniel International”, and/or “MatthewsDaniel Group”.

In light of these circumstances, the Panel finds not only that the Respondent was aware of the Complainant and its MATTHEWSDANIEL trademark when registering the disputed domain name, but also that registration and use of the disputed domain name can only reasonably be understood as a deliberate attempt to impersonate the Complainant or to intentionally create the false impression that the Respondent and its website were affiliated with, endorsed by, or otherwise connected to the Complainant within the meaning of paragraph 4(b)(iv) of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 3.4.

The Panel further considers the Respondent's unsupported assertion that its personal name is "Daniel Matthews" to be merely pretextual. In any event, this unsupported assertion does not provide a credible explanation for the registration of the disputed domain name or for the way in which the Respondent used the MATTHEWSDANIEL trademark on the associated website.

The Panel additionally notes that, following notification of the Complaint, the Respondent removed the references to the Complainant's trademark from its website. In the circumstances of this case, however, such conduct does not, in the Panel's view, cure the Respondent's prior bad faith use. Rather, it reinforces the Panel's conclusion that the Respondent was aware that its registration of the disputed domain name and the previous use of the Complainant's MATTHEWSDANIEL trademark on the associated website was not legitimate.

All in all, the Panel concludes that the disputed domain name was registered and has been used in bad faith.

Consequently, 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 <mat-dan.com> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Kaya Köklü/

Kaya Köklü

Sole Panelist

Date: July 3, 2026