

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

Accenture Global Services Limited v. Diego Garsia
Case No. D2026-2206

1. The Parties

The Complainant is Accenture Global Services Limited, Ireland, represented by McDermott Will & Schulte LLP, United States of America ("United States" or "US").

The Respondent is Diego Garsia, United States.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <accenture-sales.com> is registered with PDR Ltd. d/b/a PublicDomainRegistry.com (the "Registrar").

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the "Center") on May 21, 2026. On May 22, 2026, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On May 23, 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 (GDPR Masked / GDPR Masked) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on May 27, 2027, 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 29, 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 June 1, 2026. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was June 21, 2026. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent's default on June 22, 2026.

The Center appointed William Lobelson as the sole panelist in this matter on June 26, 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 Accenture Global Services Limited, that provides a range of services and solutions in strategy, consulting, digital, technology and operations, under the name ACCENTURE, on a worldwide level.

It owns numerous trademark registrations for ACCENTURE, inter alia:

- US trademark Reg. No. 3 091 811 of May 16, 2006
- US trademark Reg. No. 7 266 256 of January 9, 2024

The disputed domain name is <accenture-sales.com>, registered on April 14, 2026. Previously it did not direct to any active web page. Currently the disputed domain name resolves to the Complainant's official website.

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 its earlier trademark, that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name, and that the disputed domain name has been registered and is being used in bad faith.

The Complainant requests the transfer of the disputed domain name.

B. Respondent

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

6. Discussion and Findings

Notwithstanding the default of the Respondent, it remains incumbent on the Complainant to make out its case in all respects under the Rules set out in paragraph 4(a) of the Policy. Namely, the Complainant must prove that:

(i) the disputed domain name is identical or confusingly similar to a trademark or service mark in which the Complainant has rights (paragraph 4(a)(i));

(ii) the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the disputed domain name (paragraph 4(a)(ii)); and

(iii) the disputed domain name has been registered and is being used in bad faith (paragraph 4(a)(iii)).

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.

Based on the available record, the Panel finds 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 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.

Although the addition of other terms (here "-sales") may bear on assessment of the second and third elements, the Panel finds the addition of such term does not prevent a finding of confusing similarity between the disputed domain name and the mark for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.8.

Based on the available record, 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 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 particularly by asserting that the Respondent is not affiliated with it in any way and that it never authorized the Respondent to use its trademark as part of the disputed domain name. The Complainant contends that the Respondent does not make any bona fide or legitimate non-commercial fair use of 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.

Based on the available record, 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 Complainant claims that the Respondent has registered the disputed domain name and uses the same in bad faith, even though the disputed domain name does not resolve towards any active webpage.

It is a consensus view among UDRP panels that, with comparative reference to the circumstances set out in paragraph 4(b) of the UDRP deemed to establish bad faith registration and use, such as the apparent lack of so-called active use (e.g., to resolve to a website) of the domain name without any active attempt to sell or to contact the trademark holder (which constitutes passive holding), does not as such prevent a finding of bad faith.

The Panel must examine all the circumstances of the case to determine whether the Respondent is acting in bad faith.

Examples of what may be cumulative circumstances found to be indicative of bad faith include the complainant having a well-known trademark, no response to the complaint having been filed, and the respondent's concealment of its identity. UDRP panels may draw inferences about whether a domain name was used in bad faith given the circumstances surrounding the registration.

The Complainant has contended that its trademark ACCENTURE, which has been registered and used for years, now benefits from a high level of public awareness.

Earlier UDRP decisions have acknowledged the reputation of the Complainant's mark.

Further, the disputed domain name was registered using a privacy service filed anonymously, but when the identity of the Respondent was disclosed by the Registrar, it was confirmed that this individual was based in US, where the Complainant's mark is exploited and registered.

The fact that the Respondent used a USA address implies that he is a US resident or at least has connections with USA, where the Complainant's mark is exploited.

Regarding the high similarity between the disputed domain name and the Complainant's trademark ACCENTURE, it is highly likely that the disputed domain name was registered in bad faith.

The Panel also notes that the Respondent did not reply to the Complaint.

As stated in [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 3.3, there is a consensus view about "passive holding":

"From the inception of the UDRP, panelists 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. To the contrary, in looking at the totality of circumstances in each case, panelists have found that the registration and non-use of a domain name can still constitute bad faith for purposes of the Policy.

Factors that have been considered relevant in applying the passive holding doctrine include: (i) the degree of distinctiveness or reputation of the complainant's mark, (ii) the failure of the respondent to submit a response or to provide any evidence of actual or contemplated good-faith use, (iii) the respondent's taking active steps to conceal its identity or (iv) the use of false or inaccurate contact details (noted to be in breach of the respondent's registration agreement).

Taking the above factors into consideration, panels assess the overall plausibility of any (claimed) good faith use to which the domain name may be put in light of the composition of the domain name in relation to the relevant mark, such that, the more arbitrary or distinctive a mark the less plausible a claimed non-infringing good faith use is likely to be, and vice versa."

The Panel takes note of the Complainant's reputation, and the composition of the disputed domain name, and finds that such passive holding in the circumstances of this case does not prevent a finding of bad faith (*Telstra Corporation Limited v. Nuclear Marshmallows*, WIPO Case No. [D2000-0003](#); *Jupiters Limited v. Aaron Hall*, WIPO Case No. [D2000-0574](#); *Ladbroke Group Plc v. Sonoma International LDC*, WIPO Case No. [D2002-0131](#); *Westdev Limited v. Private Data*, WIPO Case No. [D2007-1903](#); *Malayan Banking Berhad v. Beauty, Success & Truth International*, WIPO Case No. [D2008-1393](#); and *Intel Corporation v. The Pentium Group*, WIPO Case No. [D2009-0273](#)).

The Panel finds that the current redirection of the disputed domain name to the Complainant's official website does not amount to good faith use either.

Based on the above, 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 <accenture-sales.com> be transferred to the Complainant.

/William Lobelson/

William Lobelson

Sole Panelist

Date: July 6, 2026