

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

Accenture Global Services Limited v. Oscar Oliver, Accenioc, James White, Accen, Brent Walker, AccentureLDT, Ranoda Bekker, Acc, Earthel Calicutt, Acc, and Justin Watson, Acc
Case No. D2026-2423

1. The Parties

The Complainant is Accenture Global Services Limited, Ireland, represented by McDermott Will & Schulte LLP, United States of America ("United States" or "U.S.").¹

The Respondents are Oscar Oliver, Accenioc, United States; James White, Accen, United States; Brent Walker, AccentureLDT, United States; Ranoda Bekker, Acc, United States; Earthel Calicutt, Acc, United States; and Justin Watson, Acc, United States.

2. The Domain Names and Registrar

The disputed domain names <accenture-discuss.com>, <accenture-interview.com>, <accenture-reply.com>, <accenture-talent.com>, <accenture-talk.com>, <apply-accenture.com>, <connect-accenture.com>, <contact-accenture.com>, <discuss-accenture.com>, <explore-accenture.com>, <find-accenture.com>, <hiring-accenture.com>, <interview-accenture.com>, <join-accenture.com>, <meet-accenture.com>, <reply-accenture.com>, <search-accenture.com>, <talent-accenture.com>, and <talk-accenture.com> are registered with Nicenic International Group Co., Limited (the "Registrar").

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the "Center") on June 3, 2026. On June 4, 2026, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain names. On June 5, 2026, the Registrar transmitted by email to the Center its verification response disclosing registrant and contact information for the disputed domain names 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 June 11, 2026 with the registrant and contact information of nominally multiple underlying registrants revealed by the Registrar(s), requesting the Complainant to either file separate complaint(s) for the disputed domain names associated with different

¹ The Panel notes that Accenture Global Services Limited was listed as the Complainant in the caption of the Complaint. However, the Complainant mentioned that "Complainant Accenture Global Services Limited, along with its affiliates and predecessor, Accenture Global Services GmbH (collectively, 'Complainant'), submits this Complaint...". The Panel considers that Accenture Global Services Limited is the Complainant for the purposes of this Decision in the circumstances of this case.

underlying registrants or alternatively, demonstrate that the underlying registrants are in fact the same entity and/or that all domain names are under common control. The Complainant filed an amended Complaint on June 15, 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 Respondents of the Complaint, and the proceedings commenced on June 18, 2026. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was July 8, 2026. The Respondents did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondents' default on July 9, 2026.

The Center appointed Tommaso La Scala as the sole panelist in this matter on July 22, 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 in this administrative proceeding is Accenture Global Services Limited, a company belonging to an international group which provides a broad range of services and solutions in strategy, consulting, digital, technology and operations under the ACCENTURE trademark, first used in commerce on January 1, 2001. The Complainant has offices and operations in more than 200 cities in 49 countries.

The Complainant owns more than 1,000 trademark registrations for ACCENTURE, ACCENTURE & Design and other marks incorporating the ACCENTURE brand (collectively, the "ACCENTURE Marks") in more than 140 countries, including as a mere example:

- the U.S. registration No. 3,091,811 ACCENTURE (word), registered on May 16, 2006 for classes 9, 16, 35, 36, 37, 41, and 42;
- the U.S. registration No. 2,665,373 ACCENTURE & Design, registered on December 24, 2002 for classes 35, 36, 41, and 42; and
- the U.S. registration No. 7,266,256 ACCENTURE (word), registered on January 9, 2024 for classes 9, 35, 36, 37, 41, and 42.

The ACCENTURE Marks have been the subject of substantial and continuous promotion worldwide, with annual advertising expenditures ranging between approximately USD 32 million and USD 132 million in the period from 2009 to 2025. The ACCENTURE mark has featured in Interbrand's Best Global Brands Report since 2002, ranking 31st in the 2024 edition; it has featured in Kantar Millward Brown's BrandZ Top 100 Brand Ranking since 2006, ranking 20th in 2025 with a brand valuation exceeding USD 100 billion; and it was identified by Brand Finance, in its 2024 Global 500 brand rankings, as the world's most valuable IT services brand.

The Complainant also owns several domain names comprising the ACCENTURE trademark, such as <accenture.com>, registered on August 30, 2000, which resolves to the Complainant's official website.

The disputed domain names were registered in successive batches between March 2 and April 12, 2026, namely <hiring-accenture.com>, <talent-accenture.com>, and <interview-accenture.com> on March 2, 2026; <talk-accenture.com>, and <reply-accenture.com> on March 15, 2026; <join-accenture.com> and <discuss-accenture.com> on March 22, 2026; <apply-accenture.com> on March 29, 2026; <explore-accenture.com>, <contact-accenture.com>, <connect-accenture.com>, <search-accenture.com>, <meet-accenture.com> and

<find-accenture.com> on April 5, 2026; and <accenture-interview.com>, <accenture-discuss.com>, <accenture-talent.com>, <accenture-talk.com>, and <accenture-reply.com> on April 12, 2026.

According to the Complaint, eight of the disputed domain names (namely <hiring-accenture.com>, <talent-accenture.com>, <interview-accenture.com>, <talk-accenture.com>, <join-accenture.com>, <discuss-accenture.com>, <apply-accenture.com> and <explore-accenture.com>) redirect Internet users to the Complainant's own official website at "www.accenture.com", while the remaining eleven disputed domain names do not resolve to any active website and return an error message.

A technical verification on the record, dated June 18, 2026, confirms such redirection in respect of seven of those disputed domain names, <explore-accenture.com> returning an error message at that date.

The disputed domain name <meet-accenture.com> was used on April 7, 2026 to send an email communication to a prospective candidate, enquiring whether the recipient would be interested in an employment opportunity with the Complainant.

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 names.

Notably, the Complainant contends that:

(a) the disputed domain names are confusingly similar to the Complainant's ACCENTURE Marks, as each of them reproduces the coined term "accenture" in its entirety, with the mere addition of a generic or descriptive term and of the generic Top-Level Domain ".com";

(b) the Respondents lack any rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain names, since the Respondents are not commonly known by the disputed domain names, have not been licensed or otherwise authorized by the Complainant to use the ACCENTURE Marks, and have registered the disputed domain names in order to use them in email addresses for fraudulent recruitment purposes, thereby passing themselves off as the Complainant; and

(c) the Respondents registered and are using the disputed domain names in bad faith, namely to intentionally attract Internet users for commercial gain by creating a likelihood of confusion with the Complainant's ACCENTURE Marks as to the source, sponsorship, affiliation or endorsement of the Respondents' email communications, the redirection of part of the disputed domain names to the Complainant's own website being apt to lend credibility to such communications, while the passive holding of the remaining disputed domain names does not prevent a finding of bad faith.

The Complainant further requests the consolidation of the Complaint against the multiple disputed domain name registrants.

B. Respondents

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

6. Discussion and Findings

6.1 Consolidation: Multiple Respondents

The amended Complaint was filed in relation to nominally different domain name registrants. The Complainant alleges that the domain name registrants are the same entity, or under common control. The Complainant requests the consolidation of the Complaint against the multiple disputed domain name registrants pursuant to paragraph 10(e) of the Rules.

The disputed domain name registrants did not comment on the Complainant's request.

Paragraph 3(c) of the Rules states that a complaint may relate to more than one domain name, provided that the domain names are registered by the same domain name holder.

In addressing the Complainant's request, the Panel will consider whether (i) the disputed domain names or corresponding websites are subject to common control; and (ii) the consolidation would be fair and equitable to all Parties. See WIPO Overview of WIPO Panel Views on Select UDRP Questions ("[WIPO Overview 3.1](#)"), section 4.11.2.

As regards common control, the Panel notes that the 19 disputed domain names are all registered with the same Registrar and were registered in six successive batches over a period of some six weeks, between March 2 and April 12, 2026. All of them are built on an identical and highly distinctive pattern, namely the Complainant's ACCENTURE trademark combined, by means of a hyphen, with a short English term drawn from the vocabulary of recruitment and business contact ("apply", "connect", "contact", "discuss", "explore", "find", "hiring", "interview", "join", "meet", "reply", "search", "talent", "talk"), placed either before or after the mark, and all under the same generic Top-Level Domain ".com".

The registration data disclosed by the Registrar point in the same direction. The registrant organizations declared for all 19 disputed domain names consist of the Complainant's own trademark or of abbreviations thereof, namely "Accenioc", "Accen", "AccentureLDT" and "Acc", the latter being declared by three of the nominally different registrants. Three of the registrants (James White, Brent Walker, and Earhel Calicutt) declared one and the same telephone number, and the two remaining ones (Ranoda Bekker and Justin Watson) declared another telephone number common to both; both numbers are manifestly fictitious sequences of consecutive digits. Three of the registrants declared email addresses built on an identical pattern, consisting of the declared first and last name followed by three digits at the same email provider, while two further registrants declared addresses at one and the same email provider. The declared postal addresses are equally revealing: two nominally different registrants declared addresses on "N Lamar" in Austin, United States, two declared addresses referring to "Muscatine", and two declared one and the same postal code although in nominally different States, while other addresses combine inconsistent or non-existent geographical indications.

Finally, the disputed domain names share a common technical pattern of use, part of them redirecting to one and the same target, namely the Complainant's own official website, and the remainder returning an error message.

The Respondents have not opposed the Complainant's request for consolidation.

Therefore, the Panel considers that the disputed domain names are likely to be owned by the same Respondent acting under different aliases and are, in any event, subject to common control. As regards fairness and equity, the Panel sees no reason why consolidation of the disputes would be unfair or inequitable to any Party; on the contrary, consolidation allows the Parties to address in a single proceeding a set of domain names which form part of one and the same scheme. Accordingly, the Panel decides to consolidate the disputes regarding the nominally different disputed domain name registrants (referred to below as "the Respondent") in a single proceeding.

6.2 Substantive Issues

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 names. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.7.

The Complainant has established rights in the ACCENTURE trademark.

Each of the disputed domain names consists of the ACCENTURE trademark, reproduced in its entirety, with the sole addition of a hyphen and of a term – “apply”, “connect”, “contact”, “discuss”, “explore”, “find”, “hiring”, “interview”, “join”, “meet”, “reply”, “search”, “talent” or “talk” – placed either before or after the mark, together with the generic Top-Level Domain “.com”. The Complainant's ACCENTURE mark is clearly recognizable within each of the disputed domain names.

Although the addition of such terms may bear on the assessment of the second and third elements, the Panel finds that the addition of these terms does not prevent a finding of confusing similarity between the disputed domain names and the mark for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.8. The generic Top-Level Domain “.com” is a standard registration requirement and is disregarded for the purposes of the first element. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.11.1.

Therefore, the Panel finds the disputed domain names to be confusingly similar to the ACCENTURE trademark in which the Complainant has rights. Accordingly, 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.

This Panel finds that the Complainant has made a prima facie case that the Respondent does not have rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain names. The Respondent does not appear to be commonly known by the name “Accenture” or by any of the disputed domain names, and there is no evidence in the record that the Respondent has acquired any trademark or service mark rights in such terms. The declaration, in the registration data, of organization names consisting of the Complainant's trademark or of abbreviations thereof does not alter this conclusion, such names being manifestly adopted for the sole purpose of appropriating the Complainant's trademark. The Respondent has no connection to or affiliation with the Complainant, and the Complainant has not licensed or otherwise authorized the Respondent to use or register any domain name incorporating the Complainant's ACCENTURE Marks.

The Respondent's use of the disputed domain names does not amount to a legitimate noncommercial or fair use, nor to any use in connection with a bona fide offering of goods or services. On the contrary, the record shows that at least one of the disputed domain names, <meet-accenture.com>, was used to send an email communication offering a purported employment opportunity with the Complainant, while eight further

disputed domain names redirect Internet users to the Complainant's own official website. In the Panel's view, such use carries a clear risk of implied affiliation.

Panels have held that the use of a domain name for illegitimate activity, here passing off and other types of fraud, can never confer rights or legitimate interests on a respondent. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 2.13.1. Nor does the mere holding of the remaining disputed domain names, which do not resolve to any active website, confer any rights or legitimate interests on the Respondent under the circumstances of this case.

Having reviewed the available record and considering that 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 names 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.

The disputed domain names were all registered in March and April 2026, that is more than 25 years after the Complainant first used and registered the ACCENTURE mark, which is a coined term and had long since become distinctive and widely known worldwide. Each of the disputed domain names reproduces that mark in its entirety in combination with a term drawn from the vocabulary of recruitment and business contact, and the registrant organizations declared to the Registrar consist of the Complainant's mark or of abbreviations thereof. These circumstances show that the Respondent knew of the Complainant and its trademark when registering the disputed domain names, and deliberately targeted them.

As regards use, the Complainant has documented that the disputed domain name <meet-accenture.com> was used on April 7, 2026 to send an email communication to a prospective candidate, purporting to offer an employment opportunity with the Complainant. The Panel further notes that eight of the disputed domain names redirect Internet users to the Complainant's own official website.

Panels have held that the use of a domain name for illegitimate activity, here passing off and other types of fraud, constitutes bad faith. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 3.4. The Panel accordingly finds that the Respondent has purposely registered and used those disputed domain names to attempt to attract, for commercial gain, Internet users by creating a likelihood of confusion with the Complainant's ACCENTURE Marks as to the source, sponsorship, affiliation or endorsement of its communications, within the meaning of paragraph 4(b)(iv) of the Policy, and that such conduct also constitutes a disruption of the Complainant's business.

As regards the disputed domain names which do not resolve to any active website, panels have found that the non-use of a domain name 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, 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 distinctiveness and reputation of the Complainant's trademark and the composition of those disputed domain names, the Respondent's failure to submit any response or to provide any evidence of actual or contemplated good faith use, the manifestly false contact details provided to the Registrar in breach of the registration agreement, and the implausibility of any good faith use to which those disputed domain names may be put – all the more so as they form part of a single series, registered within the same short period and on the same pattern as the disputed domain names shown to have been used for the fraudulent scheme described above. The Panel therefore finds that in the circumstances of this case the passive holding of those disputed domain names does not prevent a finding of bad faith under the Policy.

The Panel finds the third element of the Policy has been established.

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 names <accenture-discuss.com>, <accenture-interview.com>, <accenture-reply.com>, <accenture-talent.com>, <accenture-talk.com>, <apply-accenture.com>, <connect-accenture.com>, <contact-accenture.com>, <discuss-accenture.com>, <explore-accenture.com>, <find-accenture.com>, <hiring-accenture.com>, <interview-accenture.com>, <join-accenture.com>, <meet-accenture.com>, <reply-accenture.com>, <search-accenture.com>, <talent-accenture.com>, and <talk-accenture.com> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Tommaso La Scala/

Tommaso La Scala

Sole Panelist

Date: August 5, 2026