

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

VFS Global Services PLC v. Iadi James, Gviri
Case No. D2026-2491

1. The Parties

The Complainant is VFS Global Services PLC, United Kingdom, represented by Aditya & Associates, India.

The Respondent is Iadi James, Gviri, Nigeria.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <vfsservice.com> is registered with Tucows Domains Inc. (the "Registrar").

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the "Center") on June 9, 2026. On June 9, 2026, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On the same day, 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 (Not Available) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on June 10, 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 amendment to the Complaint on the same day.

The Center verified that the Complaint together with the amendment to the 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 30, 2026. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was July 20, 2026. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent's default on July 25, 2026.

The Center appointed Torsten Bettinger as the sole panelist in this matter on July 27, 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, VFS Global Services PLC, is part of the VFS Global group of companies, which provides administrative and technology services relating to visa, passport, and consular application processes. The VFS Global business traces its origins to 2001 and provides services to diplomatic missions and governmental authorities in numerous countries.

The Complainant and its group companies use the VFS and VFS GLOBAL trademarks in connection with their services and own numerous trademark registrations, including, inter alia:

- Singapore Trade Mark Registration No. T0400918Z for VFS, registered on November 9, 2004;
- Indian Trademark Registration No. 1555893 for VFS GLOBAL, registered on May 7, 2007, in Class 9;
- European Union Trade Mark Registration No. 006923569 for VFS GLOBAL (figurative), registered on June 29, 2009, in Classes 9, 35, and 38; and
- United Kingdom Trade Mark Registration No. UK00003045463 for VFS. GLOBAL EST.2001 (figurative), registered on July 11, 2014, in Classes 9, 16, 35, 38, 39, and 42.

The Complainant's group operates its principal website at the domain name <vfglobal.com>, which was registered on February 23, 2005, and is used to provide information and services relating to visa applications.

The disputed domain name <vfsservice.com> was registered on July 22, 2025.

The evidence submitted by the Complainant shows that email addresses associated with the disputed domain name, including "[...]"@vfsservice.com, [...]@vfsservice.com, [...]@vfsservice.com, and [...]@vfsservice.com, have been used to send communications referring to "VFS Global" and relating to visa processing, biometric enrolment, and work visa services.

One of the communications submitted in evidence requested payment of NGN 190,100, stated to correspond to CAD 200, as a "Biometric Enrollment Fee", and directed the recipient to [...]@vfsservice.com for further assistance.

The evidence further shows that a recipient of such communications contacted the Complainant's Fraud and Compliance Team to enquire whether the communications were authentic.

5. Parties' Contentions

A. Complainant

The Complainant requests that the disputed domain name be transferred to it and contends that it has satisfied each of the elements required under the Policy.

With regard to paragraph 4(a)(i) of the Policy, the Complainant contends that:

- it has rights in the VFS and VFS GLOBAL trademarks;
- the disputed domain name incorporates the VFS trademark in its entirety; and
- the addition of the term "service" does not prevent a finding of confusing similarity.

With regard to paragraph 4(a)(ii) of the Policy, the Complainant submits that:

- that it has not authorized, licensed, or otherwise permitted the Respondent to use the VFS or VFS GLOBAL trademarks;
- that the Respondent is not commonly known by the disputed domain name and has no trademark rights in the term “VFS”; and
- that the use of the disputed domain name for email communications impersonating the Complainant and soliciting payments does not constitute a bona fide offering of goods or services or legitimate noncommercial or fair use.

With regard to paragraph 4(a)(iii) of the Policy, the Complainant contends that:

- the Respondent must have been aware of the Complainant and its VFS and VFS GLOBAL trademarks when registering the disputed domain name;
- the Respondent has used email addresses associated with the disputed domain name to impersonate the Complainant in communications relating to visa processing and biometric enrolment;
- the Respondent has used such communications to solicit payments from members of the public; and
- such use constitutes phishing, impersonation, and bad faith registration and use of the disputed domain name.

B. Respondent

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

6. Discussion and Findings

Paragraph 4(a) of the Policy states that the Complainant must prove each of the following three elements:

- (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.

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 the VFS and VFS GLOBAL trademarks for purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.2.1.

The disputed domain name incorporates the VFS trademark in its entirety. The addition of the term “service” does not prevent the VFS trademark from being recognizable in the disputed domain name. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.8.

The Top-Level Domain (“TLD”) “.com” is viewed as a standard registration requirement and is disregarded under the first element confusing similarity analysis.

Accordingly, the Panel finds that the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to the Complainant’s VFS trademark. 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 may result in the difficult task of proving a negative, requiring information that is often primarily within the knowledge or control of the respondent.

Where a complainant makes out a prima facie case that the respondent lacks rights or legitimate interests, the burden of production shifts to the respondent to come forward with relevant evidence demonstrating rights or legitimate interests in the domain name, although the burden of proof remains on the complainant. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 2.1.

The Complainant has not authorized, licensed, or otherwise permitted the Respondent to use the VFS or VFS GLOBAL trademarks. There is no evidence before the Panel that the Respondent is affiliated with the Complainant or has been commonly known by the disputed domain name.

The evidence shows that email addresses associated with the disputed domain name have been used for communications purporting to originate from “VFS Global” and relating to visa processing and biometric enrolment. One such communication requested payment of a purported biometric enrolment fee.

The use of a domain name for impersonation or other fraudulent activity can never confer rights or legitimate interests on a respondent. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 2.13.1.

The Respondent has not submitted any response and has not come forward with any evidence of rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name.

Accordingly, the Panel finds that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name within the meaning of paragraph 4(a)(ii) of the Policy. The second element of the Policy has been established.

C. Registered and Used in Bad Faith

The Panel notes that paragraph 4(b) of the Policy sets out circumstances, in particular but without limitation, that shall be evidence of the registration and use of a domain name in bad faith.

The Complainant’s VFS and VFS GLOBAL trademark rights predate the registration of the disputed domain name by many years.

The disputed domain name incorporates the VFS trademark in its entirety together with the term “service”. More significantly, the evidence shows that email addresses associated with the disputed domain name were used for communications referring expressly to “VFS Global” and concerning visa processing and biometric enrolment, being services for which the Complainant is known.

In these circumstances, the Panel finds that the Respondent registered the disputed domain name with actual knowledge of the Complainant and its trademarks.

The evidence further shows that the Respondent used email addresses associated with the disputed domain name to impersonate the Complainant. In particular, a communication submitted in evidence requested payment of a purported “Biometric Enrollment Fee” while presenting itself as connected with “VFS Global”.

The use of a domain name for phishing, impersonation, or other fraudulent activity constitutes manifestly bad-faith use. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 3.4.

The Panel therefore finds that the Respondent registered and used the disputed domain name with the intention of creating a false impression of association with the Complainant and of exploiting that impression for financial gain.

Accordingly, the Panel finds that the disputed domain name has been registered and is being used in bad faith within the meaning of paragraph 4(a)(iii) of the Policy. 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 name <vfsservice.com> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Torsten Bettinger/

Torsten Bettinger

Sole Panelist

Date: August 10, 2026