

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

Veolia Environnement SA v. Name Redacted
Case No. D2026-2639

1. The Parties

The Complainant is Veolia Environnement SA, France, represented by IP Twins SAS, France.

The Respondent is Name Redacted.¹

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <veoilla.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 17, 2026. On June 17, 2026, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On June 17, 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 June 18, 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 June 22, 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”).

¹ The Respondent appears to have used the name of an employee of the Complainant when registering the disputed domain name. In light of the suspected identity theft, the Panel has redacted the Respondent’s name from this decision. However, the Panel has attached as Annex 1 to this decision an instruction to the Registrar regarding transfer of the disputed domain name, which includes the name of the Respondent. The Panel has authorized the Center to transmit Annex 1 to the Registrar as part of the order in this proceeding, and has indicated Annex 1 to this decision shall not be published due to the exceptional circumstances of this case. See *Banco Bradesco S.A. v. FAST-12785241 Attn. Bradescourgente.net / Name Redacted*, WIPO Case No. [D2009-1788](#).

In accordance with the Rules, paragraphs 2 and 4, the Center formally notified the Respondent of the Complaint, and the proceedings commenced on June 24, 2026. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was July 14, 2026. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent's default on July 20, 2026.

The Center appointed Francine Tan as the sole panelist in this matter on July 24, 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 French holding company of the Veolia Group (the "Group"), which was established about 170 years ago. Its core businesses are in water, waste, and energy management. The Group has nearly 215,000 employees worldwide and a total revenue of EUR 44,692 million in 2024.

The Complainant is the registered proprietor of trade mark registrations for VEOLIA, which include the following:

- (i) International registration No. 814678, registered on September 11, 2003;
- (ii) International registration No. 919580, registered on March 10, 2006;
- (iii) European Union registration No. 0910325, registered on March 10, 2006; and
- (iv) United States of America ("United States") registration No. 3543738, registered on December 9, 2008.

The Complainant also owns and operates various domain names which incorporate its VEOLIA trade mark, such as <veolia.com>, which was registered on December 30, 2002.

The disputed domain name was registered on April 19, 2026 which, the Complainant asserts, has been used by the Respondent for a phishing scheme. An email, using the disputed domain name, had been sent to a client of the Complainant for a fake "mistake in the Veolia account". The Respondent impersonated a specific United States-based employee of the Group and used his name in the email account.

A cease-and-desist letter was sent by the Complainant's in-house legal counsel on May 7, 2026, followed by a reminder on June 4, 2026. No response was received from the Respondent.

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 the following:

- (a) The disputed domain name is confusingly similar to the trade mark VEOLIA, which is well known. It "contains an imitation of the trademark VEOLIA" – there are additional letters "i" and "l", and a replacement of the letter "i" with an "l", both letters being visually similar to each other.
- (b) The Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the disputed domain name. The registration of the Complainant's VEOLIA mark took place many years before the registration of the disputed domain name. The Respondent cannot reasonably pretend that it was intending to develop a legitimate activity through the disputed domain name. The Respondent is not commonly known by the name "Veolia",

not affiliated with the Complainant, and not authorized or licensed to use the VEOLIA trade mark. The conducting of phishing activities via the disputed domain name and impersonation of an employee of the Complainant are not proof of legitimate interest.

(c) The disputed domain name is registered and being used in bad faith. It is implausible that the Respondent was unaware of the Complainant when he registered the disputed domain name. The Complainant's VEOLIA trade mark was considered by panels in earlier UDRP decisions to be well known. A simple search via Google or any other search engine would immediately show results relating to the Complainant's trade mark. The use of the disputed domain name to conduct phishing activities and impersonation are not good faith use.

B. Respondent

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

6. Discussion and Findings

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 trade mark 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 trade mark or for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.2.1.

The Panel finds that the disputed domain name comprising the word "veoilla" is confusingly similar to the VEOLIA mark for the purposes of the Policy. A domain name which consists of a variation of a trade mark (typically a common, obvious, or intentional misspelling) is considered by panels to be confusingly similar to the relevant mark for purposes of the first element. This stems from the fact that the domain name contains sufficiently recognizable aspects of the relevant mark. This is a typical case of typosquatting where the Respondent has substituted and added similar-appearing characters. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.9.

The generic Top-Level Domain ".com" is but a technical requirement for domain names and is not relevant to the consideration of whether there is confusing similarity between the disputed domain name and the Complainant's trade mark.

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 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.

Panels have held that the use of a domain name for illegitimate or illegal activity, including passing off, phishing, or other types of fraud, can never confer rights or legitimate interests on a respondent. Here, the disputed domain name was used for email communications impersonating the Complainant's employee. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 2.13.1.

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.

Having regard to the circumstances of the case, in particular the deliberate misspelling of the Complainant's trade mark and the manner in which the disputed domain name has been used, the Panel is satisfied that the Respondent registered the disputed domain name in bad faith. The Respondent has used the disputed domain name as part of a sophisticated scheme to deceive the Complainant's customers by creating a likelihood of confusion with the Complainant and its trade mark as to the source, sponsorship, affiliation, or endorsement of the Respondent's activities. In particular, the Respondent impersonated an employee of the Complainant in furtherance of that scheme. Panels have consistently held that the use of a domain name for illegitimate or illegal activity, including phishing, passing off or other forms of fraud, constitutes evidence of bad faith registration and use under the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 3.4.

Accordingly, the Panel finds that the Respondent's conduct falls squarely within paragraph 4(b)(iv) of the Policy. The Panel also draws an adverse inference from the Respondent's failure to respond to the Complaint and to the Complainant's cease-and-desist letter.

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 <veoilla.com> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Francine Tan/

Francine Tan

Sole Panelist

Date: August 5, 2026