ARBITRATION
AND
MEDIATION CENTER

WIPO
WORLD
INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY
ORGANIZATION

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

Accenture Global Services Limited v. wotlk king
Case No. D2026-2915

1. The Parties

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

The Respondent is wotlk king, China.

2. The Domain Names and Registrars

The disputed domain names <accenturepdo.com> and <accenturepdo.org> are registered with Dynadot Inc (the "Registrar").

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the "Center") on July 2, 2026. On July 3, 2026, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain names. On July 7, 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 (DT)/ SUPER PRIVACY SERVICE LTD C/O DYNADOT) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on July 9, 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 July 14, 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 July 15, 2026. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was August 4, 2026. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent's default on August 7, 2026.

The Center appointed Estela Mariel de Luca as the sole panelist in this matter on August 14, 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 an international company providing strategy, consulting, digital, technology and business process services under the name ACCENTURE since 2001. It has offices and operations in more than 200 cities across 49 countries.

The Complainant owns multiple trademarks for ACCENTURE worldwide, including the following:

- , United States Trademark Registration No. 2,665,373, registered on December 24, 2002, in International Classes 35, 36, 37, 41 and 42.

- ACCENTURE, United States Trademark Registration No. 3,091,811, registered on May 16, 2006, in International Classes 9, 16, 35, 36, 37, 41 and 42,

- , United States Trademark Registration No. 2,884,125, registered on September 14, 2004, in International Classes 18, 25 and 28.

The Complainant owns the domain name <accenture.com>, registered on August 29, 2000. The disputed domain names were registered on May 26, 2026, and resolve to a page displaying an Internet browser error message stating, "This site can't be reached".

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 the disputed domain names are nearly identical and confusingly similar to its famous ACCENTURE trademark, which is clearly recognizable within the disputed domain names, and that the addition of the term "pdo" does not alter this finding. The Complainant further submits that the inclusion of generic Top-Level Domains ("gTLDs") is "completely without legal significance".

The Complainant asserts that the Respondent lacks rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain names pursuant to paragraphs 4(a)(ii) and 4(c) of the Policy. It contends that ACCENTURE is not a generic or descriptive term and that the ACCENTURE marks have acquired extensive secondary meaning and global renown through substantial and exclusive use.

The Complainant further submits that the Respondent is neither affiliated with the Complainant nor licensed or otherwise authorized to use its ACCENTURE trademarks or any domain name incorporating them. Furthermore, the Complainant states that there is no evidence suggesting that the Respondent was commonly known by the disputed domain names prior to the date on which the Respondent registered it to trade off the reputation and goodwill of the Complainant's ACCENTURE trademarks. Moreover, the Complainant contends that the passive holding of the disputed domain names — which currently resolve to an error message— fails to constitute a bona fide offering of goods or services, or a legitimate noncommercial or fair use.

The Complainant also contends that, in view of the worldwide reputation of the ACCENTURE marks and their ubiquitous presence on the Internet, the Respondent must have been aware of them when registering the disputed domain names. In addition, the passive holding of domain names incorporating a well-known trademark, in circumstances where no legitimate use is apparent, may constitute evidence of bad faith under paragraph 4(a)(iii) of the Policy.

Finally, the Respondent's identity has been removed from the WhoIs information for the disputed domain names, which is indicative of passive holding and bad faith.

B. Respondent

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

6. Discussion and Findings

Under paragraph 4(a) of the Policy, the Complainant carries the burden of proving:

(i) that the disputed domain names are identical or confusingly similar to a trademark or service mark in which the Complainant has rights;
(ii) that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the disputed domain names;
(iii) that the disputed domain names have been registered and is being used in bad faith.

The Respondent's default in the case at hand does not automatically result in a decision in favor of the Complainant, however, paragraph 5(f) of the Rules provides that if the Respondent does not submit a Response, in the absence of exceptional circumstances, the Panel shall decide the dispute based upon the Complaint.

Further, according to paragraph 14(b) of the Rules, the Panel may draw such inferences from the Respondent's failure to submit a Response as it considers appropriate.

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 Panel finds the mark is recognizable within the disputed domain names. Accordingly, the disputed domain names are confusingly similar to the mark for the purposes of the Policy. WIPO Overview 3.1, section 1.7.

Although the addition of the term "pdo" to both disputed domain names 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 names and the mark for the purposes of the Policy. WIPO Overview 3.1, section 1.8.

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 names. 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 further notes that the Respondent is not affiliated with the Complainant and has not been licensed or otherwise authorized to use the Complainant's ACCENTURE trademark. Nor is there any evidence in the record indicating that the Respondent is commonly known by the disputed domain names within the meaning of paragraph 4(c)(ii) of the Policy.

Further, the evidence does not support a finding that the Respondent has used the disputed domain names in connection with a bona fide offering of goods or services, or that the Respondent is making a legitimate noncommercial or fair use of the disputed domain names. On the contrary, the disputed domain names do not resolve to an active website.

The Panel finds that 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.

Panels have found that the non-use of a domain name would not prevent a finding of bad faith under the doctrine of passive holding. Although panels will look at the totality of the circumstances in each case, 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). WIPO Overview 3.1, section 3.3.

The evidence demonstrates that the Complainant holds long-standing rights in the well-known ACCENTURE trademark, which predate the Respondent's registration of the disputed domain names. In light of the Complainant's established reputation and the incorporation of the ACCENTURE mark in the disputed domain names the Panel finds that the Respondent likely knew of the Complainant's trademark rights at the time of registration. WIPO Overview 3.1, section 3.2.2.

Having reviewed the available record and taking into account the totality of the circumstances, including the Respondent's failure to submit a Response or to provide any evidence of actual or contemplated good-faith use, and the use of inaccurate contact details, the Panel finds that the disputed domain names were registered and are being used in bad faith. Furthermore, the Panel further notes that the Respondent employed a privacy service (Super Privacy Service LTD c/o Dynadot) when registering the disputed domain names to conceal its identity, which in the circumstances of this case constitutes an additional factor supporting the Panel's conclusion of bad faith.

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 names <accenturepdo.com> and <accenturepdo.org> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Estela Mariel de Luca/
Estela Mariel de Luca
Sole Panelist
Date: August 24, 2026.