

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

DNV AS v. Christian Acker, Joe Doe
Case No. D2026-3007

1. The Parties

The Complainant is DNV AS, Norway, represented by Zacco Norway AS, Norway.

The Respondents are Christian Acker, and Joe Doe, Germany.

2. The Domain Names and Registrar

The disputed domain names <dnv-it.com> and <dnv-it.solutions> are registered with NameCheap, Inc. (the "Registrar").

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the "Center") on July 8, 2026. On July 9, 2026, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain names. On July 10, 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 (Privacy Service Provided by Withheld for Privacy ehf) and contact information in the Complaint.

The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on July 13, 2026 with the registrant and contact information of nominally multiple underlying registrants revealed by the Registrar, requesting the Complainant to either file separate complaint(s) for the disputed domain names associated with different 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 amendment to the Complaint on July 16, 2026.

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 Respondents of the Complaint, and the proceedings commenced on July 20, 2026. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was August 9, 2026. The Respondents did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondents' default on August 11, 2026.

The Center appointed Peter Burgstaller as the sole panelist in this matter on August 13, 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 Norwegian based company, founded in 1864 and is now one of the leading advisors for the maritime industry, and delivers testing, certification and technical advisory services to the energy value chain, including renewables, oil and gas, and for energy management; it also provides digital solutions for managing risk and improving safety and asset performance across many industries (Annex 4 to the Complaint). The Complainant owns numerous trademark registrations containing the mark DNV in multiple jurisdictions (Annex 5 to the Complaint), inter alia:

- International trademark registration, Reg. No. 1522485, registered on October 4, 2019, designated in many jurisdictions around the world;
- United States of America trademark registration, Reg. No. 6513761, registered on October 12, 2021;
- European Union trademark registration, Reg. No. 003326873, registered on January 10, 2005; and
- Norwegian trademark registration, Reg. No. 162893, registered on May 26, 1994.

Further, the Complainant owns various domain names containing the mark DNV, inter alia the domain name <dnv.com> which resolves to its official business website.

The Complainant has a local subsidiary in Germany with the company name "DNV maritime Software GmbH" and the registration No. HRB 8056, registered in the Company Register in Germany (Annex 6.1 to the Complaint).

The disputed domain name <dnv-it.com> was registered on June 29, 2026 and the disputed domain name <dnv-it.solutions> on April 12, 2026.

At the time of filing the Complaint the disputed domain name <dnv-it.com> redirected Internet users to the domain name <dnv-it-portal.de> which resolved to a website displaying the DNV mark under a company name "DNV IT Software GmbH" and the registration No. HRB 8056 (Annexes 6.4, 6.7 and 6.8 to the Complaint). The disputed domain name <dnv-it.solutions> did not resolve to an active website but the Complainant asserts it was registered and held as part of a broader fraudulent employment scheme.

5. Parties' Contentions

A. Complainant

The Complainant asks for consolidating the disputes against different disputed domain name registrants in a single proceeding since there are indicators that suggest that the disputed domain names were registered by the same entity.

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 each of the disputed domain names incorporate, in a recognizable manner, the Complainant's DNV trademark together with the suffix "it", which means "information technology". This addition cannot prevent a finding of confusing similarity under the first element.

The Complainant notes that the Respondents do not have any rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain names. The Respondents are not linked to the Complainant in any way whatsoever and have never been authorized by the Complainant to register domain names that are similar to its trademark. The Respondents are moreover not commonly known by or associated with the disputed domain names and do not use them for any bona fide offering of goods or services.

On the contrary: the Complainant alleges that the Respondents are using the disputed domain names as a part of a wider employment scheme/fraud, designed to impersonate the Complainant and its local subsidiary in Germany.

The disputed domain name <dnv-it.com> is redirecting traffic to the domain name <dnv-it-portal.de>, another domain name used in the fraud, along with the disputed domain names and the domain name <dnv-it.de>, as reported by several victims. In the scheme, the Respondents are posing as "DNV IT Software GmbH" (a company that does not exist in the Company Register of Germany) using the registration No. HRB 8056, i.e., the number belonging to the Complainant's DNV Maritime Software GmbH subsidiary. The purpose of the scheme appears to be to lure unsuspecting individuals to reveal their personal data and sign employment contracts with a non-existing company.

Although the domain names <dnv-it.de> and <dnv-it-portal.de> are naturally not a part of this Complaint, the Complainant has filed and been granted so-called DISPUTE-Entries against these domain names with DENIC, the German registry operator.

Accordingly, the Complainant argues that the Respondents' activities will risk diluting and damaging the Complainant's valuable business and trademark, and that the Respondents have no rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain names.

Finally, the Complainant contends that the Respondents have registered and are using the disputed domain names in bad faith: it is obvious that the Respondents were fully aware of the Complainant and its trademarks when registering the disputed domain names because of the widespread use and recognition of the DNV trademark and its related products, as well as the intensive online use of the Complainant's marks. The Respondents' use of the disputed domain names is a clear example of cybersquatting; the disputed domain names are therefore registered and used in bad faith under the Policy.

B. Respondent

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

6. Discussion and Findings

6.1 Preliminary Issues

Consolidation of 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 mere alter egos of each other, or under common control. The Complainant requests consolidation of the disputes against 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 disputed domain names have a very similar naming pattern: both of them using the Complainants' marks DNV followed by a hyphen and the suffix "it";
- the disputed domain names were registered within a short period of time and use identical name servers;
- the registrants' details were redacted for privacy by using privacy service when registering the disputed domain names;
- the Respondents' purported location is Germany;
- both disputed domain names were registered with NameCheap, Inc; and
- finally, the Respondents did not react in any way to the proceedings – the Respondents neither objected to the Complainant's consolidation request nor filed any Response.

Therefore, as regards fairness and equity, the Panel sees no reason why consolidation of the disputes would be unfair or inequitable to any Party.

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

According to paragraph 4(a) of the Policy, the Complainant must prove that:

- (i) the disputed domain names are 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 with respect to the disputed domain names; and
- (iii) the disputed domain names have been registered and are 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 3.1](#), section 1.7.

The Complainant submitted evidence which incontestably and conclusively establishes rights in the mark DNV.

In the present case, the disputed domain names are confusingly similar to the DNV mark in which the Complainant has rights since that mark remains recognizable within the disputed domain names.

Although the disputed domain names add a hyphen and the term "it", it has long been established under UDRP decisions that adding terms to a trademark does not prevent a finding of confusing similarity under the first element of the Policy, if the relevant trademark remains recognizable within the disputed domain name. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.8; this is the case here: the DNV mark of the Complainant is clearly recognizable in the disputed domain names.

Finally, it has also long been held that generic Top-Level Domains (here “.com” and “.solutions”), are generally disregarded when evaluating the confusing similarity between a disputed domain name and a trademark. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.11.1.

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.

While 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 often impossible 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. 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 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, since it has never assigned, granted, licensed, sold, transferred or in any way authorized the Respondent to register or use its trademark in any manner including in a domain name.

Moreover, the Respondent is not commonly known by the disputed domain names and does not use them for any bona fide offering of goods or services.

The Respondent did not formally reply and hence has not rebutted the Complainant’s contentions.

Further, the composition of the disputed domain name, coupled with the use of the disputed domain name <dnv-it.com> to redirect to a website at “www.dnv-it-portal.de” which was used in connection to a fraudulent scheme indicates to the Panel the Respondent’s intention of taking unfair advantage of the likelihood of confusion between the disputed domain names and the Complainant as to the origin or affiliation of the website at the disputed domain names. Moreover, panels have held that the use of a domain name for illegitimate activity (here, claimed impersonation and/ or passing off) can never confer rights or legitimate interests on a respondent. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 2.13.1.

Based on the available record, the Panel finds the second element of the Policy has been established.

C. Registered and Used in Bad Faith

As stated in many decisions rendered under the Policy (e.g., *Robert Ellenbogen v. Mike Pearson*, WIPO Case No. [D2000-0001](#)), both conditions, registration and use in bad faith, must be demonstrated; consequently, the Complainant must show that:

- the disputed domain name was registered by the Respondent in bad faith; and
- the disputed domain names are being used by the Respondent in bad faith.

In the present case, the Complainant provided evidence which demonstrates that it has rights and is the owner of the registered trademark DNV, registered and used in many jurisdictions around the world long before the disputed domain names were registered.

The Complainant has put forward evidence that the disputed domain name <dnv-it.com> was used by the Respondent to redirect to the domain name <dnv-it-portal.de> which hosts a website featuring the

Complainant's mark DNV as well as purported to provide information about IT-Consulting and software development under a company name ("DNV IT Software GmbH") which does not exist under the displayed Registration Number 8056 of the Company Register; it is to the contrary: the Registration Number 8056 belongs to a German subsidiary company of the Complainant.

In doing so, the Panel finds that the Respondent is giving Internet users the false and misleading impression that the site is controlled or at least authorized by the Complainant.

This shows to the Panel that the Respondent intentionally attempts to attract, for commercial gain, Internet users by creating a likelihood of confusion with the Complainant and its mark, which constitutes bad faith use. The Panel further notes that the website redirected by this disputed domain name was used in connection with a fraudulent scheme.

Regarding the disputed domain name <dnv-it.solutions>, the Panel notes that such does not resolve to an active website, but this does not prevent a finding of bad faith. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 3.3. Having reviewed the available record, the Panel notes the reputation of the Complainant's trademark, the composition of the disputed domain name, not only similar to the Complainant's trademark but to the other disputed domain name used in bad faith and in connection with a fraudulent scheme, and finds that in the circumstances of this case the passive holding of the disputed domain name does not prevent a finding of bad faith under the Policy.

The evidence and documents produced and put forward by the Complainant together with the fact that the Respondent has failed to file a Response and therefore failed to present any evidence of any good faith registration and use with regard to the disputed domain names further indicates, on balance, that the disputed domain names were registered and are used by the Respondent in bad faith under paragraph 4(a)(iii) 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 <dnv-it.com> and <dnv-it.solutions> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Peter Burgstaller/

Peter Burgstaller

Sole Panelist

Date: August 27, 2026