

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

VFS GLOBAL SERVICES PLC v. Chernyi Aleksandr Vasilevich
Case No. D2026-3448

1. The Parties

The Complainant is VFS GLOBAL SERVICES PLC, United Kingdom, represented by Aditya & Associates, India.

The Respondent is Chernyi Aleksandr Vasilevich, Russian Federation.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <support-vfsglobal.com> is registered with PDR Ltd. d/b/a PublicDomainRegistry.com (the "Registrar").

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the "Center") on August 4, 2026. On August 4, 2026, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On August 5, 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 (Domain Admin, Privacy Protect, LLC (PrivacyProtect.org)) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on August 7, 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 August 7, 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").

On August 4, 2026, the Complainant forwarded an email of the same date from an email address associated with the disputed domain name, in which the sender stated that it had “no objection to the transfer of the domain name to VFS Global Services PLC” and did not intend to contest the transfer. Following the Complainant’s indication that the Respondent did not object to the transfer of the disputed domain name, the Center informed the Parties on August 14, 2026, of the possibility of suspending the proceedings under paragraph 17 of the Rules to facilitate settlement. The Complainant declined settlement and requested that the proceedings continue, which the Center confirmed on August 17, 2026.

In accordance with the Rules, paragraphs 2 and 4, the Center formally notified the Respondent of the Complaint, and the proceedings commenced on August 18, 2026. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was September 7, 2026. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent’s default on September 8, 2026.

The Center appointed Luca Barbero as the sole panelist in this matter on September 9, 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 was incorporated in the United Kingdom on September 28, 2010. It is part of the VFS GLOBAL group of companies, which provides business process outsourcing, technology, and logistics support services related to the processing of visa applications to the diplomatic missions of 71 governments in 169 countries. The Complainant submits that the VFS GLOBAL group has successfully processed over 557.09 million transactions since 2001 and over 240.14 million biometric enrolments since 2007 through 4,250 visa application centers located in Asia, Africa, the Middle East, and Europe.

The Complainant is the owner, amongst others, of the following trademark registrations:

European Union Trade Mark registration No. 006923569 for VFS GLOBAL (figurative mark), filed on May 7, 2008, and registered on June 29, 2009, in classes 9, 35, and 38;

United Kingdom trademark registration No. UK00003045463 for VFS. GLOBAL EST.2001 (figurative mark), filed on March 6, 2014, and registered on July 11, 2014, in classes 9, 16, 35, 38, 39, and 42;

Ukraine trademark registration No. 144623 for VFS GLOBAL (figurative mark), filed on October 27, 2010, and registered on September 12, 2011, in classes 9 and 35.

The Complainant also owns the domain name <vfsglobal.com>, which was registered on February 23, 2005, and is used by the Complainant to promote its services under the trademark VFS GLOBAL.

The disputed domain name was registered on October 13, 2025, and does not currently resolve to an active website. However, the disputed domain name has MX (Mail Exchange) records and SPF (Sender Policy Framework) records configured¹ and, according to the documents and statements submitted by the Complainant – which have not been challenged by the Respondent – an email address based on the disputed domain name has been used to send fraudulent email communications to third parties, falsely posing as the Complainant, with the aim of obtaining payments and users’ personal data.

¹ Noting in particular the general powers of a panel articulated inter alia in paragraphs 10 and 12 of the UDRP Rules, it has been accepted that a panel may undertake limited factual research into matters of public record if it would consider such information useful to assessing the case merits and reaching a decision, in particular to affirm or corroborate a party’s contention. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 4.8.

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.

The Complainant contends that the disputed domain name is identical and confusingly similar to its domain name <vfsglobal.com> and to its trademark VFS GLOBAL.

The Complainant states that the Respondent does not have any rights or legitimate interests in respect of the disputed domain name because: i) the Respondent's name does not reflect the dominant part of the disputed domain name, which consists of the wording "vfsglobal"; ii) the Respondent does not own any trademark registrations for VFS GLOBAL in any country; iii) the Respondent has not acquired any reputation and/or goodwill in "vfsglobal" in any country; iv) the Respondent is in no way associated with the Complainant, nor is it licensed, permitted or authorized by the Complainant to use the Complainant's marks in any way including to register the disputed domain name; and v) the Respondent registered and used the disputed domain name, which is confusingly similar to the Complainant's trademarks, to deceive, scam, mislead, and cheat consumers by misrepresenting the origin of the services offered and deceive applicants seeking visa-related services.

The Complainant submits that the Respondent registered the disputed domain name in bad faith because: i) the Respondent does not have any legitimate rights or interests in the disputed domain name; and ii) the Respondent must have been aware of the Complainant's services, prior rights, and interests with respect to the Complainant's domain name and/or the VFS GLOBAL mark, since it intentionally adopted the disputed domain name to deceive and misguide the public at large for financial gain.

The Complainant states that the Respondent sent fraudulent emails to unsuspecting applicants from an email address based on the disputed domain name, with the deliberate intent to impersonate the Complainant and mislead recipients into believing that the communications originating therefrom were officially associated with, authorized by, or operated on behalf of the Complainant. The Complainant further submits that the Respondent deliberately incorporated the Complainant's VFS GLOBAL mark coupled with the term "support", in order to create a highly deceptive impression of legitimacy and official association with the Complainant.

The Complainant contends that the Respondent's use of the disputed domain name amounts to a deliberate, calculated, dishonest attempt to deceive the public, misappropriate the Complainant's identity, and unlawfully obtain money from unsuspecting applicants seeking the Complainant's visa-related services. The Complainant therefore concludes that the Respondent's actions constitute a clear case of impersonation, phishing, and financial fraud, carried out by exploiting the goodwill and global reputation associated with the Complainant's trademark.

B. Respondent

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

6. Discussion and Findings

According to paragraph 15(a) of the Rules: "A Panel shall decide a complaint on the basis of the statements and documents submitted and in accordance with the Policy, these Rules and any rules and principles of law that it deems applicable." Paragraph 4(a) of the Policy directs that the Complainant must prove each of the following:

- (i) that the disputed domain name is 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 name; and
- (iii) that 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 respect of a trademark or service mark for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.2.1. Indeed, the Complainant has provided evidence of valid trademark registrations for VFS GLOBAL (figurative mark).

The dominant feature of the Complainant's mark, consisting of the letters "vfs" and the term "global", is recognizable within the disputed domain name. Accordingly, the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to the mark for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.7.

Although the addition of other terms, here, "support-", 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 name and the mark for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.8.

As to the generic Top-Level Domain ".com", it can be disregarded under the first element confusing similarity test, being a standard registration requirement. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.11.1.

Therefore, 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.

According to the records, there is no relationship between the Complainant and the Respondent, and the Complainant has not authorized the Respondent to register or use its trademarks or the disputed domain name. Moreover, there is no evidence from which the Panel could infer that the Respondent has rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name, or that the Respondent might be commonly known by the disputed domain name.

Furthermore, there is no evidence showing that the Respondent has made use of, or preparations to use, the disputed domain name in connection with a bona fide offering of goods or services or a legitimate noncommercial use without intention to misleadingly divert consumers or to tarnish the Complainant's mark.

Indeed, even though the disputed domain name does not currently resolve to an active website, based on the evidence provided by the Complainant – which has not been contested by the Respondent – it has been used for the purpose of sending email communications falsely posing as the Complainant. Such evidence suggests that the Respondent used the disputed domain name to deceive users, misappropriate the Complainant's identity, and unlawfully obtain money and personal information from unsuspecting applicants seeking the Complainant's visa-related services.

Panels have held that the use of a domain name for illegal activity such as impersonation, phishing, or other types of fraud can never confer rights or legitimate interests on a respondent. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 2.13.1.

Therefore, the Panel finds the second element of the Policy has also 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.

In the present case, the Panel finds that, in light of i) the prior registration and use of the trademark VFS GLOBAL by the Complainant; and ii) the promotion of the Complainant's visa-related services online under the said mark via the website "www.vfsglobal.com", the Respondent knew or should have known of the Complainant's trademark at the time of registration of the disputed domain name. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 3.2.2.

Moreover, considering the composition of the disputed domain name and the Respondent's above-described use of the same to send emails impersonating the Complainant from an email address based on the disputed domain name, the Panel finds that the Respondent was actually aware of, and intended to target, the Complainant and its trademark at the time of registration of the disputed domain name.

The disputed domain name does not resolve to an active website. However, as indicated above, according to the records the disputed domain name has been used for the creation of an email address from which fraudulent email communications were sent to third parties, passing themselves off as the Complainant, with the scope of obtaining payments and personal information from users interested in the Complainant's services. The Panel finds that such use of the disputed domain name clearly shows that the Respondent acted in bad faith through the registration and use of the disputed domain name. Indeed, Panels have held that the use of a domain name for purposes other than to host a website, including sending phishing email communications, may constitute bad faith. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 3.4.

Therefore, the Panel finds that the Complainant has established the third element of the Policy as well.

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 <support-vfsglobal.com> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Luca Barbero/

Luca Barbero

Sole Panelist

Date: September 23, 2026