

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

VEON Amsterdam B.V. v. Sahil Khan

Case No. D2026-3452

1. The Parties

The Complainant is VEON Amsterdam B.V., Netherlands (Kingdom of the), represented by NLO Shieldmark B. V., Netherlands (Kingdom of the).

The Respondent is Sahil Khan, India.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <veon.shop> is registered with Spaceship, Inc. (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 (The RDAP server redacted the value, Domain Admin, Privacy service provided by Withheld for Privacy ehf) 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 amended Complaint on the same date.

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 August 14, 2026. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was September 3, 2026. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent’s default on September 4, 2026.

The Center appointed Wilson Pinheiro Jabur as the sole panelist in this matter on September 8, 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 subsidiary of the multinational digital operator (Veon Ltd, shortly “Veon”) that operates in Pakistan, Ukraine, Bangladesh, Uzbekistan, and Kazakhstan. Veon is publicly traded on the NASDAQ stock exchange.

The Complainant’s official homepage is available at “www.veon.com”, the respective domain name having been registered on April 24, 1998.

The Complainant is the owner of the following, amongst others, trademark registrations (Annexes 3-8 to the Complaint):

- European Union Trademark Registration No. 015793524 for VEON, registered on January 2, 2017, in classes 36 and 45; and
- European Union Trademark Registration No. 015918576 for VEON, registered on February 28, 2019, in classes 9 and 38.

The disputed domain name was registered on June 20, 2026, and presently does not resolve to an active webpage.

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 asserts to be a subsidiary of the multinational digital operator that provides services to over 150 million connectivity customers and 205 million Active 3-Month Digital Customers, operating across five countries that are home to more than six percent of the world’s population, having transformed lives through technology-driven services that empower individuals and drive economic growth.

Under the Complainant’s view, the disputed domain name is identical to the Complainant’s well-known VEON trademark and trade name.

Regarding the absence of the Respondent’s rights or legitimate interests, the Complainant argues that:

- i. there is no evidence of the Respondent’s use of, or demonstrable preparations to use, the disputed domain name or a name corresponding to the disputed domain name in connection with a bona fide offering of goods or services;
- ii. the Respondent (as an individual, business, or other organization) is not commonly known by the disputed domain name;
- iii. there is no relationship between the Complainant and the Respondent;
- iv. the Respondent is not making a legitimate noncommercial or fair use of the disputed domain name, without intent for commercial gain misleadingly to divert consumers or to tarnish the trademark or service mark at issue, given that the disputed domain name is being passively held;

v. there is an inherent risk associated with the composition of the disputed domain name which solely consists of the reproduction of the Complainant's well-known trademark with the Top-Level Domain ".shop" which is inherently commercial in nature and is specifically intended for online retail or e-commerce activities; and

vi. extensive public-source searches conducted by reference to the Respondent's disclosed name, email address, telephone number and location did not identify any business, undertaking, trademark right, trade name or other commercial activity associated with the Respondent that could explain a legitimate selection or use of the disputed domain name.

As to the registration and use of the disputed domain name, the Complainant argues that the disputed domain name, incorporating the Complainant's distinctive and invented VEON trademark with the Top-Level Domain ".shop" creates the clear and misleading impression of an official or authorized online sales channel operated by, or affiliated with, the Complainant. Furthermore, the Complainant contends that the disputed domain name is being passively held.

B. Respondent

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

6. Discussion and Findings

Paragraph 4(a) of the Policy sets forth the following three requirements, which have to be met for this Panel to order the transfer of the disputed domain name to the Complainant:

- (i) the disputed domain name is identical or confusingly similar to a trademark or service mark in which the Complainant has rights; and
- (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.

The Complainant must prove in these administrative proceedings that each of the aforementioned three elements is present in order to obtain the transfer of the disputed domain name.

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.

The entirety of the mark is reproduced within the disputed domain name. Accordingly, the disputed domain name is identical to the mark for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.7.

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.

The Respondent, in not responding to the Complaint, has failed to invoke any of the circumstances, which could demonstrate, pursuant to paragraph 4(c) of the Policy, any rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name. This entitles the Panel to draw any inferences from such default, as it considers appropriate, pursuant to paragraph 14(b) of the Rules. Nevertheless, the burden of proof is still on the Complainant to make at least a prima facie case against the Respondent under the second element.

In that sense, and according to the evidence submitted, the Complainant has made a prima facie case against the Respondent who has not been commonly known by the disputed domain name and has not been authorized to register or use the disputed domain name which is identical to the Complainant's reputed trademark and nearly identical – save for the Top-Level Domain – to its official domain name; there also being no relation between the Respondent and the Complainant and its business.

Also, the lack of evidence as to any trademarks registered by the Respondent corresponding to the disputed domain name, corroborates the finding that the Respondent targeted the Complainant when registering the disputed domain name.

Under these circumstances and absent evidence to the contrary, the Panel finds that the Respondent does not have rights or legitimate interests with respect to the disputed domain name. The second element of the Policy has therefore 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.

Paragraph 4(b) of the Policy sets out a list of non-exhaustive circumstances that may indicate that a domain name was registered and used in bad faith, but other circumstances may be relevant in assessing whether a respondent's registration and use of a domain name is in bad faith. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 3.2.1.

Panels have consistently found that the mere registration of a domain name that is identical or confusingly similar to a widely-known trademark by an unaffiliated entity can by itself create a presumption of bad faith. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 3.1.4. Noting that the disputed domain name is identical to the Complainant's VEON mark (and nearly identical to its official domain name), well known in its industry and predating the registration of the disputed domain name by many years, the Panel finds, on balance, that the disputed domain name was registered by the Respondent in bad faith.

Moreover, non-use of a domain name would not by itself prevent a finding of bad faith under the doctrine of passive holding. The Panel notes the reputation of the Complainant's mark, the composition of the disputed domain name, lack of reply by the Respondent to refute the Complainant's claims and/or to invoke any rights or legitimate interests, his use of what appears to be false or incomplete contact information in the registration details of the disputed domain name, 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. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 3.3.

For the reasons above, the Panel finds that the Respondent has registered and is using the disputed domain name in bad faith pursuant to paragraph 4(a)(iii) of the Policy. The third element of the Policy has therefore been met.

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 <veon.shop> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Wilson Pinheiro Jabur/

Wilson Pinheiro Jabur

Sole Panelist

Date: September 18, 2026