ARBITRATION
AND
MEDIATION CENTER

WIPO
WORLD
INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY
ORGANIZATION

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION
VEON Amsterdam B.V. v. Name Redacted
Case No. D2026-4241

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 Name Redacted[1].

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <veon-jobs.com> is registered with Hostinger Operations, UAB (the "Registrar").

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the "Center") on September 21, 2026. On September 22, 2026, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On September 23, 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) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on September 23, 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 September 23, 2026.

[1] The underlying registrant of the disputed domain name appears to have used the name and contact details of a third party when registering the disputed domain name. In light of the potential identity theft, the Panel has redacted the name of this registrant from this Decision. However, the Panel has attached as Annex 1 to this Decision an instruction to the concerned 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 concerned Registrar as part of the order in these proceedings, and has indicated that Annex 1 to this Decision shall not be published due to the exceptional circumstances of this case.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.

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 September 30, 2026. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was October 20, 2026. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent's default on October 21, 2026.

The Center appointed Francine Tan as the sole panelist in this matter on October 26, 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, a Dutch company, is a subsidiary and the intellectual property holding company of the VEON Ltd group of companies ("Veon"). Veon is a multinational digital operator that provides services to over 150 million connectivity customers and 205 million "Active 3-Month Digital Customers". Veon is publicly traded on the U.S.-based NASDAQ stock exchange. Markets Veon operates in are, amongst others, Pakistan, Ukraine, Bangladesh, Uzbekistan and Kazakhstan. Its website is located at "www.veon.com".

The Complainant holds numerous trademark registrations for VEON in the European Union ("EU") and in the markets it operates. These registrations include:

- EU Trade Mark Registration No. 015793524, registered on January 2, 2017;
- EU Trade Mark Registration No. 015918576, registered on February 28, 2019;
- Pakistan Trademark Registration No. 438187, registered on November 23, 2016; and
- Uzbekistan Trademark Registration No. 35307, dated February 25, 2019.

The Complainant owns and operates, among others, the following domain names incorporating its VEON trademark:

- <veon.com> registered April 24, 1998;
- <veondigital.co.uk> registered September 14, 2016; and
- <veonglobal.us> registered September 14, 2016.

The disputed domain name was registered on August 24, 2026.

At the time of filing the Complaint, the disputed domain name did not resolve to an active website but redirected to a Hostinger parking page stating that the disputed domain name can be managed via a Hostinger account. The website subsequently appeared to have been taken offline or no longer configured to resolve.

On September 21, 2026, the Complainant sent a cease-and-desist letter to the abuse contact address of the Registrar and to the only email address then known to be associated with the Respondent, reporting the abusive use of the disputed domain name and requesting immediate remedial action.

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 that:

1. The disputed domain name is confusingly similar to a trade mark or service mark in which the Complainant has rights. The disputed domain name incorporates in its entirety the Complainant's VEON trade mark. The addition of the descriptive term "jobs", a hyphen, and the generic Top-Level Domain ".com" does not prevent a finding of confusing similarity. In fact, the term "jobs" reinforces the impression that the disputed domain name is associated with the Complainant's official recruitment platform. This is reinforced by the fact that the disputed domain name appears to have been used for recruitment-related communications falsely purporting to originate from the Complainant.

2. The Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the disputed domain name. The Complainant has not licensed or authorized the Respondent to use the VEON trade mark, whether as a domain name, email address, trade name or otherwise. The Complainant has no relationship with the Respondent that could confer rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name. The disputed domain name was registered on August 24, 2026, long after the Complainant had acquired its trademark rights and established a substantial international reputation. The disputed domain name incorporates the VEON mark in full with the addition of "-jobs", thereby falsely suggesting an official recruitment platform operated by or affiliated with the Complainant. There is no evidence of active use of the disputed domain name or of demonstrable preparations for legitimate use. Although the disputed domain name does not resolve to an active website, the Complainant alleges that it has been used to send deceptive recruitment-related emails.

3. The disputed domain name was registered and is being used in bad faith. The Complainant uses <veon.com> as its principal corporate domain for its website, corporate communications and email services. It also operates other VEON-formative domain names through its affiliates. The Complaint was filed following reports received from members of the public concerning purported job offers sent from an email address using the disputed domain name and the name of a genuine human resources representative employed by Veon Uzbekistan ("the impersonation email"). The impersonation email displayed the VEON trade mark. According to the Complainant, a job applicant was purportedly offered employment after a brief Microsoft Teams text exchange, without a telephone or video interview, and was told that a cheque would be sent for deposit into the applicant's personal account to purchase work equipment. The Complainant states that its investigations indicated that the disputed domain name is being used to facilitate fraudulent recruitment activities through impersonation emails.

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 for the purposes of the Policy. WIPO Overview 3.1, section 1.2.1.

The entirety of the VEON trade mark is reproduced and recognizable within the disputed domain name. The additional term "-jobs" does not prevent a finding of the confusing similarity with the Complainant's VEON trade mark. Accordingly, the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to the Complainant's VEON mark for the purposes of the Policy. WIPO Overview 3.1, sections 1.7 and 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 name. The Complainant has not authorized the Respondent to use its VEON trade mark, and there is no indication that the Respondent is commonly known by the disputed domain name, or that the disputed domain name has been used in connection with a bona fide offering of goods or services. 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 activity, here, claimed as applicable to this case, phishing/identity theft or other types of fraud, can never confer rights or legitimate interests on a respondent. WIPO Overview 3.1, section 2.13.1. The evidence submitted with the Complaint indicates that the disputed domain name was used to send impersonation emails falsely purporting to originate from a genuine employee of Veon. Such use cannot constitute a bona fide offering of goods or services or a legitimate noncommercial or fair use. The lack of an active website does not alter this conclusion, as the disputed domain name may be used for email even without hosting an active website.

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.

The Complainant's VEON trade mark predates the registration of the disputed domain name by several years. The disputed domain name reproduces the mark in its entirety and adds the term "jobs", which suggests an employment or recruitment connection with the Complainant. In light of this and the evidence of the Respondent's use of the disputed domain name to send impersonation emails, the Panel is persuaded that the Respondent was aware of the Complainant and deliberately targeted its trade mark when registering

the disputed domain name. The Respondent's conduct demonstrates a deliberate attempt to mislead recipients into believing that the communications originated from, or were authorized by, the Complainant.

Panels have held that the use of a domain name for illegitimate activity, in this case, phishing/identity theft or other types of fraud, constitutes bad faith. WIPO Overview 3.1, section 3.4. The Respondent intentionally attempted to mislead Internet users, falsely representing itself as being affiliated with, or authorized by, or acting on behalf of the Complainant in sending fraudulent recruitment-related emails. Although the disputed domain name did not resolve to an active website, its use in email communications is sufficient to establish use for the purposes of the Policy. Having reviewed the record, the Panel finds the Respondent's registration and use of the disputed domain name constitutes bad faith under the Policy.

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 <veon-jobs.com> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Francine Tan/
Francine Tan
Sole Panelist
Date: November 9, 2026