ARBITRATION
AND
MEDIATION CENTER

WIPO
WORLD
INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY
ORGANIZATION

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION
VEON Amsterdam B.V. v. Seyed Hani Ahmadi
Case No. DIR2026-0007

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 Seyed Hani Ahmadi, Iran (Islamic Republic of).

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <veon.ir> is registered with IRNIC.

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the "Center") on September 3, 2026. On September 3, 2026, the Center transmitted by email to IRNIC a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On September 5, 2026, IRNIC 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 (unknown) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on September 7, 2026, providing the registrant and contact information disclosed by IRNIC, and inviting the Complainant to submit an amendment to the Complaint. The Complainant filed an amended Complaint on September 8, 2026. Hard copies of the Complaint were received by the Center on September 8, 2026.

The Center verified that the Complaint and the amended Complaint satisfied the formal requirements of the .ir Domain Name Dispute Resolution Policy (the "Policy" or "irDRP"), the Rules for .ir Domain Name Dispute Resolution Policy (the "Rules"), and the WIPO Supplemental Rules for .ir Domain Name Dispute Resolution Policy (the "Supplemental Rules").

In accordance with the Rules, paragraphs 2(a) and 4(a), the Center formally notified the Respondent of the Complaint, and the proceedings commenced on September 17, 2026. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5(a), the due date for Response was October 7, 2026. On October 12, 2026, the Center notified the Respondent's default.

The Center appointed Andrea Mondini as the sole panelist in this matter on October 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 a Dutch company publicly listed on the NASDAQ stock exchange offering digital operator services in at least five countries with over 150 million connectivity customers and 205 million active three-month digital customers.

The Complainant owns numerous trademark registrations in several jurisdictions, including:

TRADEMARK	JURISDICTION	REGISTRATION NUMBER	REGISTRATION DATE	INTERNATIONAL CLASSES
VEON	European Union	015793524	January 2, 2017	45
VEON	Pakistan	438187	November 23, 2016	9

The Complainant holds numerous domain name registrations including the VEON trademark, notably the domain name <veon.com> which hosts its homepage.

The Respondent did not file a Response. Therefore, not much is known about the Respondent.

According to the information provided by IRNIC, the disputed domain name was registered on June 21, 2017. According to the evidence submitted with the Complaint, the disputed domain name redirects to a third-party website where the disputed domain name is offered for sale.

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 as follows:

The trademark VEON has been extensively used to identify the Complainant and its services. The disputed domain name is identical or confusingly similar to the VEON trademark in which the Complainant has rights, because it incorporates this trademark in its entirety.

The Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the disputed domain name. The Respondent has not been authorized by the Complainant to use this trademark, is not commonly known by the disputed domain name, and there is no evidence of the Respondent's use, or demonstrable preparation to use, the disputed domain name in connection with a bona fide offering of goods and services.

The disputed domain name was registered in bad faith because it is obvious that the Respondent had knowledge of both the Complainant and its well-known trademark VEON at the time it registered the disputed domain name.

The fact that the disputed domain name is not being used by the Respondent but is being offered for sale, is indicative of bad faith.

The Complainant sent a cease-and-desist letter to the Registrar on September 3, 2026, reporting the abuse in relation to the disputed domain name and asking the Registrar to pass on the letter to the Respondent.

B. Respondent

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

6. Discussion and Findings

According to paragraph 4(a) of the Policy, in order to succeed, a complainant must establish each of the following elements:

(i) the disputed domain name is 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 in respect of the disputed domain name; and
(iii) the disputed domain name has been registered or 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. [1]

The Complainant has shown rights in respect of the trademark VEON for the purposes of the Policy. WIPO Overview 3.1, section 1.2.1.

The Panel finds 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 addition of the country code Top-Level Domain ("ccTLD") ".ir" in the disputed domain name is a standard registration requirement and as such may be disregarded under the confusing similarity test under the Policy, paragraph 4(a)(i). WIPO Overview 3.1, section 1.11.1.

The Panel finds the first element of the Policy has been established.

---

[1] Given the similarities between the irDRP and the Uniform Domain Name Resolution Policy ("UDRP"), the Panel finds it appropriate to refer to UDRP jurisprudence, including reference to the WIPO Overview 3.1.

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 for a complainant to prove 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.

Furthermore, noting the disputed domain name is almost identical to the Complainant's trademark and domain name <veon.com>, the composition of the disputed domain name itself may suggest a connection or implied affiliation between the Complainant and the Respondent which in fact does not exist. WIPO Overview 3.1, section 2.5.1.

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

C. Registered or 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 or use of a domain name in bad faith. WIPO Overview 3.1, section 3.2.1.

The Complainant has credibly shown that it is a NASDAQ-listed company offering digital operator services in at least five countries with over 150 million connectivity customers. Under these circumstances, the Panel finds that this trademark is well known. Moreover, VEON is a coined term with no apparent dictionary meaning. Against this background, and noting that the Complainant's trademark registration predates the registration of the disputed domain name, and in the absence of any response, the Panel considers it unlikely that the Respondent selected the disputed domain name, which incorporates the VEON mark, without knowledge of the Complainant and its trademark. Therefore, the Panel finds it more likely than not that the Respondent registered the disputed domain name with knowledge of the Complainant's trademark.

Panels have consistently found that the mere registration of a domain name that is identical or confusingly similar (particularly domain names comprising typos or incorporating the mark plus a descriptive term) to a well-known trademark, and particularly in the case of coined or fanciful marks, can by itself create a presumption of bad faith. WIPO Overview 3.1, section 3.1.4. In the circumstances of this case, the composition of the disputed domain name, together with the reputation and distinctive nature of the VEON trademark, supports a finding of registration in bad faith.

The fact that the disputed domain name is used for redirecting to a third party website where it is offered for sale supports an inference that the Respondent registered the disputed domain name with a view to selling it for commercial gain. The Panel finds, on balance, that this is evidence of registration and use in bad faith.

Based on the available record, the Panel finds that the Complainant has established the third element of the Policy with regard to the disputed domain name.

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.ir> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Andrea Mondini /
Andrea Mondini
Sole Panelist
Date: October 28, 2026