

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

Accenture Global Services Limited v. Transure Enterprise Ltd
Case No. D2024-0848

1. The Parties

The Complainant is Accenture Global Services Limited, Ireland, represented by McDermott Will & Emery LLP, United States of America (“United States”).

The Respondent is Transure Enterprise Ltd, United States.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <accnture.com> is registered with Above.com, Inc. (the “Registrar”).

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the “Center”) on February 27, 2024. On February 27, 2024, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On March 5, 2024, 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 (above_privacy) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on March 5, 2024 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 March 10, 2024.

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 March 11, 2024. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was March 31, 2024. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent’s default on April 2, 2024.

The Center appointed Wilson Pinheiro Jabur as the sole panelist in this matter on April 15, 2024. 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 management consulting firm with offices in 49 countries.

In addition to the <accenture.com> domain name which was registered on August 29, 2000, and is used to host the Complainant's official website, the Complainant is the owner, amongst others, of the following trademark registrations (Annex D to the Amended Complaint):

- United States Trademark Registration No. 2,665,373 for the word and device mark ACCENTURE, registered on December 24, 2002, successively renewed, in classes 35, 36, 41 and 42;
- United States Trademark Registration No. 3,091,811 for the word mark ACCENTURE, registered on May 16, 2006, successively renewed, in classes 9, 16, 35, 36, 37, 41 and 42; and
- United States Trademark Registration No. 7,266,256 for the word mark ACCENTURE, registered on January 9, 2024, in classes 9, 35, 36, 37, 41 and 42.

The disputed domain name was registered on August 25, 2016, and presently resolves to a parked webpage displaying pay-per-click ("PPC") advertisements related to the Complainant or its activities.

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 have started using its ACCENTURE trademark on January 2001 in connection with management consulting, technology services, and outsourcing services, currently operating in more than 200 cities in 49 countries, and holding trademark rights in more than 140 countries.

The Complainant further asserts to have extensively used and promoted its ACCENTURE trademark which has become distinctive and globally famous, enjoying notoriety and having acquired substantial goodwill, as can be illustrated by its rankings in Interbrand's *Best Global Brands Report* since 2002, Kantar Millward Brown's *BrandZ – Top 100 Brand Rankings* since 2006, and Fortune Global 500's *The World's Most Valuable Brands*.

In addition, the Complainant claims to support numerous social projects worldwide as well as to sponsor sports events such as the World Golf Championships and cultural activities such as a collaboration with the Louvre Museum to develop new technological programs to spread culture and reach new segments of the public.

According to the Complainant, the disputed domain name characterizes a mistyping of the Complainant's well-known ACCENTURE trademark, with the suppression of the first letter "e", which does not preclude a finding of confusing similarity thereof.

As to the Respondent's absence of rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name, the Complainant argues that:

- i. the Complainant's trademark is not a generic or descriptive term in which the Respondent might have an interest;
- ii. the Respondent is neither affiliated with, nor has it been licensed or permitted to use the Complainant's trademark or any domain name relating to it;
- iii. the Respondent is not commonly known by the disputed domain name, nor was it known as such prior to the registration date of the disputed domain name; and
- iv. the Respondent is not using the disputed domain name for any valid purpose, rather using it in connection with a sponsored website displaying pay-per-click links, what does not characterize a bona fide use of the disputed domain name.

In what it relates to the bad faith registration of the disputed domain name, the Complainant asserts that the Respondent had notice of the ACCENTURE trademark, duly registered and well-known in many jurisdictions worldwide, being it unlikely that the Respondent was not aware of it when registering the disputed domain name. Furthermore, the Respondent's use of the disputed domain name to redirect Internet users to commercial websites through various sponsored click-through links constitutes bad faith and indicates that the Respondent registered and is using the disputed domain name with the intent to attract Internet users to its website for commercial gain by creating a likelihood of confusion with the Complainant's ACCENTURE mark as to the source, sponsorship, affiliation or endorsement of the Respondent's website.

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:

- (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 this administrative proceeding that each of the aforementioned three elements is present so as to have the disputed domain name transferred, according to the Policy.

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 Selected UDRP Questions, Third Edition, ("[WIPO Overview 3.0](#)"), section 1.7.

The Complainant has shown rights in respect of a trademark or service mark for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 1.2.1.

The Panel finds the mark 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 3.0](#), sections 1.7 and 1.9.

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 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 3.0](#), 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.

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.

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 3.0](#), section 3.2.1.

In the present case the following factors indicate the Respondent’s bad faith registration and use of the disputed domain name:

- a. the reputation and distinctiveness of the Complainant and its ACCENTURE trademark;
- b. the absence of a reply by the Respondent;
- c. the implausibility of any good faith use to which the disputed domain name may be put;
- d. the Respondent’s choice to retain a privacy protection service to conceal its true identity;
- e. the use of the disputed domain name in connection with a webpage displaying PPC links related to the Complainant and its activities; and
- f. the indication of what appears to be false or incomplete contact details, not having the Center been able to deliver the Written Notice to the address indicated in the WhoIs.

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 <accenture.com> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Wilson Pinheiro Jabur/

Wilson Pinheiro Jabur

Sole Panelist

Date: April 19, 2024