



**URS | DETERMINATION**  
(URS Procedure 9, URS Rules 13)

**URS DISPUTE NO. A812539C**

Determination DEFAULT

**I. PARTIES**

Complainant: Veolia Environnement (France)  
Complainant's authorized representative: IP Twins (France)

Respondent: Bunyamin Korkmaz (Türkiye)

(collectively referred to as 'the Parties')

**II. THE DOMAIN NAME, REGISTRY OPERATOR AND REGISTRAR**

Domain Name: veolia.company ('the disputed domain name')  
Registry Operator: Identity Digital  
Registrar: GoDaddy.com, LLC

**III. PROCEDURAL HISTORY**

Complaint submitted: 2 July 2025  
Lock of the disputed domain name: 14 July 2025  
Notice of Complaint: 17 July 2025  
Default Date: 31 July 2025  
Notice of Default: 3 August 2025  
Panel Appointed: 5 August 2025  
Default Determination issued: 5 August 2025

**IV. EXAMINER**

Examiner's Name: Gustavo Moser

The Examiner certifies that he has acted independently and impartially and to the best of his knowledge has no known conflict in serving as the Examiner in this URS administrative proceeding.

**V. RELIEF SOUGHT**

The Complainant requests that the disputed domain name be suspended for the balance of the registration period.

The Respondent has not submitted a Response.

## **VI. STANDARD OF REVIEW**

Clear and convincing evidence.

## **VII. DISCUSSIONS AND FINDINGS**

### **A. Disputed domain name**

The disputed domain name was registered on 12 September 2024 and currently resolves to a parking page provided by GoDaddy (for present purposes, ‘the Respondent’s website’).

### **B. Complainant**

#### **B.1 Trade mark standing**

For the purposes of this URS administrative proceeding, the Complainant relies on the following registered word trade marks:

- International trade mark registration no. 814678, registered on 11 September 2003, for the word mark VEOLIA, in classes 1, 6, 9, 11, 17, 19, 32, 35, 36, 37, 39, 40, 41, and 42 of the Nice Classification; and
- International trade mark registration no. 919580, registered on 10 March 2006, for the word mark VEOLIA, in classes 9, 11, 16, 35, 36, 37, 38, 39, 40, 41, and 42 of the Nice Classification

(Collectively referred to as ‘the Complainant’s trade mark’ or ‘the trade mark VEOLIA’).

#### **B.2 Complainant’s Factual Allegations**

The Complainant is the holding company of Veolia group, a 170-year-old entity that generated total revenue of EUR 44.692 million in 2024. The Veolia group operates three core businesses: water, waste, and energy.

The Complainant seeks the suspension of the disputed domain name on the grounds set out in section B.3 below.

#### **B.3 URS grounds**

##### **i. The disputed domain name is identical or confusingly similar to a word mark**

The Complainant submits that the disputed domain name is at least confusingly similar to the trade mark VEOLIA. The mere addition of the generic Top-Level Domain (‘the TLD’) <.company> is insufficient to avoid a finding of confusing similarity.



**ii. Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect to the disputed domain name**

The Complainant argues a *prima facie* case the Respondent lacks rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name. The Respondent is not recognised by the disputed domain name and has no affiliation with or authority from the Complainant.

**iii. The disputed domain name was registered and is being used in bad faith**

The Complainant asserts that the Respondent registered the disputed domain name with knowledge of the Complainant's rights and likely intention to sell it to the Complainant, evidencing bad faith. The likelihood of confusion is presumed, potentially resulting in the diversion of Internet traffic to the Respondent's website.

**C. Respondent:**

The Respondent has defaulted in this URS administrative proceeding, failing to advance any substantive defence.

**D. Procedural findings:**

Having reviewed the communications records, the Examiner finds that MFSD has discharged its responsibility under the URS Procedure paragraphs 3 and 4 and URS Rules paragraph 4.

In accordance with URS Rules Paragraph 9(d), in absence of a Response, the language of the Determination shall be English.

**E. Findings of fact:**

The disputed domain name <veolia.company> was registered on 12 September 2024, and currently resolves to a parking page provided by GoDaddy.

The Complainant has, to the satisfaction of the Examiner, adduced proof of trade mark rights in the term 'veolia'.

**F. Reasoning:**

Pursuant to paragraph 13 of the URS Rules, the Examiner shall make a Determination of a Complaint in accordance with the URS Procedure, the URS Rules and any rule and principles of law that the Examiner deems applicable.

Paragraph 1.2.6 of the URS Procedure sets out the grounds which the Complainant must establish to succeed:

1. The disputed domain name is identical or confusingly similar to a word mark;
2. The Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name; and
3. The disputed domain name was registered and is being used in bad faith.

It is incumbent on the Complainant the onus of meeting the above threshold. The evidentiary standard under the URS procedure is clear and convincing, providing the basis for examiners to determine each of the three URS Procedure grounds.

### **1. The disputed domain name is identical or confusingly similar to a word mark**

The Examiner is satisfied that the Complainant holds URS-relevant rights in the registered trade mark VEOLIA as of 2003.

The disputed domain name <veolia.company> contains the Complainant's trade mark VEOLIA in its entirety. The TLD suffix, while generally disregarded in assessing confusing similarity as part of the anatomy of a domain name, may heighten the risk of confusion given its descriptive nature.

Accordingly, the Examiner finds that the Complainant has succeeded under paragraph 1.2.6.1 of the URS Procedure.

### **2. Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name**

The evidence presented indicates that the Respondent is not commonly known by the disputed domain name. Furthermore, the Examiner notes the Respondent's absence of any affiliation with, or authorisation from, the Complainant concerning the trade mark VEOLIA.

For the foregoing reasons, the Examiner finds that the Complainant has made a *prima facie* showing of the Respondent's lack of rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name under paragraph 1.2.6.2 of the URS Procedure.

### **3. The disputed domain name was registered and is being used in bad faith**

The Examiner has no hesitation in finding that the Respondent registered and has used the disputed domain name with full knowledge of, and intention to target, the Complainant. The factual matrix of the case supports a presumption of bad faith registration and use: (i) the reputation of the Complainant and the Complainant's trade mark; (ii) the evident similarity between the disputed domain name and the Complainant's trade mark, as well as the Respondent's attempt to create such unwarranted link; (iii) the Respondent's default in this URS administrative proceeding and failure to refute the Complainant's *prima facie* case; (iv) the Respondent's attempt to gain reputational advantage by redirecting Internet users for a likely improper purpose; and (v) the absence of any conceivable good faith use of the disputed domain name.

In view of the above, the Examiner finds that the Complainant has met the requirement under paragraph 1.2.6.3 of the URS Procedure.



#### **4. Abusive Complaint**

For the avoidance of doubt, the Examiner finds that the Complaint was not brought by the Complainant abusively nor does the Complaint contain any deliberate material falsehoods.

### **VIII. DETERMINATION**

#### **A. Demonstration of URS elements**

Demonstrated

#### **B. Complaint and remedy**

Complaint: Accepts

Domain Name: veolia.company

Suspends for the balance of the registration period

#### **C. Abuse of proceedings**

Finding of abuse of proceedings: Not finds

#### **D. Publication**

Publication: Publish the Determination

### **SIGNATURE**

Name: Gustavo

Surname: Moser

Date: 5 August 2025