



URS | DETERMINATION

(URS Procedure 9, URS Rules 13)

URS DISPUTE NO. F2BA56A9

Determination DEFAULT

I. PARTIES

Complainant(s): Veolia Environnement (France)

Complainant's authorized representative: IP Twins (France)

Respondent(s): Privacy Protect, LLC (PrivacyProtect.org) (United States)

II. THE DOMAIN NAME(S), REGISTRY OPERATOR AND REGISTRAR

Domain Name: veolia-solution.pro

Registry Operator: Identity Digital

Registrar: HOSTINGER operations, UAB

III. PROCEDURAL HISTORY

Complaint submitted: 2 July 2025

Lock of the domain name(s): 7 July 225

Notice of Complaint: 13 July 2025

Default Date: 27 July 2025

Notice of Default: 28 July 2025

Panel Appointed: 29 July 2025

Default Determination issued: 1 August 2025

IV. EXAMINER

Examiner's Name: Paddy Tam

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 administrative proceeding.

V. RELIEF SOUGHT

The Complainant requests that the 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. Complainant:

The Complainant is Veolia Environnement, based in Paris, France. It is the holding company of the Veolia Group, a 170-year-old organization that reported total revenue of €44.692 billion in 2024. The Veolia Group operates in three core sectors: water, waste, and energy.

The Complainant is the holder of both the VEOLIA word and figurative trademarks. These trademarks are widely recognized and well-known in their respective sectors, including but not limited to the following:

- International trademark VEOLIA number 814678 in classes 1, 6, 9, 11, 17, 19, 32, 35, 36, 37, 39, 40, 41 and 42;
- International trademark VEOLIA number 919580 in classes 9, 11, 16, 35, 36, 37, 38, 39, 40, 41 and 42;
- International semi-figurative trademark logo drop number 878086 in classes 09, 11, 16, 32, 35, 36, 37, 38, 39, 40, 41, 42, 44.

B. Respondent:

The Respondent is Privacy Protect, LLC (PrivacyProtect.org), located in the United States.

The Respondent has failed to submit a formal response within the required period of time.

C. 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.

D. Findings of fact:

The Registration Date of the Disputed Domain Name is 14 April 2025.

Despite the Respondent has defaulted, the Examiner is still required to review the case on the merits of the claim under URS 6.3.

E. Reasoning:

1. The domain name(s) is(are) identical or confusingly similar to a word mark

The Complainant asserts rights in the VEOLIA trademark based on its global portfolio of trademark registrations. By virtue of these registrations, the Complainant has demonstrated ownership and rights in the mark in accordance with URS 1.2.6.1.

The Complainant further contends that the Disputed Domain Name is confusingly similar to its VEOLIA trademark. Specifically, the Disputed Domain Name incorporates the VEOLIA mark in its entirety, with the mere addition of the generic Top-Level Domain (gTLD) ".pro"



and the descriptive term “solution.” The word “solution” clearly alludes to the various services and solutions offered by the Veolia Group, as outlined on its official website. It is well established that the inclusion of a gTLD or generic term does not negate a finding of confusing similarity.

Upon conducting a side-by-side comparison, the Examiner concludes that the Disputed Domain Name is confusingly similar to the Complainant’s trademark. The addition of the generic term “solution” does not sufficiently distinguish the domain name from the VEOLIA mark.

Accordingly, the Examiner finds that the Complainant has satisfied the requirements of URS 1.2.6.1.

2. Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests to the domain name(s)

To satisfy URS 1.2.6.2, the Complainant must first establish a *prima facie* case that the Respondent lacks rights or legitimate interests in the Disputed Domain Name. Once such a case is made, the burden shifts to the Respondent to demonstrate that it does possess rights or legitimate interests.

The Complainant asserts that the Respondent is not affiliated with the Complainant in any way and has not been authorized to use its trademarks or to register any domain name incorporating those marks. Furthermore, the Respondent holds no prior rights or legitimate interests in the Disputed Domain Name or in the VEOLIA word and figurative trademarks. Given the high degree of similarity between the Disputed Domain Name and the well-known VEOLIA trademark, the Respondent cannot reasonably claim to have intended to engage in any legitimate activity under the domain name.

Additionally, the Disputed Domain Name resolves to a website that reproduces the VEOLIA word and figurative trademarks and promotes various investment offerings.

Upon reviewing screenshots of the associated website, the Examiner notes that the VEOLIA logo is prominently displayed, reinforcing the impression of unauthorized use. Based on this evidence, the Examiner finds that the Complainant has established a *prima facie* case that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in the Disputed Domain Names and the Respondent has not rebutted the assertion within the required period of time.

Accordingly, the Examiner concludes that the Complainant has satisfied the requirements of URS 1.2.6.2.

3. The domain name(s) was(were) registered and is(are) being used in bad faith

To satisfy URS 1.2.6.3, the Complainant must demonstrate that both the registration and use of the Disputed Domain Name were carried out in bad faith.

The Complainant asserts that, given the widespread recognition of the VEOLIA trademark, the Respondent either knew or should have known of the Complainant’s rights in the mark at the time of registration. The Disputed Domain Name closely resembles the VEOLIA

trademark and incorporates additional terms that are directly related to the Complainant's business activities. This creates a presumption of confusion, which is likely to divert Internet traffic from the Complainant's official website to the Respondent's site. The active use of the Disputed Domain Name in connection with fraudulent online shops further supports a finding of bad faith.

Upon reviewing the screenshots of the websites associated with the Disputed Domain Name and considering the Respondent's failure to submit a formal response, the Examiner finds it highly probable that the Respondent had actual knowledge of the Complainant's VEOLIA trademark at the time of registration. This constitutes bad faith registration. Moreover, the Respondent's use of the Disputed Domain Name to promote unauthorized investment offerings and display the Complainant's trademarks disrupts the Complainant's business and seeks to exploit its reputation for commercial gain, thereby evidencing bad faith use. See Pierce Protocols Limited vs. Protection of Private Person, Privacy Protection, B170FBFC (MFSD 2022-08-11)

Accordingly, the Examiner concludes that the Complainant has satisfied the requirements of URS 1.2.6.3.

4. Abusive Complaint

The Examiner finds that the Complaint was neither abusive nor contained material falsehoods.

VIII. DETERMINATION

A. Demonstration of URS elements

Demonstrated

B. Complaint and remedy

Complaint: Accepts

Domain Name: veolia-solution.pro

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: Paddy

Surname: Tam

Date: 1 August 2025