

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

Halliburton Energy Services, Inc. v. jacobs boris
Case No. D2025-0698

1. The Parties

The Complainant is Halliburton Energy Services, Inc., United States of America ("United States" or "U.S."), represented by Polsinelli PC, United States. .

The Respondent is jacobs boris, Nigeria.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <haliborton.com> is registered with Web Commerce Communications Limited dba WebNic.cc (the "Registrar").

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the "Center") on February 20, 2025. On February 21, 2025, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On February 22, 2025, 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 (Domain Admin, Whoisprotection.cc) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on February 24, 2025, 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 amendment to the Complaint on February 24, 2025.

The Center verified that the Complaint together with the amendment to the 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 February 27, 2025. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was March 19, 2025. The Response was filed with the Center on February 27, 2024.

The Center appointed Tobias Zuberbühler as the sole panelist in this matter on March 28, 2025. 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 was founded in 1919 and is one of the largest providers of products and services to the energy industry.

The Complainant owns trademark registrations in various jurisdictions, including the U.S. trademark HALLIBURTON (Reg. No. 2,575,819, registered on June 4, 2002).

The disputed domain name was registered on December 12, 2024, and resolves to a parked page indicating “We’re coming soon Landing Page by Olittsite Builder...”

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.

B. Respondent

In an email communication to the Center of February 27, 2025, the Respondent made inter alia the following statements:

“1. My Legitimate Interest in the Domain

I purchased haliborton.com on December 13, 2024, for my new business.

The name ‘Haliborton’ was selected because I liked it and intended to develop a business around it.

I have not yet uploaded a website, but I have designed a logo and have plans for the domain.

At the time of registration, I had no knowledge of the Complainant’s business or trademarks, and I had no ill intention in acquiring the domain.

2. Willingness to Settle

I understand the Complainant has concerns regarding this domain. While I believe I have a legitimate right to own and use it, I am open to discussing a settlement, including a possible transfer of the domain under reasonable terms.”

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 trademark and the disputed domain name. See 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.

A domain name is "identical or confusingly similar" to a trademark for the purposes of the Policy when the domain name includes the trademark, or a confusingly similar approximation, regardless of other terms in the domain name (*Wal-Mart Stores, Inc. v. Richard MacLeod d/b/a For Sale*, WIPO Case No. [D2000-0662](#)). This includes the removal of the letter "l" and the change of the letter "u" to "o" in the Complainant's HALLIBURTON trademark, which is considered a common, obvious, or intentional misspelling of a trademark (i.e., "typosquatting"). See [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 1.9.

The Panel finds that 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 that 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 in substance and has not come forward with any evidence demonstrating rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name such as those enumerated in the Policy or otherwise. The Panel also notes that the composition of the disputed domain name reflects the Respondent's ultimate intent to confuse unsuspecting Internet users into believing that the disputed domain name is operated by the Complainant.

The Panel finds that 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.

Under the circumstances of this case, it can be inferred that the Respondent was aware of the Complainant's trademark when registering the disputed domain name.

The evidence and allegations submitted by the Complainant support a finding that the present passive holding of the disputed domain name does not prevent a finding of bad faith. The Panel notes, that the Respondent has not provided any reasonable explanation, let alone evidence, of any contemplated good faith use of the disputed domain name which, moreover, consists of an inherently misleading typographical variation of the Complainant's trademark.

The Panel finds, on the balance of probabilities, 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 <haliborton.com> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Tobias Zuberbühler/

Tobias Zuberbühler

Sole Panelist

Date: April 2, 2025