ARBITRATION
AND
MEDIATION CENTER

WIPO
WORLD
INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY
ORGANIZATION

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION
Halliburton Energy Services, Inc. v. sekhar zoomnova, novaglobalservices
Case No. D2026-0809

1. The Parties

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

The Respondent is sekhar zoomnova, novaglobalservices, India.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <halliburtonmena.com> is registered with GoDaddy.com, LLC (the "Registrar").

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the "Center") on February 25, 2026. On February 26, 2026, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On February 26, 2026, 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 (Undisclosed) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on March 2, 2026, 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 March 2, 2026.

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 March 4, 2026. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was March 24, 2026. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent's default on March 25, 2026.

The Center appointed Adam Samuel as the sole panelist in this matter on March 31, 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 world-renowned energy company. The Complainant owns a number of United States of America trademarks, including no 2575819 for HALLIBURTON registered on June 4, 2002. The Complainant markets its products and services through a number of domain names, including <halliburton.com>, registered on October 17, 1995.

The disputed domain name was registered on October 8, 2024. It does not currently resolve to an active website. The Complainant asserts that it has been used as part of a phishing scheme.

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 that the disputed domain name consists of the Complainant's well-known, the abbreviation "mena" for Middle Eastern and North African and the generic Top-Level Domain ("gTLD") ".com". The addition of "mena" does not diminish the confusing similarity between the Complainant's trademark and the disputed domain name.

The Respondent has no rights or legitimate interest in the disputed domain name. The Respondent is not connected with the Complainant in any way. The Respondent's name is not that of the disputed domain name. The Respondent has used the disputed domain name to seek to obtain personal details from candidates for employment with the Complainant.

The Respondent knew of the Complainant's business when it registered the disputed domain name. It sought to impersonate the Complainant in offering a position to a candidate within the Middle Eastern region in order to obtain personal details of that individual.

B. Respondent

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

6. Discussion and Findings

To succeed, the Complainant must demonstrate that all of the elements listed in paragraph 4(a) of the Policy have been satisfied:

(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 and is being used in bad faith.

A. Identical or Confusingly Similar

The disputed domain name contains the Complainant's trademark, the acronym "mena" and the gTLD ".com".

The gTLD is irrelevant here as it is a standard registration requirement. See section 1.11.1 of the WIPO Overview of WIPO Panel Views on Select UDRP Questions ("WIPO Overview 3.1").

The insertion of four letters which are actually an acronym for the Middle East North Africa region where the Complainant has a significant presence does not prevent a finding of confusing similarity between the dispute domain name and the Complainant's trademark. See Section 1.8 of the WIPO Overview 3.1

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

B. Rights or Legitimate Interests

The Respondent is not called "Halliburtonmena" or anything similar. There is no evidence that the Complainant has ever authorised the Respondent to use its trademarks, nor that the Respondent has made a bona fide offering or a legitimate noncommercial or fair use of the disputed domain name. For these reasons, the Panel concludes that the Complainant has met this element. See section 2.1 of the WIPO Overview 3.1.

C. Registered and Used in Bad Faith

The Complainant's trademark is world-renowned and has no independent meaning. In February 2026, the Respondent used the disputed domain name to purport to offer a position at one of the Complainant's Middle Eastern offices presumably in order to obtain personal details about the individual. On registering the disputed domain name, the Respondent knew about the Complainant and its business and wished to impersonate the Complainant in order to obtain personal data. See section 3.2.2 of the WIPO Overview 3.1.

All this is evidence of registration and use of the disputed domain name in bad faith. There is no need to deal with the Complainant's other allegations.

For these reasons, the Panel concludes that the Complainant has met this element.

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 <halliburtonmena.com> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Adam Samuel/
Adam Samuel
Sole Panelist
Date: April 7, 2026.