

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

7-Eleven, Inc., 7-Eleven International LLC v. Smollett Osae, Online media Ghana LLC

Case No. D2026-1246

1. The Parties

The Complainants are 7-Eleven, Inc. (the “First Complainant”) and 7-Eleven International LLC (the “Second Complainant”), United States of America (“United States”), represented by D.M. Kisch Inc., South Africa.

The Respondent is Smollett Osae, Online media Ghana LLC, Ghana, represented by SN Anku & Associates, Ghana.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <7elevenenergy.com> is registered with Name.com, Inc. (the “Registrar”).

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the “Center”) on March 23, 2026. On March 24, 2026, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On March 25, 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 (Private Registration / Unknown) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on March 26, 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 amended Complaint on April 1, 2026.

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 April 2, 2026. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was April 22, 2026. The Response was filed with the Center on April 17, 2026. The Respondent sent email communications to the Center on May 4, 2026, May 13, 2026, and July 1, 2026.

The Center appointed David H. Bernstein, John Swinson, and Assen Alexiev as panelists in this matter on July 10, 2026. The Panel finds that it was properly constituted. Each member of 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 First Complainant was founded in 1927 and operates the 7-ELEVEN retail convenience store chain which includes more than 83,000 stores in 20 countries worldwide. The Complainants' corporate website is located at the domain name <7-eleven.com>. The logo of the 7-ELEVEN store chain is:



The Second Complainant was founded in 2021 and is an affiliate of the First Complainant.

The First Complainant is the registered owner of a number of trademark registrations for 7-ELEVEN (the “7-ELEVEN trademark”), including the following representative registrations:

- the United States trademark 7-ELEVEN (word) with registration No. 0896654, registered on August 11, 1970 for services in International Class 42; and
- the United States trademark 7-ELEVEN (word) with registration No. 2914788, registered December 28, 2004 for goods in International Class 4.

The Second Complainant is the owner of a number of 7-ELEVEN word trademarks registered in Ghana, including the trademarks with registration Nos. 56246, 56548, 56302, 56303 and 56304, registered on May 16, 2022 for goods or services in International Classes 29, 30, 32, 35 or 43, respectively.

The disputed domain name was registered on April 11, 2015. It resolves to a website that promotes the services provided by the company 7 Eleven Energy Services Limited (“7 Eleven Energy Services”) and describes it as “an upstream Oil & Gas Service Logistics Company that proficiently provides offshore, onshore and near shore logistics services to E&P, drilling contractors and production companies in Ghana”. The website indicates the contact details of 7 Eleven Energy Services in Ghana and displays the logo



5. Parties' Contentions

A. Complainants

The Complainants state that the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to their 7-ELEVEN trademark, because it reproduces the trademark in its entirety in combination with the dictionary word “energy”. The Complainants maintain that the addition of this word to the 7-ELEVEN trademark does not avoid a finding of confusing similarity with the trademark, and that any Internet user visiting the website at the disputed domain name would reasonably expect it to be commercially linked to the owner of the 7-ELEVEN trademark.

The Complainants submit that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the disputed domain name because it is not their authorised reseller, agent or licensee. According to the Complainants, the Respondent's behaviour shows an intent to obtain an unfair commercial gain by misleadingly diverting consumers, because it prominently and without authorisation presents their 7-ELEVEN trademark at the top

and bottom of its website and within the Uniform Resource Locator of the website, where relevant consumers would expect to find the name of the online shop or website provider. The Complainants maintain that the website at the disputed domain name includes no information regarding the identity of the provider of the website.

The Complainants contend that the disputed domain name was registered and is being used in bad faith. They maintain that “7-ELEVEN” is an imaginative term that is unique to them and is not commonly used to refer to services including oil and gas logistics. In the Complainants’ view, the Respondent chose the disputed domain name with knowledge of the Complainants’ services, such as offering gasoline and with an intent to invoke a misleading impression in the general public that there is a connection or business relationship between the parties.

The Complainants note that the Respondent did not stop using the disputed domain name even after they made it aware of their trademark rights with their demand letter dated November 19, 2025.

B. Respondent

According to the Respondent, the disputed domain name is not confusingly similar to the Complainants’ 7-ELEVEN trademark. The Respondent submits that the expression “7eleven”, in its various forms, is not exclusively associated with the Complainants in Ghana and that numerous unrelated entities operating in diverse sectors in Ghana have adopted “7eleven” or variations of it as part of their business names. According to the Respondent, the elements of the Complainants’ 7-ELEVEN trademark, namely the number “7” and the word “eleven”, are ordinary elements that are widely used and not exclusively attributable to the Complainants, and may be adopted by different parties for a variety of legitimate reasons.

The Respondent states that, in April 2015, 7 Eleven Energy Services, a company duly incorporated in Ghana in January 2015 and operating in the field of upstream oil and gas logistics services, contracted the Respondent’s services through a Domain and Website Design Service Agreement. Pursuant to this agreement, the Respondent registered the disputed domain name on behalf of 7 Eleven Energy Services in April 2015. The Respondent explains that the disputed domain name was independently conceived in connection with the personal and sentimental significance to the owner of 7 Eleven Energy Services of the date November 7, which is both his own and his wife’s birthdate.

The Respondent denies that the disputed domain name was registered or used targeting the Complainants and points out that, at the time of registration of the disputed domain name, the Second Complainant had not been established and the First Complainant had no registered trademarks in Ghana. The Respondent denies that the Complainants’ 7-ELEVEN trademark is well-known in Ghana and notes that the Complainants do not operate any stores there. According to the Respondent, this negates any inference of bad faith, as it is inconceivable that the Respondent would have targeted rights that did not then exist within the relevant jurisdiction.

The Respondent maintains that following its registration, 7 Eleven Energy Services has continuously been in control of the disputed domain name and has used it in connection with its bona fide commercial activities. It maintains that 7 Eleven Energy Services is not, and has never held itself out to be, a reseller or distributor of the Complainants’ goods, and has always provided upstream oil and gas logistics services, which are not related to the Complainants’ services.

The Respondent submits that the Complainants have not adduced any evidence that the Respondent was aware of, or sought to target, the Complainants at the time of registration of the disputed domain name. It denies the Complainants’ assertion that the logo displayed on the website at the disputed domain name is the Complainants’ trademark, and submits that this is the company logo of 7 Eleven Energy Services. The Respondent adds that the website of 7 Eleven Energy Services at the disputed domain name is substantially different from the Complainants’ website at the domain name <7-eleven.com>, and that the two websites relate to different lines of business, with 7 Eleven Energy providing oil and gas logistics services, while the Complainants carry out retail convenience store operations.

The Respondent submits that the Complaint constitutes an attempt at Reverse Domain Name Hijacking (RDNH), and notes that the Complainants knew or ought to have known that they could not succeed under the Policy, given that the disputed domain name was registered several years prior to the Second Complainant's trademarks in Ghana, that there is no evidence that the Respondent had knowledge of or targeted the Complainants, and that the Respondent has demonstrable rights and legitimate interests in the disputed domain name.

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. WIPO Overview of WIPO Panel Views on Select UDRP Questions ("[WIPO Overview 3.1](#)"), section 1.7.

The Complainants have shown rights in respect of the 7-ELEVEN trademark for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.2.1.

The Panel finds the 7-ELEVEN trademark is recognisable within the disputed domain name. Accordingly, the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to the 7-ELEVEN trademark for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.7.

Although the addition of other terms (here, "energy") may bear on assessment of the second and third elements, the Panel finds that the addition of such term does not prevent a finding of confusing similarity between the disputed domain name and the 7-ELEVEN trademark for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.8.

The Respondent's lengthy argument that the disputed domain name is not confusingly similar to a trademark in which the Complainant has rights reflects a fundamental misunderstanding of the UDRP. The Respondent's argument that the Complainant lacked relevant trademark rights in Ghana at the time that the disputed domain name was registered and has failed to establish common law trademark rights is irrelevant; the Complainants clearly have registered trademark rights somewhere, and that is all that is required under the first element of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.1.3. The Respondent's argument that the disputed domain name is not confusingly similar to the Complainants' trademark because the mark is not recognizable within the domain name given the addition of the word "energy" and because the Respondent uses the mark 7 ELEVEN ENERGY in design form is frivolous. Equally without merit are the Respondent's arguments that the disputed domain name is aurally and conceptually distinct from the Complainants' trademark and that the Complainants have failed to show any evidence of actual confusion. *See generally* [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), sections 1.7, 1.8, 1.10.

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.

The Respondent has provided evidence that 7 Eleven Energy Services was duly registered as a commercial entity in Ghana in January 2015 and that the birthdate of the owner of this company and of his spouse is November 7 (which can be represented as 7/11 or 7-11 in many countries). This supports the Respondent's explanation that the disputed domain name was chosen by the owner of 7 Eleven Energy Services because it reflected this mutual birthdate. It is evident that the same birthdate is also reflected in the trade name of 7 Eleven Energy Services. The Respondent's statement that the disputed domain name was registered by it

on behalf of 7 Eleven Energy Services pursuant to an agreement by which 7 Eleven Energy Services contracted the Respondent's services is supported by the copy of this agreement submitted by the Respondent. Its statement that 7 Eleven Energy Services has always been in control of the disputed domain name is evident from the content of the associated website, which promotes the services of this company and indicates its contact details. The Panel finds that the above provides a credible explanation for the registration of the disputed domain name, also considering that the case file contains no indicia of illegitimate conduct or cybersquatting (see the discussion below).

In view of the above, the Panel accepts that 7 Eleven Energy Services, being the beneficial owner of the disputed domain name, has been commonly known by a name corresponding to the disputed domain name. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 2.3. This supports a finding that the beneficial owner of the disputed domain name has rights and legitimate interests in it under paragraph 4(c)(ii) of the Policy.

The disputed domain name is being used for the official website of 7 Eleven Energy Services, which offers upstream oil and gas logistic services. It has been used for this purpose at least since January 23, 2016, the date of its earliest archived copy¹ at the Wayback Machine. These services do not appear to overlap with the retail convenience store and gasoline sales (essentially downstream) services offered by the Complainants' 7-ELEVEN chain. Rather, it seems that the two companies operate in different lines of business (although they both involve oil) and in different countries.

The website at the disputed domain name clearly identifies 7 Eleven Energy Services as its provider, indicates its contact details, and shows that the company is ISO 9001:2015 certified; the logo displayed on it incorporates distinct design elements and colors different from the Complainants' logo and includes direct reference to "energy services". As noted by the Respondent, the Complainants had no trademark rights and did not carry out any commercial activities in Ghana in 2015, when the disputed domain name was registered with the assistance of the Respondent and its beneficial owner started using it, and there is no evidence that the Respondent or the beneficial owner of the disputed domain name had any knowledge of the Complainants prior to the receipt of the cease-and-desist letter of November 19, 2025.

The above leads the Panel to the conclusion that, before notice of the dispute, the beneficial owner of the disputed domain name has used the disputed domain name and a trade name corresponding to the disputed domain name in connection with a bona fide offering of services. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 2.2. This supports a finding that the beneficial owner of the disputed domain name has rights and legitimate interests in it under paragraph 4(c)(i) of the Policy. The same can be said about the Respondent to the extent that it acts on behalf of the beneficial owner of the disputed domain name.

The Panel therefore finds that the second element of the Policy has not been established.

C. Registered and Used in Bad Faith

The evidence in the case file as presented does not indicate that the Respondent's aim in registering the disputed domain name was to profit from or exploit the Complainants' trademark.

As discussed above, in 2015, when the disputed domain name was registered, the Complainants had no trademark rights in Ghana and were not operating there. The Complainants have not adduced evidence about any fame or even renown of its trademark in Ghana at the time the disputed domain name was registered in 2015. They only registered their trademark years later, and even today, do not appear to be operating any stores in Ghana. Without evidence that the Complainants' 7-ELEVEN trademark is famous or at least well known in Ghana, it does not seem likely that, by registering the disputed domain name, the Respondent intended to divert or confuse Internet users to its website or to attract business based on the reputation of the Complainants' trademark. Moreover, even if the beneficial owner had heard of the 7-ELEVEN chain, that would not have given the Complainants a property right in that term that would

¹ <https://web.archive.org/web/20160123060434/http://7elevenenergy.com/>

necessarily have prevented the beneficial owner in Ghana from selecting that as the name of its company offering non-competitive services in a part of the world where the Complainants do not operate. The Complainants have not, for example, submitted any evidence that the use of the name 7 ELEVEN ENERGY in Ghana would have constituted trademark infringement or trademark dilution, which could have undermined a finding that the Respondent was making a bona fide offering of services. *Cf. Bearfoot LLC v. Alexis Moret, BRFT Holdings LLC*, WIPO Case No. [D2026-1680](#) (“If either of the Parties were infringing the other’s trademark rights, that would be relevant to the question of whether that party is making a bona fide use of the trademark. See, e.g., [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 2.13; and *Nara Aziza Smith v. Vanessa Clarke*, WIPO Case No. [D2025-1839](#). In this case, though, neither Part has shown that the other is more likely than not infringing its trademark.”).

The disputed domain name reflects the name of its beneficial owner 7 Eleven Energy Services, and the Respondent’s explanation about the choice of the disputed domain name is supported by credible evidence. The website promotes the services of 7 Eleven Energy Services, which do not appear to be competing with the Complainants. The website clearly indicates the name and contact details of its provider and is targeted toward a domestic customer base within Ghana. There is no evidence that the Respondent or the beneficial owner of the disputed domain name have attempted to use the Complainants’ reputation for commercial gain or have selected the disputed domain name to target the Complainants.

The above leads the Panel to the conclusion that the beneficial owner of the disputed domain name has registered and is using the disputed domain name for a legitimate business activity, rather than to profit from the Complainants’ trademark. As long as the Respondent has assisted the beneficial owner of the disputed domain name to do the same, its activities also appear to have been carried out in good faith.

The Panel therefore finds that the third element of the Policy has not been established.

The Panel notes that its reasoning and findings are only in relation to the three elements of the Policy, and the Panel takes no position on the issue of whether the Respondent and/or the beneficial owner of the disputed domain name may have been involved in any form of trademark infringement or unfair competition practices under the laws of Ghana. Other than a passing reference by the Respondent to Section 1(2)(a)(b) of Ghana’s Protection Against Unfair Competition Act 2000 (Act 589) and the Trademarks Acts, neither party has submitted argument or evidence related to the laws of Ghana and whether they may be implicated by the underlying facts.

D. Reverse Domain Name Hijacking

Paragraph 15(e) of the Rules provides that, if after considering the submissions, the Panel finds that the Complaint was brought in bad faith, for example in an attempt at Reverse Domain Name Hijacking or to harass the domain-name holder, the Panel shall declare in its decision that the Complaint was brought in bad faith and constitutes an abuse of the administrative proceeding. The mere lack of success of the complaint is not, on its own, sufficient to constitute reverse domain name hijacking. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 4.16. Although it always is the Panel’s obligation to consider whether a finding of Reverse Domain Name Hijacking is appropriate, here, the Respondent has expressly requested such a finding.

The Complainants operate in many countries and have extensive trademark rights in many jurisdictions. The disputed domain name and the trade name of its beneficial owner are confusingly similar to the Complainants’ trademarks. The Complainants have however failed on the second and third elements of the Policy. This outcome is the result of the success of the Response, which includes strong arguments supported by credible evidence. There is however no evidence that the Complainants were aware of the Respondent’s defences prior to the submission of the Complaint (including the birthdates of the beneficial owner’s founders – a fact that is not disclosed on the website to which the disputed domain name resolves), and it does not appear that the Respondent has responded to their cease-and-desist letter sent in November 2025. There is therefore no support for a finding that the Complainant ought to have known that the Complaint cannot succeed.

Moreover, a request for a finding of Reverse Domain Name Hijacking is a request for an equitable remedy, and a party that seeks equity needs to come to the proceedings in equity as well. The Respondent's lengthy and frivolous arguments under the first element undermine the Respondent's position as a party itself acting in an equitable manner, at least in these proceedings. *WE-EF LEUCHTEN GmbH v. wang yajun*, WIPO Case No. [D2025-1723](#) ("Because a finding of RDNH is a matter of equity, it should not be granted when the Respondent itself has engaged in questionable conduct ... in the UDRP proceeding itself."); *Breazy Inc. v. Domains by Proxy, LLC, DomainsByProxy.com / VR PRODUCTS I LLC*, WIPO Case No. [D2021-1486](#) (declining to find RDNH because a "request for a finding of Reverse Domain Name Hijacking is an equitable remedy, and equitable relief should only be available to a party who comes before a panel with clean hands").

In these circumstances, the Panel finds that the Complaint has not been brought in bad faith and that it does not constitute an attempt at Reverse Domain Name Hijacking.

7. Decision

For the foregoing reasons, the Complaint is denied.

/Assen Alexiev/
Assen Alexiev
Presiding Panelist

/David H. Bernstein/
David H. Bernstein
Panelist

/John Swinson/
John Swinson
Panelist
Date: July 24, 2026