

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

Halliburton Energy Services, Inc. v. Enrico Ruggerone Case No. D2025-3268

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 Enrico Ruggerone, Italy.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <haliburton.com> is registered with NameCheap, Inc. (the “Registrar”).

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the “Center”) on August 14, 2025. On August 15, 2025, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On August 15, 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 (Redacted for Privacy Privacy service provided by Withheld for Privacy ehf) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on August 18, 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 August 18, 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 August 22, 2025. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was September 11, 2025. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent’s default on September 15, 2025.

The Center appointed Haig Oghigian as the sole panelist in this matter on September 18, 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, Halliburton, is an American corporation which operates providing a variety of products and services to the global energy industry. Founded in 1919, the Complainant has operations in approximately 70 countries at present, including the United States and Italy.

The Complainant owns numerous mark registrations for HALLIBURTON, such as but not limited to:

Trademark	Country	Registration Number	Registration Date
HALLIBURTON	United States of America	2575840	June 4, 2002
HALLIBURTON	United States of America	2575819	June 4, 2002
HALLIBURTON	Germany	895308	July 12, 1972
HALLIBURTON	European Union	006125141	September 8, 2008

The Complainant operates its website at <halliburton.com>, and others.

The disputed domain name <halinburton.com> was registered by the Respondent on August 6, 2025.

The Respondent is Enrico Ruggerone, of Rome, Italy. The disputed domain name was used to pose as a Complainant’s employee in email communications.

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 Respondent posed as a Complainant’s employee, fraudulently communicating with a vendor.

-The disputed domain name is identical or confusingly similar to a trademark or service mark in which the Complainant has rights.

The Complainant owns numerous trademark registrations for HALLIBURTON, which predate the registration of the disputed domain name by the Respondent by several years at minimum. The Complaint states that the relevant trademark, HALLIBURTON is confusingly similar to the disputed domain name, though “having merely added a country name (Mexico) to the end of distinctive HALLIBURTON mark”. The Complainant further adds that the disputed domain name contains a slight, but intentional, variation of the Complainant’s well-known HALLIBURTON trademark, the removal of an “l”, and the addition of a “n” in the middle of Complainant’s distinctive trademark. The Complainant therefore submits that the HALLIBURTON trademark is reproduced in the disputed domain name and that as a case of typosquatting, does not prevent a finding of confusing similarity.

-The Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the disputed domain name.

The Complainant argues that as they have demonstrated rights to the mark contained within the disputed domain name, and have never licensed mark to the Respondent meaning that the Respondent cannot have used the mark with permission. The Complainant states that furthermore, the Respondent has no presence using the mark or similar marks, nor has the Respondent demonstrated any ownership of any marks that bare similarity with marks owned by the Complainant.

-The disputed domain name was registered and used in bad faith.

The Complainant states that the disputed domain name reproduces the Complainant's mark, while having no relationship to that mark even though the Respondent should have been aware of the Complainant due to their established brand, industry recognition and numerous trademark registrations, and therefore constitutes bad faith registration. The Complainant adds that the use of typosquatting in the disputed domain name further demonstrates bad faith use, as it shows that the Respondent was intentionally attempting to deceive Internet users by creating a likelihood of confusion with the Complainant and the Complainant's trademarks.

B. Respondent

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

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 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.

The Panel finds the mark is recognizable within the disputed domain name. Accordingly, the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to the mark for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), sections 1.7 and 1.9.

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.

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 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 and has not come forward with any relevant evidence demonstrating rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name such as those enumerated in the Policy or otherwise. The use of the disputed domain name to impersonate a Complainant's employee is an example of bad faith under the Policy and therefore cannot give rise to rights or legitimate interests for the Respondent in the disputed domain name.

The Panel finds 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.

In the present case, the Panel notes that the Respondent acted in bad faith as they reproduced, without authorization, the Complainant's mark HALLIBURTON though with a misspelling. The Panel adds that despite the misspelling, the mark remains recognizable in the disputed domain name and indicates bad faith registration. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 3.1.4.

Paragraph 4(b) of the Policy sets out a list of non-exhaustive circumstances that may indicate that a domain name was registered and used in bad faith, but other circumstances may be relevant in assessing whether a respondent's registration and use of a domain name is in bad faith. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 3.2.1.

Panels have held that the use of a domain name for illegitimate activity here, claimed impersonation/passing off constitutes bad faith. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 3.4. Having reviewed the record, the Panel finds the Respondent's registration and use of the disputed domain name constitutes bad faith under the Policy.

The Panel finds 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 <halinburton.com> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Haig Oghigian/

Haig Oghigian

Sole Panelist

Date: October 2, 2025