

## **ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION**

Saudi Arabian Oil Co. (Aramco) v. Dunhil Ramco, oilramcosaudi  
Case No. D2025-3506

### **1. The Parties**

The Complainant is Saudi Arabian Oil Co. (Aramco), Saudi Arabia, represented by Fish & Richardson P.C., United States of America.

The Respondent is Dunhil Ramco, oilramcosaudi, Nigeria.

### **2. The Domain Name and Registrar**

The disputed domain name <oilramcosaudi.com> is registered with Tucows Domains Inc. (the “Registrar”).

### **3. Procedural History**

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the “Center”) on August 29, 2025. On August 29, 2025, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On August 29, 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 (Unknown) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on September 1, 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 amended Complaint on September 4, 2025.

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 September 5, 2025. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was September 25, 2025. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent’s default on October 3, 2025.

The Center appointed Andrea Jaeger-Lenz as the sole panelist in this matter on October 9, 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 of the Policy.

#### 4. Factual Background

The Complainant is a company organized under the laws of Saudi Arabia. It was established in 1933 and is headquartered in Dhahran, Saudi Arabia. The Complainant is one of the world's largest integrated energy and chemicals companies, engaging in the production of (crude) oil, natural gas, refined and chemical products.

The Complainant is the registered owner of various trademarks worldwide providing protection for the word signs SAUDI ARAMCO and ARAMCO, including the following:

- European Union ("EU") trademark No. 000918581 SAUDI ARAMCO (word) registered on December 1, 1999, for goods in Class 4;
- Saudi Arabian trademark no. 1436020196 SAUDI ARAMCO (stylized in Latin) registered on November 9, 2015, for goods in Class 1;
- Nigerian trademark no. 57588 ARAMCO, registered on March 6, 2014, for goods in Class 1; and
- EU trademark 012676045 ARAMCO (word) registered on August 15, 2014, for goods and services in Classes 1, 16 and 42.

Furthermore, the group of the Complainant owns the domain names <aramco.com> and <saudiaramco.com>, which were registered on January 27, 1994, and August 6, 1997, respectively, and which resolve to the Complainant's official website, where it promotes its goods and services primarily under its ARAMCO brand, including a star device in white on blue/green background.

The disputed domain name was registered on April 6, 2025. Before the filing of the Complaint, the disputed domain name was used in email addresses to engage correspondence with persons interested in employment with the Complainant. Such correspondence included employment forms featuring "Saudi Aramco" and a white star device on blue/green background which the addressee of the correspondence was asked to fill in with personal data.

#### 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 it has established long-standing and well-recognized rights in the "Aramco" and "Saudi Aramco" names and trademarks, and points to registrations in several jurisdictions. The Complainant argues that the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to its ARAMCO and SAUDI ARAMCO trademarks, as it fully incorporates the mark with only minor alterations – namely, a misspelling of "Aramco" or "Saudi Aramco", and the addition of the descriptive term "oil", plus the generic Top-Level Domain ("gTLD") ".com". The Complainant finds that such variations constitute "typosquatting", which does not prevent a finding of confusing similarity, and that the inclusion of the descriptive term "oil", directly connected to the Complainant's business, may even heighten confusion. The addition of the ".com" suffix is irrelevant for the purpose of comparison. Accordingly, the Complainant asserts that the disputed domain name is identical or confusingly similar to the ARAMCO and SAUDI ARAMCO trademarks within the meaning of Paragraph 4(a)(i) of the Policy.

Furthermore, the Complainant contends that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name within the meaning of Paragraph 4(a)(ii) of the Policy. The Complainant argues that the Respondent is not commonly known by the disputed domain name, that it has not been authorized or licensed by the Complainant to use the ARAMCO and SAUDI ARAMCO trademarks, and has not used the disputed domain name in connection with a bona fide offering of goods or services, or for any legitimate noncommercial or fair purpose. In addition, the Complainant claims that there is no evidence that any legitimate entity exists under the Respondent's alleged name "Dunhil Ramco", and the address listed in

Lagos, Nigeria, does not appear to correspond to a real location. The Complainant concludes that the Respondent provided fictitious or false contact information.

Finally, the Complainant asserts that the Respondent has registered and is using the disputed domain name in bad faith since the Respondent has used the disputed domain name to impersonate the Complainant and to send fraudulent recruitment-related emails using the Complainant's trademarks, business address, and star device to deceive recipients into disclosing personal information. According to the Complainant, this conduct constitutes a deliberate attempt to attract Internet users for fraudulent purposes by creating a false impression of association with the Complainant. The Complainant further finds that its ARAMCO trademark is famous and distinctive, leaving no plausible explanation for the Respondent's registration other than an intent to exploit the Complainant's reputation. Additionally, the Respondent's use of false registrant information in the domain registration provides further evidence of bad faith.

## **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 Complainant's trademarks are recognizable within the disputed domain name. Accordingly, the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to the registered trademarks for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 1.7. The disputed domain name incorporates the trademarks ARAMCO and SAUDI ARAMCO in a confusingly similar way. It differs from the Complainant's trademarks by the addition of the generic term "oil", which even points to the Complainant's field of business, and the omission of the initial letter "a" from "aramco" and the placement of the term "saudi" in the second rather than the first position, plus the addition of the gTLD ".com". These variations, in the Panel's view, are not able to dispel the confusing similarity between the Complainant's trademarks and the disputed domain name. WIPO Overview, sections 1.8, 1.9 and 1.11.

In light of the above, 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 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.

Furthermore, Panels have held that the use of a domain name for illegal activity (here, claimed as phishing, impersonation/passing off and fraud) can never confer rights or legitimate interests on a respondent. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 2.13.1.

Therefore, 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.

In the present case, the Panel agrees that the Complainant's trademarks are distinctive and widely known trademarks in the oil and gas sector. The Respondent has provided no explanation for the incorporation of a misspelled version of the Complainant's trademarks into the disputed domain name, particularly given that the additional word "oil" relates to the same field of business. In addition, the correspondence emanating from the disputed domain name includes numerous references to the Complainant's "Saudi Aramco" brand and the Complainant's star device. The Panel therefore concludes that it is inconceivable that the Respondent did not have the Complainant in mind when registering the disputed domain name and in mind and with the intent to take unfair vantage of its reputation.

The undisputed evidence shows that the disputed domain name has been used in a scheme to impersonate the Complainant, in connection with fraudulent emails purporting to have been sent by the Complainant. Such use demonstrates an unlawful intent to mislead recipients into disclosing personal or sensitive information by creating a false association with the Complainant through fraudulent recruitment correspondence. Panels have held that such use of a domain name for illegal activity (here, claimed as phishing, impersonation/passing off and fraud) constitutes bad faith. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 3.4.

Consequently, the Panel finds that the Complainant the third element of the Policy has been established.

## **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 <oilramcosaudi.com> be transferred to the Complainant.

*/Andrea Jaeger-Lenz/*

**Andrea Jaeger-Lenz**

Sole Panelist

Date: October 23, 2025