ARBITRATION
AND
MEDIATION CENTER

WIPO
WORLD
INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY
ORGANIZATION

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION
QatarEnergy v. Wisa Dayse, db best, dbestgroup
Case No. D2025-3763

1. The Parties

The Complainant is QatarEnergy, Qatar, represented by Hogan Lovells (Paris) LLP, France.

The Respondents are Wisa Dayse, Qatar, and db best, dbestgroup, United States of America ("United States").

2. The Domain Names and Registrars

The disputed domain name <suppliers-qatarenargy.com> is registered with NameCheap, Inc.

The disputed domain name <suppliers-qatarenergy.com> is registered with NameSilo, LLC (the "Registrars").

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the "Center") on September 16, 2025. On September 17, 2025, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrars a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain names. On September 17, 2025, the Registrars transmitted by email to the Center their verification responses disclosing registrant and contact information for the disputed domain names which differed from the named Respondents (Redacted for Privacy, Privacy service provided by Withheld for Privacy ehf and Privacy User #e5154a86, See PrivacyGuardian.org) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on September 18, 2025 with the registrant and contact information of nominally multiple underlying registrants revealed by the Registrars, requesting the Complainant to either file separate complaint(s) for the disputed domain names associated with different underlying registrants or alternatively, demonstrate that the underlying registrants are in fact the same entity and/or that all domain names are under common control. The Complainant filed an amended Complaint on September 22, 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 Respondents of the Complaint, and the proceedings commenced on September 23, 2025. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was October 13, 2025. The Respondents did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondents' default on October 14, 2025.

The Center appointed Nayiri Boghossian as the sole panelist in this matter on October 17, 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 is a state-owned Qatari corporation operating in the field of oil and gas. The Complainant owns numerous trademark registrations for QATARENERGY such as:

- United Kingdom trademark registration no. UK00003708704, registered on January 7, 2022;
- European Union trademark registration no. 018573695, registered on April 19, 2022.

The disputed domain name <suppliers-qatarenergy.com> was registered on October 2, 2024. The disputed domain name <suppliers-qatarenargy.com> was registered on October 19, 2024. The evidence reflects that the disputed domain names were used for sending emails impersonating the Complainant. The disputed domain names do not resolve to active websites.

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 names.

Notably, the Complainant contends that the disputed domain names are confusingly similar to the Complainant's trademark. The disputed domain names incorporate the Complainant's trademark or a misspelled version of it. The addition of the term "suppliers" and a hyphen does not prevent a finding of confusing similarity nor does the misspelling of the word "energy". The generic Top-Level Domain ("gTLD") ".com" should be ignored.

The Complainant contends that the Respondents have no rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain names. There is no bona fide offering of goods or services. Instead, the disputed domain names have been used to send fraudulent emails. The Respondents do not seem to be commonly known by the disputed domain names. The Respondents are not making a legitimate noncommercial or fair use as the disputed domain names have been used to send fraudulent emails.

The Complainant contends that the disputed domain names were registered and are being used in bad faith. The Respondents must have been aware of the Complainant's trademark. The Complainant was founded in 1974 and enjoys considerable renown and goodwill worldwide. The Respondents have attempted to impersonate the Complainant. The disputed domain names have been used in connection with a phishing scheme impersonating the Complainant. The passive holding doctrine applies.

B. Respondents

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

6. Discussion and Findings

Consolidation: Multiple Respondents

The amended Complaint was filed in relation to nominally different domain name registrants. The Complainant alleges that the domain name registrants are the same entity or mere alter egos of each other, or under common control. The Complainant requests the consolidation of the Complaint against the multiple disputed domain name registrants pursuant to paragraph 10(e) of the Rules.

The disputed domain name registrants did not comment on the Complainant's request.

Paragraph 3(c) of the Rules states that a complaint may relate to more than one domain name, provided that the domain names are registered by the same domain name holder.

In addressing the Complainant's request, the Panel will consider whether (i) the disputed domain names or corresponding websites are subject to common control; and (ii) the consolidation would be fair and equitable to all Parties. See WIPO Overview of WIPO Panel Views on Selected UDRP Questions, Third Edition ("WIPO Overview 3.0"), section 4.11.2.

As regards common control, the Panel notes that: 1. The composition of both domain names is almost identical. The only difference is that letter "a" replaces the letter "e" in the word "energy". 2. The disputed domain names were registered within a short time frame from one another. 3. The disputed domain names were used for a fraudulent scheme. 4. The disputed domain names were registered using a proxy service. 5. The fraudulent emails sent contain the same name in the signature.

As regards fairness and equity, the Panel sees no reason why consolidation of the disputes would be unfair or inequitable to any Party.

Accordingly, the Panel decides to consolidate the disputes regarding the nominally different disputed domain name registrants (referred to below as "the Respondent") in a single proceeding.

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 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 names. Accordingly, the disputed domain names are confusingly similar to the mark for the purposes of the Policy. WIPO Overview 3.0, sections 1.7 and 1.9.

Although the addition of other terms here, "suppliers" may bear on assessment of the second and third elements, the Panel finds the addition of such term does not prevent a finding of confusing similarity between the disputed domain name and the mark for the purposes of the Policy. WIPO Overview 3.0, section 1.8.

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 names. 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 names such as those enumerated in the Policy or otherwise.

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

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 has used the disputed domain names to send emails to potential suppliers as part of a fraudulent scheme. Emails are sent impersonating the Complainant and inviting the recipients to register as vendors with the Complainant.

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 illegal activity here, claimed phishing and 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 names 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 names <suppliers-qatarenargy.com> and <suppliers-qatarenergy.com> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Nayiri Boghossian/
Nayiri Boghossian
Sole Panelist
Date: October 29, 2025