

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

Petróleo Brasileiro S.A. Petrobras v. ma li
Case No. D2025-4759

1. The Parties

The Complainant is Petróleo Brasileiro S.A. Petrobras, Brazil, represented by Siqueira Castro Advogados, Brazil.

The Respondent is ma li, Taiwan Province of China.

2. The Domain Names and Registrar

The disputed domain names <888-petrobras.top> and <888-petrobras.vip> are registered with Gname.com Pte. Ltd. (the “Registrar”).

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed in English with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the “Center”) on November 17, 2025. On November 18, 2025, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain names. On November 19, 2025, the Registrar transmitted by email to the Center its verification response disclosing registrant and contact information for the disputed domain names which differed from the named Respondent (Redacted for Privacy – TW) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on November 19, 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 and a further amendment to Complaint in English on November 21 and 28, 2025.

On November 19, 2025, the Center informed the Parties in Chinese and English, that the language of the Registration Agreement for the disputed domain names is Chinese. On November 28, 2025, the Complainant requested English to be the language of the proceeding. The Respondent did not submit any comment on the Complainant’s submission.

The Center verified that the Complaint together with the amended Complaint and the further amendment 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 in Chinese and English of the Complaint, and the proceeding commenced on December 2, 2025. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was December 22, 2025. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent's default on December 30, 2025.

The Center appointed Sebastian M.W. Hughes as the sole panelist in this matter on January 5, 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

A. Complainant

The Complainant is a leading global oil company headquartered in Brazil, operating in countries worldwide under the trade mark PETROBRAS (the "Trade Mark"). The Complainant is the owner of registrations in jurisdictions worldwide for the Trade Mark, including Brazilian registration No. 003676935, with a registration date of February 1, 1978; and United States of America registration No. 77976086, with a registration date of September 1, 2009.

The Complainant also owns and uses numerous domain names comprising the Trade Mark, including <petrobras.com>, registered since March 6, 1996.

B. Respondent

The Respondent is apparently an individual resident in Taiwan Province of China.

C. The Disputed Domain Names

The disputed domain names were both registered on June 7, 2025.

D. Use of the Disputed Domain Names

The disputed domain names were previously resolved to a Portuguese and English language website with what appears to be gambling or investment related content and links, with the Trade Mark displayed (the "Website").

As at the date of this Decision, the disputed domain names are no longer linked to any active website.

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, in light of the repute of the Trade Mark, the Respondent's use of the Website to provide gambling related content and links does not give rise to any rights or legitimate interests on the part of the Respondent, and amounts to bad faith registration and use.

B. Respondent

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

6. Discussion and Findings

Language of the Proceeding

The language of the Registration Agreement for the disputed domain name is Chinese. Pursuant to the Rules, paragraph 11(a), in the absence of an agreement between the parties, or unless specified otherwise in the registration agreement, the language of the administrative proceeding shall be the language of the registration agreement.

The Complaint was filed in English. The Complainant requested that the language of the proceeding be English for several reasons, including the fact that the Website contained English language content.

The Respondent did not make any submissions with respect to the language of the proceeding.

In exercising its discretion to use a language other than that of the registration agreement, the Panel has to exercise such discretion judicially in the spirit of fairness and justice to both parties, taking into account all relevant circumstances of the case, including matters such as the parties' ability to understand and use the proposed language, time and costs (see WIPO Overview of WIPO Panel Views on Selected UDRP Questions, Third Edition ("[WIPO Overview 3.0](#)"), section 4.5.1).

Having considered all the matters above, the Panel determines under paragraph 11(a) of the Rules that the language of the proceeding shall be English.

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 trade mark and the disputed domain name. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 1.7.

The Complainant has shown rights in respect of a trade mark or service mark for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 1.2.1.

The Panel finds the Trade Mark is recognizable within the disputed domain names. Accordingly, the disputed domain names are confusingly similar to the Trade Mark for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 1.7.

Although the addition of other terms (here, "888") 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 names and the Trade 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.

The Respondent has failed to show that he has acquired any trade mark rights in respect of the disputed domain names or that the disputed domain names have been used in connection with a bona fide offering of goods or services. To the contrary, the disputed domain names were previously resolved, for commercial gain, to the Website, containing to what appears to be investment or gambling related content and links.

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 light of the manner of the Respondent's use of the disputed domain names referred to above, the Panel finds, in all the circumstances, that the requisite element of bad faith has been made out pursuant to paragraph 4(b)(iv) of 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 <888-petrobras.top> and <888-petrobras.vip> be cancelled.

/Sebastian M.W. Hughes/

Sebastian M.W. Hughes

Sole Panelist

Date: January 19, 2026