

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

Halliburton Energy Services, Inc. v. Kalin Karakehayov, Tool Domains
Case No. D2026-0579

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 Kalin Karakehayov, Tool Domains, Bulgaria.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <halliburtoncontracts.com> is registered with Sav.com, LLC (the "Registrar").

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the "Center") on February 11, 2026. On February 12, 2026, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On February 12, 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 (REDACTED FOR PRIVACY) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on February 13, 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 February 13, 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 February 16, 2026. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was March 8, 2026. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent's default on March 9, 2026.

The Center appointed Theda König Horowicz as the sole panelist in this matter on March 20, 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

The Complainant is a world-renowned energy company founded in the United States in 1919 which operates in many countries.

The Complainant widely uses HALLIBURTON and owns several United States trademarks containing this name, including United States trademark registration No 2575819 for HALLIBURTON of June 4, 2002.

The Complainant markets its products and services through several domain names, including <halliburton.com> registered on October 17, 1995.

The disputed domain name was registered on December 3, 2025, without the Complainant's authorization. It directs to a webpage providing links to third party websites and indicating that the disputed domain name is for sale.

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 disputed domain name consists of the Complainant's well-known and distinctive trademark with the addition of the term "contracts" which does not dispel the confusing similarity of the disputed domain name to the Complainant's mark.

The Complainant alleges that the Respondent does not have rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name, because there is no evidence that the Respondent have been making a legitimate noncommercial or fair use of the disputed domain name or that the Respondent is commonly known by the disputed domain name.

The Complainant further states that the disputed domain name was registered and is being used in bad faith because the Complainant's HALLIBURTON trademark is well-known and well established in many countries worldwide. It is therefore inconceivable that the Respondent was unaware of the Complainant and its rights prior to registering the disputed domain name. The Respondent registered the disputed domain name through a proxy service which is an indication of bad faith use.

B. Respondent

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

6. Discussion and Findings

Paragraph 15(a) of the Rules instructs this Panel to “decide a complaint on the basis of the statements and documents submitted in accordance with the Policy, these Rules and any rules and principles of law that it deems applicable.”

Paragraph 4(a) of the Policy requires that the Complainant must prove each of the following three elements to obtain an order that the disputed domain name should be cancelled or transferred:

- (i) the disputed domain name registered by the Respondent is identical or confusingly similar to a trademark or service mark in which the Complainant has rights; and
- (ii) the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the disputed domain name; and
- (iii) the disputed domain name has been registered and is being used in bad faith.

In view of the Respondent's failure to submit a Response, the Panel shall decide these administrative proceedings on the basis of the Complainant's undisputed representations pursuant to paragraphs 5(f), 14(a) and 15(a) of the Rules and draw such inferences as it considers appropriate pursuant to paragraph 14(b) of the Rules. The Panel is entitled to accept all reasonable allegations set forth in a complaint. However, the Panel may deny relief where a complaint contains mere conclusory or unsubstantiated arguments. See WIPO Overview of WIPO Panel Views on Select UDRP Questions, ([“WIPO Overview 3.1”](#)), section 4.3.

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 3.1](#), section 1.7.

The Complainant has shown rights in respect of the trademark HALLIBURTON for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.2.1.

The entirety of the mark is reproduced within the disputed domain name with the only addition of the term “contracts” at its end. The Panel finds the mark is nevertheless clearly recognizable within the disputed domain name and does not prevent a finding of confusing similarity between the disputed domain name and the mark for the purposes of the policy. Accordingly, the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to the mark for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), sections 1.7. and 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 that 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 3.1](#), 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.

In the present case, the Panel notes that the Complainant's highly distinctive name and trademark is entirely contained in the disputed domain name and is associated with the sole descriptive word "contracts" thus giving the wrong and confusing impression that the disputed domain name might be owned or endorsed by the Complainant.

Additionally, the Respondent has defaulted and have failed to prove that before any notice of the dispute, its use of, or demonstrable preparations to use, the disputed domain name or a name corresponding to the disputed domain name in connection with a bona fide offering of goods or services. The current use which is to link the disputed domain name to a webpage offering the disputed domain name for sale does obviously not confer rights or legitimate interests *per se*.

Furthermore, nothing in the case file shows that the Respondent would be commonly known by the disputed domain name or has acquired any trademark or service mark rights.

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 must have known of the Complainant's name and trademark HALLIBURTON which is distinctive and used in several countries around the world. It seems unlikely that the Respondent did not know about this well-established trademark when registering the disputed domain name.

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 3.1](#), section 3.2.1.

Having reviewed the available record, the Panel notes the distinctiveness or reputation of the Complainant's trademark, and the composition of the disputed domain name which entirely reproduces Complainant's name and trademark with a sole addition of a descriptive word.

Furthermore, the case file shows that the disputed domain name is linked to a webpage containing links to third party websites and offering the disputed domain name for sale which shows that the Respondent was targeting Complainant's brand, for commercial gain, and intentionally attempted to attract Internet users for commercial gain by causing a likelihood of confusion with the Complainant's trademark as to the source, sponsorship, affiliation or endorsement of the website to which the disputed domain name was resolved, according to paragraph 4(b)(iv) of the Policy.

Finally, the use of a privacy service for registering the disputed domain name and that the Respondent did not participate in the proceedings are additional factors of bad faith.

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 <halliburtoncontracts.com> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Theda König Horowicz/

Theda König Horowicz

Sole Panelist

Date: April 13, 2026