

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

HELLENiQ ENERGY Holdings S.A. v. Theodosios Papandrianos, Klikc2c Pltd

Case No. D2026-0926

1. The Parties

The Complainant is HELLENiQ ENERGY Holdings S.A., Greece, represented by Ubilibet, S.L., Spain.

The Respondent is Theodosios Papandrianos, Klikc2c Pltd, Bulgaria.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

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

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the “Center”) on March 4, 2026. On March 4, 2026, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On March 4, 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, Privacy service provided by Withheld for Privacy ehf) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on March 6, 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 March 9, 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 March 13, 2026. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was April 2, 2026. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent’s default on April 13, 2026.

The Center appointed Stefan Bojovic as the sole panelist in this matter on April 17, 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 Greek company, founded in 1998, with roots tracing back to the establishment of the first refinery in Aspropyrgos, Greece. The Complainant has evolved from its origins in the oil industry into a diversified and integrated energy group with a growing presence in cleaner energy solutions and advanced infrastructure. The Complainant operates in an integrated manner across multiple segments, including oil refining, marketing of petroleum products, petrochemicals, electricity generation and supply, natural gas distribution, energy logistics, and engineering and consulting services. Its operations are maintained not only in Greece, but also across several Southeast European countries, including North Macedonia, Serbia, Montenegro, Bulgaria, and Cyprus.

As part of its energy transition and corporate strategy, and following the Group's full acquisition of share capital of company Elpedison in July 2025, the Complainant has undertaken a rebranding of Elpedison to create the new corporate identity under the name Enerwave. The rebranding was publicly unveiled on November 12, 2025, at an official event in Athens, where the Complainant's leadership presented the company's new brand identity.

The Complainant is the owner of the ENERWAVE trademark which is protected by trademark registrations in various jurisdictions, including the following:

- European Union trademark registration No. 018686740 for ENERWAVE (word/device), registered on September 8, 2022;
- International trademark registration No. 1706155 for ENERWAVE (word/device), registered on October 12, 2022;
- Bulgarian trademark registration No. 175141 for ENERWAVE, registered on May 12, 2025; and
- Greek trademark registration No. N273869 for ENERWAVE, registered on September 19, 2022.

In addition, the Complainant owns various domain name registrations reflecting its ENERWAVE trademark, such as <enerwave.eu> registered on October 22, 2021, <enerwave.group> registered on October 15, 2025, and <enerwave.org> registered on October 15, 2025.

The disputed domain name was registered on November 13, 2025, and it used to resolve to a parking page with sponsored ("pay-per-click" or "PPC") links related to the Complainant's competitors in energy sector. At the time of filing of the Complaint, the disputed domain name resolved to an inactive page.

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 is composed entirely of the Complainant's ENERWAVE trademark, which is sufficient to establish that the disputed domain name is identical or confusingly similar to the Complainant's registered trademark. Additionally, the generic Top-Level Domain ("gTLD") ".store" of the disputed domain name is typically disregarded under the first element confusing similarity test.

With reference to rights or legitimate interests in respect of the disputed domain name, the Complainant contends that it has not authorized, licensed, or allowed the Respondent or any third party to use its trademarks through the disputed domain name or in any other way that would confer validity or legitimacy upon such usage. The Respondent is also not commonly known by the disputed domain name. The Complainant further emphasizes that the disputed domain name used to resolve to a parking page with PPC links related to the Complainant's competitors. This rules out the possibility that the Respondent intends to use the disputed domain name for noncommercial purposes and in good faith, further reducing the likelihood that the Respondent has rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name. Finally, the Complainant argues that the Respondent has failed to provide response to its cease-and-desist letter and thereby lay out the rights and legitimate interests it might have in the disputed domain name.

With reference to the circumstances evidencing bad faith, the Complainant indicates that given the notoriety of its ENERWAVE trademark, it is implausible that the Respondent was unaware of the Complainant's trademarks and registered a domain name that is identical with this trademark by mere coincidence. It is also revealing that the content previously displayed on the disputed domain name directed users to pages related to competitors of the Complainant, as this reflects knowledge of the Complainant's sector of activity and, therefore, more than likely a knowledge of the Complainant's existence. The Respondent registered the disputed domain name only one day after the official public announcement of the rebranding from Elpedison to Enerwave, at a moment when the new trademark had just been unveiled and was receiving public and media attention. Having in mind that the disputed domain name used to resolve to a parking page with PPC links related to the Complainant's competitors, the Complainant deems that the Respondent registered the disputed domain name primarily for the purpose to attract, for commercial gain, Internet users to its website or other on-line location, by creating a likelihood of confusion with the Complainant's trademark.

B. Respondent

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

6. Discussion and Findings

According to paragraph 15(a) of the Rules: "[a] Panel shall decide a complaint on the basis of the statements and documents submitted and in accordance with the Policy, these Rules and any rules and principles of law that it deems applicable." Paragraph 4(a) of the Policy stipulates that the complainant must prove each of the following:

- (i) that 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;
- (ii) that the respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the disputed domain name; and
- (iii) that the disputed domain name has been registered and is being used in bad faith.

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 Select UDRP Questions ("[WIPO Overview 3.1](#)"), section 1.7.

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

The entirety of the mark is reproduced within the disputed domain name. Accordingly, the disputed domain name is identical with the Complainant's trademark for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.7.

In addition, it is well established that “.store”, as a gTLD, is disregarded in the assessment of the confusing similarity between the disputed domain name and the trademark. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.11.1.

The Panel, therefore, 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 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.

The Panel notes that there is no relationship between the Respondent and the Complainant and that the Respondent is not a licensee of the Complainant, nor has the Respondent otherwise obtained an authorization to use the Complainant’s ENERWAVE trademark. There appears to be no element from which the Panel could infer the Respondent’s rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name, or that the Respondent might be commonly known by the disputed domain name.

The Panel also finds that the previous use of the disputed domain name for a parking page with pay-per-click links does not represent a bona fide offering, having in mind that links in this case are mostly related to the Complainant’s competitors and therefore they compete with and capitalize on the reputation and goodwill of the Complainant’s trademark and mislead Internet users. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 2.9.

Since the disputed domain name is identical with the Complainant’s trademark, it also carries a high risk of implied affiliation. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 2.5.1.

Having in mind the above, 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.

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.

In the present case, the Panel notes that the Respondent was likely aware of the Complainant and its ENERWAVE trademark. It is highly unlikely that the Respondent decided to register a domain name containing this trademark in its entirety without having the Complainant in mind when doing so.

Particular circumstances panels may take into account in assessing whether the respondent's registration of a domain name is in bad faith include, inter alia, the timing and circumstances of the registration (particularly following a product launch, or the complainant's failure to renew its domain name registration). [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 3.2.1. Having in mind that the Respondent registered the disputed domain name only one day after the Complainant announced rebranding of the company Elpedison into Enerwave, the Panel holds that it is very unlikely that the registration of the disputed domain name was a mere coincidence. On the contrary, the close temporal proximity to the Complainant's rebranding announcement and the fact that the Respondent is purportedly located in Bulgaria (a country where the Complainant and its business are actively present) are all relevant factors suggesting that the Respondent was aware of the Complainant and its ENERWAVE trademark and, in fact, had the Complainant in mind when registering the disputed domain name.

Due to the above, the Panel finds that the disputed domain name has been registered in bad faith.

As indicated above, the disputed domain name used to resolve to the parking page with PPC links related to the Complainant's competitors, meaning that they compete with and capitalize on the reputation and goodwill of the Complainant's trademark. Therefore, the Panel deems that by such use of the disputed domain name, the Respondent has intentionally attempted to attract Internet users to its website for commercial gain, by creating a likelihood of confusion with the Complainant's trademark as to the source, sponsorship, affiliation or endorsement of its website in accordance with the paragraph 4(b)(iv) of the Policy. This constitutes use of the disputed domain name in bad faith under the Policy.

While the disputed domain name no longer resolves to an active website, such inactivity does not prevent a finding of bad faith given the totality of the circumstances of the case at hand. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 3.3.

Having reviewed the record, the Panel finds the Respondent's registration and use of the disputed domain name constitutes bad faith under the Policy.

Therefore, 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 <enerwave.store> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Stefan Bojovic/
Stefan Bojovic
Sole Panelist
Date: May 1, 2026