

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

Hughes Network Systems LLC v. Eka Saputra, PT. Rifa Saputra
Case No. D2026-1782

1. The Parties

The Complainant is Hughes Network Systems LLC, United States of America (“United States”), represented by Spencer Fane, LLP, United States.

The Respondent is Eka Saputra, PT. Rifa Saputra, Indonesia.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <hughesnetwebservices.com> (the “Domain Name”) is registered with GoDaddy.com, LLC (the “Registrar”).

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the “Center”) on April 25, 2026. On April 28, 2026, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the Domain Name. On April 29, 2026, the Registrar transmitted by email to the Center its verification response disclosing registrant and contact information for the Domain Name which differed from the named Respondent (Domains By Proxy, LLC, DomainsByProxy.com) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on April 29, 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 amendment to the Complaint on April 29, 2026.

The Center verified that the Complaint together with the amendment to the 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 May 6, 2026. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was May 26, 2026. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent's default on June 3, 2026.

The Center appointed Mathias Lilleengen as the sole panelist in this matter on June 8, 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 to ensure compliance with the Rules, paragraph 7.

4. Factual Background

The Complainant has offered telecommunication goods and services under the HUGHES trademark for nearly 70 years. The Complainant owns several trademark registrations for HUGHES, such as United States trademark registration No. 1288713 (word mark, registered on August 7, 1984, with a first use date of October 1, 1956), as well as several trademark registrations for HUGHESNET, such as:

- United States trademark registration No. 3235303 (word mark, registered on April 24, 2007); and
- United States trademark registration No. 3277872 (design mark, registered on August 7, 2007).

The design mark consists of the word mark HUGHESNET accompanied by a checkered square pattern.

The Complainant offers its satellite-based communication services to customers at its domain name <hughesnet.com>, registered on December 14, 2002.

According to the Registrar, the Domain Name was created on February 3, 2006. The Complainant documents that the Domain Name has been used to resolve to a website with the header “HughesNet” and a checkered square pattern (similar to the one used by the Complainant on its website, albeit with slightly different placement), that purportedly offers, among others, web design, web and ecommerce hosting, development, and marketing services for sale. At the time of the Decision, the Domain Name resolves to an under-construction web page.

5. Parties’ Contentions

A. Complainant

The Complainant provides evidence of trademark registrations and argues that its trademark is famous. The Domain Name incorporates the Complainant’s trademark in its entirety. The additional term “webservices” does not obviate but increases confusion.

The Complainant argues that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the Domain Name. The Respondent is not authorized, licensed, or permitted to register or use a domain name incorporating the Complainant’s trademark. The Respondent’s use of the Domain Name to impersonate the Complainant is not bona fide use. The Respondent is not an authorized dealer or reseller of the Complainant’s products or services, but instead falsely implies that the Respondent is the Complainant.

The Complainant argues that the Respondent has registered the Domain Name in bad faith with knowledge of the Complainant’s rights. The Complainant asserts that the Domain Name has been designed to create confusion with the Complainant’s trademark. The Respondent has used the Domain Name to impersonate the Complainant and tried to deceive visitors.

B. Respondent

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

6. Discussion and Findings

A. Identical or Confusingly Similar

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 Domain Name. WIPO Overview of WIPO Panel Views on Select UDRP Questions (["WIPO Overview 3.1"](#)), section 1.7.

The Complainant has established that it has rights in the trademarks HUGHES and HUGHESNET. The Domain Name incorporates the Complainant's HUGHES and HUGHESNET trademarks with the addition of the term "netwebservices" or "webservices". These additions do not prevent a finding of confusing similarity between the Domain Name and the trademarks. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.8. For the purpose of assessing confusing similarity under paragraph 4(a)(i) of the Policy, the Panel may ignore the generic Top-Level Domain, see [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.11.1.

The Panel finds that the Domain Name is confusingly similar to a trademark in which the Complainant has rights in accordance with paragraph 4(a)(i) of the Policy.

B. Rights or Legitimate Interests

Paragraph 4(c) of the Policy provides a list of circumstances in which a respondent may demonstrate rights or legitimate interests in a disputed domain name.

While 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 often impossible 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. 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.

Based on the evidence, the Respondent is not affiliated or related to the Complainant in any way. There is no evidence that the Respondent has registered the Domain Name as a trademark or acquired trademark rights. There is no evidence of the Respondent's use of, or demonstrable preparations to use, the Domain Name or a name corresponding to the Domain Name in connection with a bona fide offering of goods or services. On the contrary, the use of the Domain Name to promote the Respondent's products or services is evidence of bad faith, particularly noting the use of a "HughesNet" header and a checkered square pattern (similar to the one used by the Complainant on its website, albeit with slightly different placement) on the website at the Domain Name. The Panel finds also that the composition of the Domain Name signals the Respondent's intention of taking unfair advantage of the likelihood of confusion between the Domain Name and the Complainant.

The Panel finds that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the Domain Name in accordance with paragraph 4(a)(ii) of the Policy.

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.

The Panel finds that based on the longstanding use of the Complainant's HUGHES trademark, and the Complainant's domain name, the Respondent likely knew of the Complainant when it registered the Domain Name. It follows from the composition and use of the Domain Name. The Respondent has not provided any evidence of actual or contemplated good faith use of the Domain Name. On the contrary, the Respondent has used the Domain Name to intentionally attempt to attract, for commercial gain, Internet users to its website, by creating a likelihood of confusion with the Complainant's mark as to the source, sponsorship, affiliation, or endorsement of the Respondent's website. Such conduct demonstrates bad faith registration and use within the meaning of paragraph 4(b)(iv) of the Policy.

Based on the available record, 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 the Domain Name <hughesnetwebservices.com> transferred to the Complainant.

/Mathias Lilleengen/

Mathias Lilleengen

Sole Panelist

Date: June 18, 2026