

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

Hilton Worldwide Manage Limited v. Narasimhan Srinivasaraghavan
Case No. D2026-2510

1. The Parties

The Complainant is Hilton Worldwide Manage Limited, United Kingdom, represented by Markmonitor Limited, United Kingdom.

The Respondent is Narasimhan Srinivasaraghavan, India.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <hiltonsresortliverpool.com> is registered with BigRock Solutions Pvt Ltd. (the "Registrar").

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the "Center") on June 10, 2026. On June 10, 2026, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On June 11, 2026, the Registrar transmitted by email to the Center its verification response confirming that the Respondent is listed as the registrant and providing the contact details.

The Center verified that 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 June 15, 2026. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was July 5, 2026. The Respondent sent an email communication to the Center on June 16, 2026. On July 6, 2026, in accordance with paragraph 6 of the Rules, the Center informed the Parties that it would commence the panel appointment process. On July 10 and July 15, 2026, the Respondent sent email communications to the Center.

The Center appointed María Alejandra López García as the sole panelist in this matter on July 16, 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 an English company incorporated on December 7, 2010, with its registered office in Watford, United Kingdom. The Complainant is the indirect subsidiary of Hilton Worldwide Holdings Inc., which are together with its other subsidiaries, including Hilton Hotels & Resorts, known as the Hilton group ("Hilton"). The Complainant holds registered rights on behalf of Hilton.

Hilton was founded in 1919 by Conrad Hilton; today, it is a recognized global hospitality company, with a portfolio of 27 world-class brands comprising more than 9,200 properties and over 1.3 million rooms in 144 countries and territories. Hilton employs 500,000 people globally and was twice named "No. 1 World's Best Workplace" by Fortune and Great Place to Work.

Hilton owns the domain name <hilton.com>, from which it operates its client-facing website for offerings and and book stays and holidays. Hilton operates four hotels in Liverpool, United Kingdom.

Hilton operates several social media accounts that together have close to 5 million "followers"/"subscribers".

The Complainant owns several trademark registrations for the term HILTON, including but not limited to:

- Canadian trademark for HILTON (word mark), Registration No. TMA138763, in International Class ("IC") 43, registered on January 15, 1965, and in force until January 15, 2035; and
- Austrian trademark for HILTON (word mark), Registration No. 66940, in ICs 37, 39, 41, and 42, registered on June 12, 1970, and in force until October 7, 2029; and
- United Kingdom trademark for HILTON (word mark), Registration No. UK00001300389, in IC 43, registered on August 28, 1990, and in force until February 9, 2028.

The disputed domain name was registered on July 21, 2025, and resolves to an inactive website with no content, but with active Mail Exchanger ("MX") records. The disputed domain name has been used in phishing attacks that impersonate Hilton and target Internet users via fraudulent job adverts.

The Respondent seems to be an individual identified as Narasimhan Srinivasaraghavan, apparently located in India.

On November 17, 2025, the Complainant sent a cease-and-desist Letter to the Respondent, but no answer was received.

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.

In relation to the first element of the Policy, in summary, the Complainant contends that the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to its well-known trademark HILTON; that the additional terms do not prevent a finding of confusing similarity between the Complainant's well-known trademark HILTON and the disputed domain name.

In relation to the second element of the Policy, in summary, the Complainant contends that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the disputed domain name, given that the Respondent is not commonly known as Hilton or Hilton's Resort Liverpool before or after the registration of the disputed domain name; that the Respondent is not a licensee of the Complainant and has not received any permission, consent or acquiescence from the Complainant to use its marks in association with the registration of the disputed domain name or, indeed, any domain name, service or product; that, considering that the disputed domain name has been used in phishing attacks and impersonation, the Complainant contends that there is no conceivable use to which the disputed domain name could be put now, or in the future, that would confer any rights or legitimate interest upon the Respondent.

In relation to the third element of the Policy, in summary, the Complainant contends that the Respondent has registered and is using the disputed domain name in bad faith, given that the disputed domain name incorporates the Complainant's well-known HILTON mark as its first element, which, as such, creates a presumption of bad faith upon the Respondent; that the disputed domain name has been passively held, and used to send phishing emails to simulate genuine job offers impersonating Hilton, which constitute bad faith under the Policy.

B. Respondent

On June 16, 2026, the Respondent sent the following email communication to the Center: "erh get lost".

On July 10, 2026, the Respondent sent an email communication to the Center, which apparently added " " into the email sent by the Center on July 6, 2026, regarding the commencement of panel appointment process.

On July 15, 2026, the Respondent sent the following email communication to the Center: "Get lost".

The Panel finds that such communications show that the Respondent has been effectively notified of the Complaint in accordance with paragraph 2(a) of the Rules, but chose not to submit its Response as set out in paragraph 5(a) of the Rules. Therefore, it is evident that the Respondent did not formally reply to the Complainant's contentions.

6. Discussion and Findings

Under the Policy, the Complainant is required to prove that:

- (i) the disputed domain name is identical or confusingly similar to a trademark 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 accordance with paragraph 5(f) of the Rules, in the absence of a Response, the Panel shall decide the dispute based upon the Complaint. The complainant bears the burden of proof; a respondent's default does not, by itself, mean that the complainant is deemed to have prevailed. See WIPO Overview of WIPO Panel Views on Select UDRP Questions ("[WIPO Overview 3.1](#)") section 4.3. Therefore, the Panel will decide this case based on the "balance of probabilities" or "preponderance of the evidence" standard. See [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 4.2.

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 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 confusingly similar to the mark for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.7.

Although the addition of other terms (here, "s", "resort", "liverpool") may bear on assessment of the second and third elements, the Panel finds the addition of such terms does not prevent a finding of confusing similarity between the disputed domain name and the mark for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.8.

In relation to the generic Top-Level Domain ".com", it is well established that such element is viewed as a standard registration requirement and as such is disregarded under the first element confusing similarity test. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.11.1.

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.

Given the evidence provided, including the lack of a formal Response, combined with the use of the disputed domain name to engage in phishing activities, the Panel finds that nothing in the record could suggest any rights or legitimate interests in accordance with paragraph 4(c) of the Policy.

Panels have held that the use of a domain name for illegal activity (here, claimed as phishing, impersonation, passing off, or other types of fraud) can never confer rights or legitimate interests on a respondent. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 2.13.1.

The Panel finds the second element of the Policy has been established.

C. Registered and Used 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 this case, the Respondent has engaged in unlawful conduct at every stage, i.e., selection, registration, and use of the disputed domain name, including the setup of the MX records. The Panel notes that the composition of the disputed domain name confirms the Respondent's extensive knowledge of the Complainant's business activities and of the trademark HILTON, at the time of its registration. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 3.2.2.

Panels have held that the use of a domain name for illegal activity (here, claimed as phishing, impersonation, passing off, or other types of fraud) constitutes bad faith. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 3.4. Having reviewed the record, the Panel finds the Respondent's registration and use of the disputed domain name 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 name <hiltonsresortliverpool.com> be transferred to the Complainant.

/María Alejandra López García/

María Alejandra López García

Sole Panelist

Date: July 24, 2026