

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

Wallan Trading Company (Wallan Hyundai) v. Jimmy Harianto
Case No. D2026-2633

1. The Parties

The Complainant is Wallan Trading Company (Wallan Hyundai), Saudi Arabia, internally represented.

The Respondent is Jimmy Harianto, Philippines.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <wallanhyundai.com> 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 June 16, 2026. On June 17, 2026, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On June 17, 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 (Arshad Hussain) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on June 19, 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 June 20, 2026, and an amended Complaint on June 29, 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 June 30, 2026. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was July 20, 2026. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent’s default on July 24, 2026.

The Center appointed W. Scott Blackmer as the sole panelist in this matter on July 27, 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 authorized Hyundai dealer in Saudi Arabia, organized as a Saudi Arabian trading company operating since 2010. The Complainant has no registered trademark but asserts rights in WALLAN HYUNDAI as an unregistered, common law mark, with screenshots of its website since 2010 and current social media sites and photos of signage at its dealership and on the stands at a sporting event. The Complainant has also submitted as an annex to the Complaint an advertising agreement between itself and Hyundai Motor Company ("HMC"), authorizing the Complainant to carry out advertising activities for motor vehicles manufactured by HMC.

The disputed domain name was created on August 12, 2010, and is currently registered to the Respondent Jimmy Harianto, listing a postal address in the Philippines and a Gmail contact email address.

From registration and renewal records submitted with the Complaint and screenshots from the Internet Archive's Wayback Machine, it is evident that the Complainant was the initial registrant of the disputed domain name in 2010 and used it for the Complainant's former website advertising its business. However, due to an "unintended lapse" by a third-party service provider, the Complainant failed to renew the registration of the disputed domain name in 2025, and the disputed domain name was subsequently acquired by the Respondent.

At the time of this Decision the disputed domain name redirects to an Indonesian-language online gaming website headed "MPOID", offering a variety of casino games conducted in Indonesian Rupiah currency payable with a variety of credit and debit cards.

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 identical or confusingly similar to its common law WALLAN HYUNDAI mark. The Complainant asserts that the Respondent is has no relationship with the Complainant and is not authorized to use the mark, is not commonly known by the mark, and is not using the disputed domain name in connection with a bona fide offering of goods or services but rather to direct Internet users to an unrelated, commercial third-party site, which is not a legitimate use and also represents bad faith under the Policy.

B. Respondent

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

6. Discussion and Findings

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 Panel finds the Complainant has established unregistered service mark rights in WALLAN HYUNDAI for the purposes of the Policy. The record shows that the Complainant has advertised under this mark continuously for 16 years. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.3.

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

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. The Complainant denies any association with the Respondent, which also does not have a name corresponding to the disputed domain name.

The Respondent uses the disputed domain name only to redirect to a gambling website under an entirely different name, and there is no indication whether or how the Respondent is connected to that business. The disputed domain name is identical to the Complainant's highly distinctive mark and was long used for the Complainant's business, so its use to redirect to another party's unrelated business can only be deemed misleading and, therefore, not in connection with a "bona fide" offering of goods or services as described in the example of legitimate uses in the Policy, paragraph 4(c)(i).

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 acquired a recently expired and highly distinctive domain name – composed with a well-known automobile mark – and was therefore on notice that there was a strong likelihood that it had trademark significance. In these circumstances, especially noting Complainant's prior use of the disputed domain name for almost 15 years, the Respondent's prior awareness of the Complainant may reasonably be inferred. Therefore, redirecting the disputed domain name to a commercial gaming website accords with the example of bad faith found in the Policy, paragraph 4(b)(iv), creating a likelihood of confusion with the Complainant's mark to attract Internet users to another site for commercial gain.

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 <wallanhyundai.com> be transferred to the Complainant.

/W. Scott Blackmer/

W. Scott Blackmer

Sole Panelist

Date: August 10, 2026