

## **ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION**

Hilton Worldwide Manage Limited v. Dion Humolli, E N D Properties  
Case No. D2026-2656

### **1. The Parties**

The Complainant is Hilton Worldwide Manage Limited, United Kingdom ("UK"), represented by Markmonitor Limited, United Kingdom.

The Respondent is Dion Humolli, E N D Properties, Netherlands (Kingdom of the).

### **2. The Domain Names and Registrar[s]**

The disputed domain names <hiltonresidence.com> and <hiltonresidencejlt.com> are registered with Hostinger Operations, UAB (the "Registrar").

### **3. Procedural History**

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the "Center") on June 18, 2026. On June 18, 2026, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain names. On June 18, 2026, the Registrar transmitted by email to the Center its verification response disclosing registrant and contact information for the disputed domain names which differed from the named Respondent (The RDAP server redacted the value) 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 amended Complaint on June 24, 2026.

The Center verified that the Complaint and 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 July 6, 2026. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was July 26, 2026. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent's default on July 29, 2026.

The Center appointed Olga Zalomiy as the sole panelist in this matter on August 3, 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 UK company which is member of a group of Hilton companies, a major global hospitality company. The Complainant owns a number of trademark registrations for the HILTON trademark, such as:

- Canadian trademark No. TMA138763 for the HILTON mark, registered on January 15, 1965;
- Australian Trademark No. 370777 for the HILTON mark, registered on January 22, 1982; and
- United Kingdom trademark No. UK00001300389 for the HILTON mark, registered on August 28, 1990.

The Complainant also owns multiple domain names incorporating its trademark, such as <hilton.com>.

The Respondent registered the disputed domain names on November 13, 2025. The disputed domain name <hiltonresidence.com> redirects users to the disputed domain name <hiltonresidencejlt.com>. The <hiltonresidencejlt.com> directs users to a website designed to look like a genuine website for Complainant's hotel in Dubai. The website under the disputed domain name <hiltonresidencejlt.com> displays the Complainant's trademark and its copyrighted materials. The disputed domain name <hiltonresidencejlt.com> has active Mail Exchange ("MX") records.

#### **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 names.

Notably, the Complainant contends that the disputed domain names are confusingly similar to its well-known HILTON trademark, because the disputed domain names reproduce the Complainant's mark in its entirety. The Complainant contends that the generic Top-Level Domain ("gTLD") ".com" should be disregarded for the assessment of confusing similarity. The Complainant argues that inclusion of descriptive word "residence" and abbreviation "jlt" does nothing to distinguish the disputed domain names from the Complainant's mark.

The Complainant submits that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain names because: (i) the Respondent has not been authorized by the Complainant to use its HILTON trademark in the disputed domain names; (ii) the Respondent does not hold any trademark rights corresponding to the disputed domain names; (iii) the Respondent has not been making any legitimate noncommercial or fair use of the disputed domain names because the disputed domain names falsely suggest affiliation with the Complainant; and (iv) the Respondent is not using the disputed domain names for legitimate offering of goods or services because the disputed domain name <hiltonresidence.com> redirects users to the disputed domain name <hiltonresidencejlt.com>. In turn, the <hiltonresidencejlt.com> directs users to a website designed to look like a genuine website for Complainant's hotel in Dubai. The website under the disputed domain name <hiltonresidencejlt.com> displays the Complainant's trademark and its copyrighted materials. The Complainant argues that because the disputed domain name <hiltonresidencejlt.com> has configured MX and Sender Policy Framework ("SPF") records, it can be used for misleading emails. In the Complainant's view, such use cannot confer rights or legitimate interests on the Respondent.

The Complainant asserts that the Respondent registered the disputed domain names in bad faith, because they incorporate the Complainant's well-known trademark. The Complainant contends that the Respondent registered the disputed domain names to attract, for commercial gain, Internet users to its website by creating a likelihood of confusion with the Complainant's trademark because the Respondent's website is attempting to pass off as the Complainant's genuine website. In addition, the Complainant argues that the Respondent's website is potentially a phishing website because it misleads Internet users into divulging personal data from which the Respondent is likely to benefit financially. Furthermore, the Complainant's argues that by configuring MX and SPF records for the disputed domain name <hiltonresidencejlt.com>, the Respondent created a potential for using it for misleading emails. Finally, the Complainant contends that the Respondent is using the disputed domain names to disrupt business of a competitor.

## **B. Respondent**

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

## **6. Discussion and Findings**

Pursuant to paragraph 4(a) of the Policy, to succeed in this proceeding, the Complainant must prove each of the following elements with respect to the disputed domain names:

- (i) the disputed domain names are 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 names; and
- (iii) the disputed domain names have been registered and are 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 names. 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 Panel finds the mark is recognizable within the disputed domain names. Accordingly, the disputed domain names are confusingly similar to the mark for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.7. The inclusion of the gTLD ".com" is typically disregarded in the context of the confusing similarity assessment, being a technical requirement of registration. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.11.1.

Although the addition of other terms here, "residence" and "jlt" 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 names and the mark for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 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 names. 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 names such as those enumerated in the Policy or otherwise.

The evidence on record shows that the Respondent is not commonly known by the disputed domain names, nor has it been authorized by the Complainant to use the Complainant’s trademark in a domain name. The Panel finds that the composition of the disputed domain names reflects the Respondent’s intent to create confusion among users seeking or expecting the Complainant, thereby precluding a finding of fair use of the disputed domain names.

Panels have held that the use of a domain name for illegal activity here, claimed passing off can never confer rights or legitimate interests on a respondent. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 2.13.1. In this case, the Respondent has used one disputed domain name to redirect users to another disputed domain name, which directs users to a website that falsely presents itself as the Complainant’s website promoting Hilton Residences Dubai Jumeirah Lakes Tower.

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 registered the disputed domain names many years after the Complainant had registered and begun using the well-known HILTON trademarks, which supports a finding that the Respondent was aware of the Complainant and its mark when registering the disputed domain names.

The UDRP establishes that, for purposes of paragraph 4(a)(iii), “bad faith” registration and use of a domain name can be established by a showing of circumstances indicating that the respondent is using the domain name to intentionally attempt to attract, for commercial gain, Internet users to the respondent’s website or other online location, by creating a likelihood of confusion with the complainant’s mark as to source, sponsorship, affiliation or endorsement of the respondent’s website or location, or of a product or service on the respondent’s website or location. See Policy, paragraph 4(b)(iv).

Prior UDRP panels have found “the following types of evidence to support a finding that a respondent has registered a domain name to attract, for commercial gain, Internet users to its website by creating a likelihood of confusion with the complainant’s mark: (i) actual confusion, (ii) seeking to cause confusion (including by technical means beyond the domain name itself) for the respondent’s commercial benefit, even if unsuccessful, (iii) the lack of a respondent’s own rights to or legitimate interests in a domain name, (iv) redirecting the domain name to a different respondent-owned website, even where such website contains a disclaimer, (v) redirecting the domain name to or mimicking the complainant’s (or a competitor’s) website, and (vi) absence of any conceivable good faith use.” [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 3.1.4.

Here, the Respondent, who has no rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain names, registered domain names confusingly similar to the Complainant’s well-known trademark and redirected them to a website designed to look like the Complainant’s genuine website in Dubai. The website displays the Complainant’s trademark and its copyrighted materials. This conduct demonstrates that the Respondent is using the disputed domain names to intentionally attract, for commercial gain, Internet users to the Respondent’s websites or other online location by creating a likelihood of confusion with the Complainant’s mark as to the source, sponsorship, affiliation, or endorsement of the Respondent’s websites or other online location, or of the products or services offered there.

Panels have held that the use of a domain name for illegal activity here, claimed impersonation, passing off, 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 also finds that the presence of MX records indicates that mail servers have been configured, which suggests that the Respondent may use the disputed domain name for phishing or other fraudulent activities. The fact that the Respondent failed to respond to the Complainant’s contentions and has provided no evidence of his actual or contemplated good faith use of the disputed domain names supports such finding.

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 names <hiltonresidence.com>, and <hiltonresidencejlt.com> be transferred to the Complainant.

*/Olga Zalomiy/*

**Olga Zalomiy**

Sole Panelist

Date: August 10, 2026