

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

Naturgy Energy Group, S.A. v. Sophie Silveira
Case No. D2026-2718

1. The Parties

The Complainant is Naturgy Energy Group, S.A., Spain, represented by Elzaburu SLP, Spain.

The Respondent is Sophie Silveira, Brazil.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <naturgyvirtual.online> is registered with NameSilo, LLC (the “Registrar”).

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the “Center”) on June 23, 2026. On June 23, 2026, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On June 23, 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 (User #588f5de6 Privacy, See PrivacyGuardian.org) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on June 26, 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 July 1, 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 July 8, 2026. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was July 28, 2026. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent’s default on August 3, 2026.

The Center appointed Anne-Virginie La Spada as the sole panelist in this matter on August 10, 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, based in Spain, is an important player in the energy sector. Its main activities include the supply and distribution of natural gas and electricity and the generation of electricity. It operates in Spain, in countries of Latin America and in other countries as well.

Various rankings conducted by independent third parties since 2018 have recognized the Complainant's trademark NATURGY to be one among the 20 most well-known or valuable brands in Spain.

The Complainant owns several trademark registrations for NATURGY (alone or with other word or design elements) in many countries throughout the world, including:

- European trademark registration for NATURGY no. 016692527, registered on November 10, 2017, in classes 4, 9, 11, 35, 37, 39, 40 and 42.
- International trademark registration for NATURGY no. 1395609, registered on December 20, 2017, in classes 4, 9, 11, 35, 37, 39, 40 and 42;
- Brazilian trademark registration for NATURGY no. 912746327, registered on July 9, 2019, in class 40.

The Complainant is the owner of several domain names containing NATURGY, including the domain names <naturgy.com>, registered on May 8, 2007, and <naturgy.online> registered on July 6, 2017.

The disputed domain name was registered on June 10, 2025. It does not appear to have been connected to an active website since its registration.

The Complainant sent a cease-and-desist letter to the Respondent on May 6, 2026, through the abuse email made available by the Registrar. The Respondent did not reply to this communication.

On June 22, 2026, an attempt to access the website connected to the disputed domain name triggered an "Access Blocked – Web Page Blocked" warning notice issued by FortiGuard Intrusion Prevention, informing that access to the web page was blocked because the website was in violation of the applicable Internet policy and was in the category of "malicious websites".

At the time of filing of the amended Complainant, the disputed domain name resolved to a parking page of the Registrar.

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 confusingly similar to its well-known trademark NATURGY. The NATURGY trademark, which is wholly incorporated in the disputed domain name, remains clearly recognizable as the first, dominant and only distinctive element of the disputed domain name, while the term “virtual” is a non-distinctive dictionary word incapable of distinguishing the disputed domain name from the Complainant’s trademark.

The Complainant further contends that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name. The Complainant has not authorized, licensed or otherwise permitted the Respondent to register or use the disputed domain name nor any sign identical or confusingly similar to its NATURGY trademark. The Complainant adds that a simple Google search of “NATURGY” confirms that its company is the sole economic operator known for the goods and services covered by the Complainant’s earlier trademarks, making it implausible that the Respondent could be commonly known by the disputed domain name. The Complainant also considers that the disputed domain name creates a risk of implied affiliation with the Complainant, as internet users are likely to associate it with an official online or virtual platform, customer portal, client area or digital service of the Complainant.

Finally, the Complainant contends that the disputed domain name was registered and used in bad faith. The term “naturgy” has no meaning and consequently, is highly distinctive for the goods and services covered by the Complainant’s trademarks. The Complainant’s trademarks have furthermore acquired a high level of recognition among customers. This raises a reasonable inference that the Respondent registered the disputed domain name for its trademark value and not for its non-existent dictionary meaning. The fact that the disputed domain name was not used in connection with an active website does not prevent a finding of bad faith under the passive holding doctrine. The “Access blocked” warning notice issued by FortiGuard Intrusion Prevention is also indicative of the disputed domain name having been flagged and blocked by network-security services and further confirms the absence of any bona fide offering of goods or services. In such circumstances, given the well-known status of the NATURGY trademark, the passive holding of the disputed domain name is tantamount to use in bad faith.

B. Respondent

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

6. Discussion and Findings

According to paragraph 4(a) of the Policy, a complainant must assert and prove each of the following:

- (i) the domain name registered by the respondent is identical or confusingly similar to a trademark or service mark in which the complainant has rights;
- (ii) the respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the domain name; and
- (iii) the domain name registered by the respondent 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 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, “virtual”) may bear on assessment of the second and third elements, the Panel finds the addition of such term 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.

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.

Based on the information submitted by the Complainant, the Complainant has not granted the Respondent authorization to use its trademarks within the disputed domain name. Moreover, there is no evidence indicating that the Respondent is commonly known by the disputed domain name.

The Panel observes that the disputed domain name resolved to a parking page of the Registrar. The Respondent does not seem to have operated any bona fide or legitimate business under the disputed domain name (or to have made corresponding preparations), and it is not making any noncommercial or fair use of the disputed domain name. In the Panel’s view, the “Access blocked” warning notice issued by FortiGuard Intrusion Prevention also tends to confirm the absence of any good faith use of the disputed domain name.

Finally, the Respondent did not file a Response to the Complaint. The Panel may draw from the lack of a Response the inferences that it considers appropriate, according to the Rules, paragraph 14(b).

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.

Given the longstanding use and reputation of the Complainant’s trademark, the Panel finds it implausible that the Respondent chose the disputed domain name without having the Complainant’s mark in mind. The Panels therefore finds that the disputed domain name was registered in bad faith

Panels have found that the non-use of a domain name (including a blank or “coming soon” page) would not by itself prevent a finding of bad faith under the doctrine of passive holding. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 3.3.

Although panelists will look at the totality of the circumstances in each case, factors that have been considered relevant in applying the passive holding doctrine include: (i) the degree of distinctiveness or reputation of the complainant's mark, (ii) the failure of the respondent to submit a response or to provide any evidence of actual or contemplated good-faith use, (iii) the respondent taking active steps to conceal its identity or (iv) the use of false or inaccurate contact details (noted to be in breach of the respondent's registration agreement). Taking the above factors into consideration, panels assess the overall plausibility of any (claimed) good faith use to which the domain name may be put in light of the composition of the domain name in relation to the relevant mark, such that, the more arbitrary or distinctive a mark the less plausible a claimed non-infringing good faith use is likely to be, and vice versa. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 3.3.

Having reviewed the available record, the Panel notes the prior use and reputation of the Complainant's trademark and the composition of the disputed domain name – reproducing the Complainant's trademark entirely and combining it with the term "virtual" that may easily be perceived as referring to on-line activities of the Complainant. The Panel further observes that the disputed domain name was, at some point, connected to a website that triggered an "Access Blocked" warning, which suggests that it resolved to a webpage with potentially non-legitimate content. Finally, the Respondent failed to submit a response or provide any evidence of actual or contemplated good-faith use. In view of the circumstances of this case, the Panel holds that passive holding of the disputed domain name does not prevent a finding of 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 <naturgyvirtual.online> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Anne-Virginie La Spada/

Anne-Virginie La Spada

Sole Panelist

Date: August 24, 2026