

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

Petróleo Brasileiro S.A - Petrobras v. Ademir Da Silva
Case No. D2026-2754

1. The Parties

The Complainant is Petróleo Brasileiro S.A - Petrobras, Brazil, represented by Siqueira Castro Advogados, Brazil.

The Respondent is Ademir Da Silva, Brazil.

2. The Domain Names and Registrar

The disputed domain names <servicospetrobras.com> and <servicospetrobras.org> are registered with Dynadot Inc (the "Registrar").

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the "Center") on June 24, 2026. On June 25, 2026, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain names. On June 26, 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 (Dynadot Privacy Service) 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 amendment to the Complaint on June 26, 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 July 3, 2026. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was July 23, 2026. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent's default on July 28, 2026.

The Center appointed Rodrigo Azevedo as the sole panelist in this matter on July 30, 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 Brazilian company active in the energy sector, including the exploration, production, refining, marketing, and transportation of oil, natural gas, and derivatives.

The Complainant owns numerous trademark registrations for PETROBRAS in Brazil and other jurisdictions, including the Brazilian Trademark Registration No. 004101570, registered on December 10, 1981, which has been recognized as a well-known trademark in Brazil by the Brazilian Patent and Trademark Office ("INPI").

The Complainant also owns and operates domain names incorporating its PETROBRAS trademark, including <petrobras.com>, registered on March 6, 1996.

The disputed domain names <servicospetrobras.com> and <servicospetrobras.org> were registered by the Respondent on March 18, 2026.

At the time of the filing of the Complaint, the disputed domain names resolved to an inactive website. However, on July 3, 2026, both disputed domain names were being used in connection with websites referring to Petrobras and purported recruitment or public selection processes, reproducing references associated with the Complainant and inviting Internet users to access another website with purported services relating to employment opportunities with the Complainant.

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:

(i) The disputed domain names are identical or confusingly similar to the Complainant's trademark. The Complainant asserts that it owns longstanding rights in the PETROBRAS trademark. The disputed domain names incorporate the PETROBRAS trademark in its entirety, preceded only by the Portuguese descriptive term "servicos" ("services" in English).

(ii) The Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain names. The Complainant contends that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the disputed domain names. The Respondent has not been authorized, or otherwise permitted to use the PETROBRAS trademark or to register domain names incorporating that trademark.

There is no evidence that the Respondent is commonly known by the disputed domain names or that the Respondent owns any trademark or other rights corresponding to them. In view of that, the reasons for the Respondent's lack of legitimate interest in respect of the disputed domain names is based on (i) the Complainant's precedence over registered trademarks throughout the world; (ii) the Complainant has owned the domain <petrobras.com.br> since 1996; and (iii) the lack of activity on the disputed domain names.

(iii) The disputed domain names were registered and are being used in bad faith. This requirement is met at the present case because the websites linked to the disputed domain names are empty, and that amounts to a case of passive holding with prior knowledge of the Complainant's trademark. In this sense, by using the disputed domain names and having no content in its respective webpages, it is clear that the Respondent's

conduct is a free-ride on the Complainant's goodwill and trademark.

B. Respondent

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

6. Discussion and Findings

Paragraph 4(a) of the Policy provides that in order to be entitled to a transfer or, as requested in this case, the cancellation of a disputed domain name, a complainant shall prove the following three elements:

- (i) the disputed domain name 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 disputed domain name; and
- (iii) the disputed domain name 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.

Annex 6 to the Complaint shows valid registrations of PETROBRAS trademarks obtained by the Complainant. Based on the available record, the Panel finds 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 trademark PETROBRAS is wholly encompassed within the disputed domain names, together with the term "servicos" (a misspelling of the word "serviços", which in Portuguese means "services"), as well as – respectively – with the generic Top-Level Domain ("gTLD") extensions ".com" and ".org".

Although the addition of other terms (here, "servicos") 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 names and the mark for the purposes of the Policy. WIPO Overview 3.1, section 1.8.

It is also well established that the addition of gTLDs, such as ".com" and ".org", is typically disregarded when determining whether a domain name is confusingly similar to a complainant's trademark as such is viewed as a standard registration requirement. WIPO Overview 3.1, section 1.11.1.

The Panel finds that the disputed domain names are confusingly similar to the Complainant's PETROBRAS trademark, and that 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 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 Complainant has not licensed nor authorized the use of its well-known trademark to the Respondent, and the Panel finds no indication that the Respondent is commonly known by the disputed domain names.

The Panel notes that the composition of the disputed domain names carries a risk of implied affiliation with the Complainant, which prevents a finding of rights or legitimate interests. WIPO Overview 3.1., section 2.5.1. Moreover, the disputed domain names were, at one point, linked to websites reproducing the Complainant's PETROBRAS mark. Although there is a small disclaimer in fine print at the footer of these websites (which will be analyzed in more detail in the next topic), the Panel finds it is not enough to reverse the general perception of affiliation with the Complainant. Also, the Respondent resides in Brazil, where PETROBRAS is well known, and based on the available record, it is not an authorized reseller or service provider for the Complainant, nor has it obtained any permission for such reproduction of the trademark.

Based on the available record, 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.

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.

The Panel concludes that it is not likely that the Respondent was not aware of the Complainant's trademark and that the registration of the disputed domain names was a mere coincidence.

When the disputed domain names were registered (in 2026) the PETROBRAS trademark was already well known and directly connected with the Complainant's products and services, especially in Brazil, where the Respondent resides.

Also, the Panel considers that the addition of the term "servicos" (a misspelling of the word "serviços", meaning "services" in Portuguese) to the disputed domain names enhances the potential for confusion in the present case, as it suggests that the respective websites are official PETROBRAS service channels.

The Panel, as mentioned above, noted the existence of a small disclaimer at the bottom of the pages linked to the disputed domain names, stating that the websites would not belong to Complainant. However, this small reference contrasts with the general impression brought by the disputed domain names and by the respective websites, in which the references to PETROBRAS are ostensive.

Actually, the composition of the disputed domain names and the content on the websites linked to the disputed domain names - including references to the Complainant and reproductions of the Complainant's trademark - makes it clear to the Panel that the Respondent intentionally attempted to attract the

Complainant's customers, for commercial gain, to its website, by creating a likelihood of confusion with the Complainant's mark as to the source, sponsorship, affiliation, or endorsement of the websites.

Finally, the absence of a formal response from the Respondent to the Complainant's contentions and of any justification for the use of the Complainant's well-known trademark is further evidence of bad faith in registering and using the disputed domain names in the present case.

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 <servicospetrobras.com> and <servicospetrobras.org> be cancelled.

Rodrigo Azevedo

Sole Panelist

Date: August 13, 2026