

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

Halliburton Energy Services, Inc. v. Gon Tony
Case No. D2026-3083

1. The Parties

The Complainant is Halliburton Energy Services, Inc., United States of America ("United States"), represented by Polsinelli PC, United States.

The Respondent is Gon Tony, United States.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <halliburtonco.com> is registered with PDR Ltd. d/b/a PublicDomainRegistry.com (the "Registrar").

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the "Center") on July 13, 2026. On July 14, 2026, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On July 15, 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 sent an email communication to the Complainant on July 15, 2026, providing additional registrant and contact information disclosed by the Registrar.

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 August 5, 2026. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was August 25, 2026. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent's default on August 31, 2026.

The Center appointed Gregory N. Albright as the sole panelist in this matter on September 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, founded in 1919, is one of the world's largest providers of products and services to the energy industry. It has more than 40,000 employees, representing 130 nationalities, and operates in about 70 countries. It serves the upstream oil and gas industry throughout the lifecycle of the reservoir, from locating hydrocarbons and managing geological data to drilling and formation evaluation, well construction and completion.

The Complainant has devoted much effort and expense to protecting its intellectual property rights, and has continually used the HALLIBURTON mark in commerce for more than 80 years. The Complainant owns more than 370 trademark registrations in 60 countries worldwide, including the following:

Reg. No. 2,575,819, issued by the United States Patent & Trademark Office ("USPTO") on June 4, 2002, for the HALLIBURTON mark; and

Reg. No. 2,575,840, issued by the USPTO on June 4, 2002.

The Complainant has also registered domain names incorporating its HALLIBURTON mark, including its official website at "www.halliburton.com".

The disputed domain name was registered on July 6, 2026. The disputed domain name currently resolves to an unavailable website. The Respondent used an email associated with the disputed domain name to impersonate a Halliburton employee in connection with attempted purchase order fraud.

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.

The Complainant first contends that the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to the well-known HALLIBURTON mark. The disputed domain name contains the entirety of the mark with the addition of "co" at the end. The addition of "co" does not dispel the confusing similarity of the disputed domain name to the Complainant's mark. WIPO Overview of WIPO Panel Views on Select UDRP Questions (["WIPO Overview 3.1"](#)), section 1.8.

Second, the Complainant contends that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name. The Respondent is not commonly known by the disputed domain name. The Respondent is not (1) affiliated with the Complainant; (2) licensed to use the HALLIBURTON mark; or (3) licensed to register or use domain names or associated email addresses incorporating the HALLIBURTON mark. By registering a domain name that is confusingly similar to the HALLIBURTON mark, the Respondent improperly sought to exploit the Complainant's trademark rights, which is not a bona fide use of the disputed domain name. In addition, the Respondent has used an email address associated with the disputed domain name in connection with attempted purchase order fraud.

Finally, the Complainant asserts that the Respondent registered and is using the disputed domain name in bad faith. The Complainant's HALLIBURTON mark is well-known, and its trademark rights have long been established. The circumstances make it clear that the Respondent registered the disputed domain name with knowledge of the mark. The incorporation of the entirety of the distinctive HALLIBURTON mark, only adding "co" to the end of the disputed domain name, is presumptive evidence of the Respondent's bad faith registration and use. In addition, as noted above, the Respondent used an email associated with the disputed domain name to impersonate a Halliburton employee and attempt a purchase order fraud.

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 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, “co” – may bear on assessment of the second and third elements, the Panel finds that 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 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.

In addition, Panels have held that the use of a domain name for illegal activity – here claimed impersonation of the Complainant's employee for fraudulent purposes – can never confer rights or legitimate interests on a respondent. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 2.13.1.

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.

Here, the Respondent registered the disputed domain name on July 6, 2026, many years after the Complainant's 2002 registrations of the HALLIBURTON mark in the United States, where the Respondent is located. The disputed domain name incorporates the HALLIBURTON mark in its entirety, with the addition of the term "co", and the Respondent used an associated email address to impersonate the Complainant's employee in connection with attempted purchase order fraud. This sequence of events, together with the confusing similarity of the disputed domain name and the mark, supports the conclusion that the Respondent registered the disputed domain name with knowledge of the Complainant's mark for the purpose of exploiting it for improper purposes. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), sections 3.2.1 and 3.2.2. The Panel therefore finds that the Respondent registered the disputed domain name in bad faith.

In addition, Panels have held that active use of a domain name for illegal activity, like the Respondent's impersonation of the Complainant's employee for fraudulent purposes, constitutes bad faith. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 3.4.

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 <halliburtonco.com> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Gregory N. Albright/

Gregory N. Albright

Sole Panelist

Date: September 17, 2026