ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION
Oracle International Corporation v. Liang Luoliang
Case No. D2026-3231

1. The Parties

The Complainant is Oracle International Corporation, United States of America (the "United States"), represented by Markmonitor Limited, United Kingdom.

The Respondent is Liang Luoliang, China.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <oraclr.com> (the "Disputed Domain Name") is registered with Unstoppable Domains Inc. (the "Registrar").

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the "Center") on July 22, 2026. On July 23, 2026, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the Disputed Domain Name. On the same date, 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 (Domain Registrant, Unstoppable Privacy Service LLC) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on July 24, 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 27, 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 30, 2026. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was August 19, 2026. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent's default on August 21, 2026.

The Center appointed Marilena Comanescu as the sole panelist in this matter on August 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 a subsidiary within the corporate group headed by Oracle Corporation, which was founded in 1977 in Santa Clara, California, United States. The Complainant and its affiliates are offering a broad range of enterprise technology, including cloud infrastructure, enterprise resource planning, human capital management, customer relationship management, and supply chain management software, serving organizations across virtually every industry sector worldwide.

Oracle Corporation is a publicly traded company, listed on the New York Stock Exchange under the ticker symbol ORCL. In its 2025 fiscal year, it generated revenue of approximately USD 57.4 billion and employed approximately 162,000 people worldwide.

The Complainant owns worldwide trademark rights for ORACLE, such as the following:

- the United States Trademark registration number 1200239 for ORACLE (word), filed on February 7, 1980, registered on July 6, 1982, covering goods in International Classes 9 and 16; and

- the European Union Trademark registration number 002843019 for ORACLE (word), filed on September 10, 2002, registered on June 16, 2004, covering goods and services in International Classes 9, 16, 35, 36, 38, 41, and 42.

The Complainant operates its main website at the domain name <oracle.com>.

The Disputed Domain Name was registered on November 22, 2025, and, at the time of filing of the Complaint, it resolves towards a parking page displaying pay-per-click (“PPC”) links of various content, including third-party goods and services that compete with the Complainant’s business.

According to evidence in the file, the Disputed Domain Name was also used for a variety of different destinations, such as (i) the Internet user was presented with a “DDOS-GUARD” interstitial page bearing an “I'm not a robot” verification prompt; and (ii) the Internet user was redirected to a website at a further third-party domain name and presented with a browser notification-permission prompt styled to induce the user to click “Allow” under the guise of a robot-verification step.

According to evidence annexed to the Complaint, in terms of Domain Name System (“DNS”) setup, the Disputed Domain Name is configured with an “A” record resolving to an IP address associated with a domain name parking and monetization network, and its DNS zone file is also configured with Mail eXchanger (“MX”) servers and Sender Policy Framework (“SPF”) 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 Name.

Notably, the Complainant contends the following:

- the Disputed Domain Name is confusingly similar to its trademark, being a typographical variant of its ORACLE mark, differing only by the substitution of the final letter "e" for the letter "r". The Complainant contends that the Disputed Domain Name can, on balance of probabilities, only reasonably refer to its ORACLE mark. The term "oraclr" has no generic or dictionary meaning;

- the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in the Disputed Domain Name mainly because: (i) the Respondent does not own any trademarks incorporating the terms "oracle" or "oraclr", is not a licensee of the Complainant and has not received any permission, consent or acquiescence to use the Complainant's name or marks in association with the registration of the Disputed Domain Name; (ii) the Complainant has found no evidence that the Respondent has ever traded legitimately under the business names "Oracle" or "Oraclr", or has been commonly known as "Oracle" or "Oraclr" prior to or after the registration of the Disputed Domain Name; (iii) the Disputed Domain Name resolves at random to a variety of destinations, including third-party interstitial and verification pages unconnected with the Complainant, and occasionally displays PPC advertising links which relate to goods and services adjacent to the Complainant's own field of business and the Complainant contends that the PPC advertising links on the website associated with the Disputed Domain Name capitalize on the value of its ORACLE well-known mark; (iv) the Disputed Domain Name's zone file is configured with MX and SPF records, which means that the Disputed Domain Name can be used for email communication. Considering that the Disputed Domain Name, at worst, directly impersonates the Complainant or, at best, carries a high risk of implied affiliation, any email originating from the Disputed Domain Name would be highly confusing or misleading to the Complainant's employees, business partners, agencies or clients; and

- the Respondent registered and is using the Disputed Domain Name in bad faith mainly because: (i) the Respondent intentionally attempted to attract, for commercial gain, Internet users to its website under the Disputed Domain Name or other online locations, by creating a likelihood of confusion with the Complainant's highly distinctive ORACLE name and mark as to the source, sponsorship, affiliation, or endorsement of the Respondent's website or other online locations; (ii) the Disputed Domain Name uses the attractive force of the Complainant's well-known mark in order to misdirect Internet users to third-party advertising; (iii) the nature of the Disputed Domain Name is in and of itself confusing. This species of "initial interest confusion" is derived from the Disputed Domain Name being confusingly similar to the Complainant's ORACLE mark; (iv) the display of PPC advertising in association with a domain name that is confusingly similar to a complainant's trademark in most circumstances is sufficient on its own for a finding of registration and use in bad faith, regardless of whether it was directly placed by the registrant or its registrar of record. The Respondent attempts to divert consumers to unrelated and competing third parties for its own financial gain; and (v) the Disputed Domain Name is configured with MX and SPF records and is therefore capable of email communication, and, since the Disputed Domain Name is confusingly similar to the Complainant's highly distinctive name and mark, anyone receiving an email originating from the Disputed Domain Name would reasonably assume that it was sent from the Complainant.

B. Respondent

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

6. Discussion and Findings

Under the Policy, the Complainant is required to prove on the balance of probabilities that:

(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 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.

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 Name. Accordingly, the Disputed Domain Name is confusingly similar to the Complainant's marks for the purposes of the Policy. WIPO Overview 3.1, section 1.7.

The Panel finds the slight alteration of the Complainant's registered trademark, the replacement of the final letter "e", with the letter "r", 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 1.9.

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 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 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 Panel finds the composition of the Disputed Domain Name, which reproduces the Complainant's distinctive trademark slightly altered and is highly similar to the Complainant's domain name, is most likely intended to confuse Internet users into believing that the Disputed Domain Name is operated by the Complainant.

Furthermore, panels have found that the use of a domain name to host a parked page comprising PPC links does not represent a bona fide offering where such links compete with or capitalize on the reputation and goodwill of the complainant's mark or otherwise mislead Internet users, as in the present case. WIPO Overview 3.1, section 2.9.

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 finds, on balance, that the Disputed Domain Name was registered in bad faith, with knowledge of the Complainant, its trademark and business, particularly because the Disputed Domain Name incorporates the Complainant's trademark slightly misspelled and is nearly identical to the Complainant's own domain name <oracle.com>, the registration of the ORACLE trademark predates the registration of the Disputed Domain Name by more than 40 years and the mark is distinctive and well known worldwide in its industry.

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.

At the time of filing the Complaint, the Disputed Domain Name resolves at random to a variety of destinations, including third-party interstitial and verification pages unconnected with the Complainant, as well as in connection with a webpage providing PPC links related to the Complainant's business.

Paragraph 4(b)(iv) of the Policy provides that the use of a 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 the 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" is evidence of registration and use in bad faith.

The Respondent was using without permission the Disputed Domain Name, comprising a typosquatted version of the Complainant's trademark, in order to get traffic on its web portal and to misleadingly divert Internet users to its website, and thus to potentially obtain commercial gain from the confusion with the Complainant.

The Disputed Domain Name is configured with MX and SPF records. Although the Complainant has not provided any evidence that phishing or fraudulent emails have indeed been sent by the Respondent, the Panel holds, noting the Disputed Domain Name incorporates a typographical error of the Complainant's trademark, that the mere presence of mail servers and SPF records represents in this case a risk of phishing or other fraudulent and abusive activities and together with other evidence, supports an inference of bad faith on the Respondent's side.

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, <oraclr.com>, be transferred to the Complainant.

/Marilena Comanescu/
Marilena Comanescu
Sole Panelist
Date: September 7, 2026