

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

Halliburton Energy Services, Inc. v. Daniel Moses
Case No. D2026-3683

1. The Parties

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

1.2 The Respondent is Daniel Moses, United States.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

2.1 The disputed domain name <halliburtoncorp.com> (the "Domain Name") is registered with TLD Registrar Solutions Ltd. (the "Registrar").

3. Procedural History

3.1 The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the "Center") on August 17, 2026. At that time, publicly available Whois details did not identify the underlying registrant of the Domain Name.

3.2 On August 18, 2026, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the Domain Name. On August 19, 2026, the Registrar transmitted by email to the Center its verification response disclosing underlying registrant and contact information for the Domain Name. The Center sent an email to the Complainant on August 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 amendment to the Complaint on August 19, 2026.

3.3 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").

3.4 In accordance with the Rules, paragraphs 2 and 4, the Center formally notified the Respondent of the Complaint, and the proceedings commenced on August 26, 2026. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was September 15, 2026. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent's default on September 16, 2026.

3.5 The Center appointed Matthew S. Harris as the sole panelist in this matter on September 18, 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.

3.6 On September 18, 2026, the Panel issued a procedural order (“Procedural Order No. 1”) in these proceedings. Procedural Order No. 1 noted that, at that time, the Domain Name appeared to resolve to a website which, on its face, impersonated the Complainant, and annexed screenshots of that website. It stated that the Panel intended to rely on this material in reaching its decision, and provided both parties with an opportunity to file (but stated that it did not require) a further submission in that respect by no later than 6 p.m. Central European Time on September 22, 2026.¹ No further submission was received from either party by that deadline.

4. Factual Background

4.1 The Complainant is a company incorporated in Delaware, United States. Since 1919, it has traded under the name HALLIBURTON in connection with the provision of products and services to the energy industry, in particular in relation to the drilling, treatment and servicing of oil, gas and geothermal wells. As at December 31, 2024, the Complainant’s business employed approximately 48,395 people, of 145 nationalities, in more than 70 countries, and reported revenue for 2024 of approximately USD 22.9 billion. The Complainant operates a website at “www.halliburton.com”.

4.2 The Complainant is the owner of, amongst others, the following United States registered trade marks:

- (i) United States registered trade mark No. 2,575,819 for HALLIBURTON as a standard character mark, filed on March 13, 2001, and registered on June 4, 2002, in classes 37, 40 and 42; and
- (ii) United States registered trade mark No. 2,575,840 for HALLIBURTON as a standard character mark, filed on March 23, 2001, and registered on June 4, 2002, in classes 1, 6, 7, 9 and 16.

4.3 The Complainant also owns numerous further trade mark registrations in some 60 other jurisdictions worldwide that comprise or incorporate the term “Halliburton”.

4.4 The Domain Name was registered on August 10, 2026.

4.5 On August 14, 2026, the Domain Name resolved to a webpage stating “This Domain Has Been Successfully Registered!” and that the website was “currently under development”, with a footer credit to “HOSTAFRICA”.

4.6 By September 18, 2026, the Domain Name instead resolved to an active website headed with the term “HALLIBURTON”, displaying a photograph of a building and sign bearing the Complainant’s name, under the heading “Empowering Energy Innovations” and text describing the delivery of “cutting-edge technology and expertise to maximize the potential of oil and gas resources across the globe”, together with navigation tabs headed “Home”, “Services”, “About”, “Blog” and “Contact”. The website’s footer displayed the Complainant’s own corporate address; i.e. “3000 N. Sam Houston Parkway E., Houston, TX 77032, USA”, and a contact email address using the Domain Name. The “Blog” page displayed unedited placeholder text of the kind generated automatically by website-building software, including the heading “Your awesome post title goes here”, dated August 18, 2026.

4.7 The Registrar has disclosed the registrant of the Domain Name which purports to be that of an individual in the United States.

¹ As to the legitimacy of a panel relying upon such material also see [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 4.8.

5. Parties' Contentions

A. Complainant

5.1 The Complainant contends that it has satisfied each of the elements required under the Policy for a transfer of the Domain Name.

5.2 The Complainant contends that the Domain Name is confusingly similar to its HALLIBURTON mark, comprising that mark in its entirety together with the term "corp".

5.3 The Complainant contends that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in the Domain Name. It states that the Respondent is not affiliated with, or licensed by, the Complainant, that the website operating from the Domain Name resolved to an unavailable page as at the date of the Complaint, and that the Respondent has not been commonly known by the Domain Name.

5.4 The Complainant contends that the Domain Name was registered and is being used in bad faith. It relies, amongst other matters, on the fame of its HALLIBURTON mark, the addition of the term "corp" to that mark, and the fact that the identity of the underlying registrant was initially concealed through a privacy or proxy Whois service, which it contends is itself an indication of bad faith.

B. Respondent

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

6. Discussion and Findings

A. Identical or Confusingly Similar

6.1 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 trade mark and the Domain Name. WIPO Overview of WIPO Panel Views on Select UDRP Questions ("[WIPO Overview 3.1](#)"), section 1.7.

6.2 The Complainant has shown rights in a registered trade mark for HALLIBURTON. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.2.1.

6.3 The only sensible reading of the Domain Name is as the Complainant's HALLIBURTON mark combined with the word "corp" and the ".com" generic Top-Level Domain. Accordingly, the entirety of the Complainant's mark is reproduced within the Domain Name and that mark is clearly recognisable in the Domain Name.

6.4 It follows that the Domain Name is confusingly similar to the Complainant's mark for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.7. The addition of the term "corp" does not prevent a finding of confusing similarity between the Domain Name and the mark for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.8.

6.5 The Panel, therefore, finds the first element of the Policy has been established.

B. Rights or Legitimate Interests, and Registered and Used in Bad Faith

6.6 It is usual for panels under the Policy to consider the issues of rights or legitimate interests, and registration and use in bad faith, in turn. However, in this case it is more convenient to consider those issues together. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 2.15.

6.7 The reason for this is that the Panel is more than satisfied on the material before it that the Domain Name both inherently misrepresents that it is operated or authorised by the Complainant and has also been used to falsely impersonate the Complainant.

6.8 The Domain Name comprises the Complainant's HALLIBURTON mark combined with the term "corp", a common abbreviation for "corporation". That term is apt to describe a large commercial entity of the kind operated by the Complainant, and its combination with the Complainant's mark reinforces, rather than dispels, the impression that the Domain Name is owned, operated or otherwise authorised by the Complainant. In these circumstances, the Panel accepts that the Domain Name inherently misrepresents an association with the Complainant, in the sense described in section 2.5.1 of the [WIPO Overview 3.1](#).

6.9 So far as the website operating from the Domain Name is concerned, it adopted the Complainant's HALLIBURTON name and styling, displayed a photograph of a building bearing the Complainant's name and signage, and described itself in terms that mirrored the Complainant's own business as a provider of oil and gas solutions. Its footer went further still, reproducing the Complainant's own corporate address combined with an email address at the Domain Name itself. Taken together, the website operating from the Domain Name deliberately presents itself as being that of the Complainant when it is not.

6.10 There is no right or legitimate interest in holding a domain name for the purpose of falsely impersonating a trade mark owner in this way, and the fact that a domain name is or has been used for such a purpose is evidence that no such right or legitimate interest exists. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 2.5. The registration and use of a domain name for such a purpose also involves registration and use in bad faith. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 3.2.1.

6.11 The Panel is less persuaded by the Complainant's contentions by reference to the Respondent's use of a privacy or proxy Whois service. There is nothing before the Panel to suggest that this was anything other than a consequence of the Registrar's standard privacy service, and as such is not by itself an indicator of bad faith (see, for example, *Microsoft Corporation v. zss panda*, WIPO Case No. [D2025-2308](#)). It may well be that the individual identified as the underlying registrant is not the real registrant of the Domain Name, and if this were the case then this would definitely support a finding of bad faith. But no such case has been advanced by the Complainant and the Panel is satisfied that this is a clear case of bad faith registration and use regardless of the accuracy or otherwise of these Whois details.

6.12 The Panel therefore finds that the second and third elements of the Policy have been established.

7. Decision

7.1 For the foregoing reasons, in accordance with paragraphs 4(i) of the Policy and 15 of the Rules, the Panel orders that the Domain Name <halliburtoncorp.com> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Matthew S. Harris/

Matthew S. Harris

Sole Panelist

Date: September 25, 2026