

## **ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION**

Matrix JVCO Ltd v. Khalifa  
Case No. DAE2025-0015

### **1. The Parties**

The Complainant is Matrix JVCO Ltd, of United Arab Emirates (“UAE”), represented by Abu-Ghazaleh Intellectual Property (AGIP), Egypt.

The Respondent is Khalifa, of United Arab Emirates.

### **2. The Domain Name and Registrar**

The disputed domain name <aiq.ae> is registered with AE Domain Administration (.aeDA).

### **3. Procedural History**

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the “Center”) on October 14, 2025. On October 14, 2025, the Center transmitted by email to AE Domain Administration (.aeDA) a request for registrant verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On October 16, 2025, AE Domain Administration (.aeDA) 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 verified that the Complaint satisfied the formal requirements of the UAE Domain Name Dispute Resolution Policy for – UAE DRP approved by .aeDA (the “Policy”), the Rules for UAE Domain Name Dispute Resolution Policy – UAE DRP (the “Rules”), and the Supplemental Rules for UAE Domain Name Dispute Resolution Policy – UAE DRP (the “Supplemental Rules”).

In accordance with the Rules, paragraphs 2(a) and 4(a), the Center formally notified the Respondent of the Complaint, and the proceedings commenced on October 24, 2025. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5(a), the due date for Response was November 13, 2025. The Respondent did not submit any Response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent’s default on November 25, 2025.

The Center appointed Jeremy Speres as the sole panelist in this matter on November 27, 2025. 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 has, since 2021, been offering artificial intelligence (“AI”) services targeted at the oil and gas sector under its AIQ mark.

The Complainant’s mark is registered in various jurisdictions, including UAE Trademark Registration No. 358884 AIQ in class 9, having a registration date of December 7, 2021.

One of the Complainant’s shareholders and joint venture partners, Abu Dhabi National Oil Company P.J.S.C. (“ADNOC”), owns the domain name <aiqintelligence.ae> and the Complainant has used it under license since at least 2021. <sup>1</sup> Presently, that domain name redirects to <aiqintelligence.ai> which was registered on September 14, 2023, and is used to host the Complainant’s primary website.

The disputed domain name was registered on March 10, 2023, and does not resolve to any website.

#### **5. Parties’ Contentions**

##### **A. Complainant**

The Complainant contends that the Respondent was an employee of ADNOC on secondment to the Complainant when he registered the disputed domain name in his own name after being privy to discussions within the Complainant concerning registration of the disputed domain name by the Complainant.

The Complainant further contends that the Respondent offered to sell the disputed domain name to the Complainant for USD 200,000 when he was approached by the Complainant to purchase it. This, the Complainant contends, shows the Respondent’s intentions for the disputed domain name all along, specifically that he registered the disputed domain name for the purpose of selling it to the Complainant for valuable consideration in excess of his documented out-of-pocket costs directly related to the disputed domain name.

##### **B. Respondent**

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

#### **6. Discussion and Findings**

##### **A. Identical or Confusingly Similar**

Given that the Policy is based on the Uniform Domain Name Dispute Resolution Policy (“UDRP”), the Panel considers it appropriate to have regard to the WIPO Overview of WIPO Panel Views on Selected UDRP Questions, Third Edition (“[WIPO Overview 3.0](#)”), except to the extent that the Policy diverges from the UDRP.

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 3.0](#), section 1.7.

The Complainant has shown rights in respect of a trademark or service mark for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 1.2.1.

---

<sup>1</sup> According to the Internet Archive. Limited Panel independent research using public sources is generally permitted. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 4.8.

The entirety of the Complainant's mark is reproduced within the disputed domain name. Accordingly, the disputed domain name is identical to the mark for the purposes of the Policy.

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

## **B. Rights or Legitimate Interests**

Paragraph 6(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 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 3.0](#), 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.

The Panel finds the second element of the Policy has been established.

## **C. Registered or is Being Used in Bad Faith**

The Panel notes that, for the purposes of paragraph 6(a)(iii) of the Policy, paragraph 6(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.

For the following reasons, the Panel considers it more likely than not that the Respondent registered the disputed domain name for the purpose of selling it to the Complainant for valuable consideration in excess of his documented out-of-pocket costs directly related to the disputed domain name, falling squarely within paragraph 6(b)(i) of the Policy.

The Complainant's evidence establishes that it is likely that the Respondent was on secondment to the Complainant when he registered the disputed domain name. Although there is no direct evidence linking the Respondent's specific contact details as presented in the disputed domain name's Whois records with the employee named by the Complainant, there is sufficient circumstantial evidence to lead the Panel to conclude, on balance of probabilities, that the Respondent was likely employed by the Complainant at the time he registered the disputed domain name. This includes the fact that the Complainant has presented a) an email exchanged with one "Khalifa" using the Complainant's company email addresses on October 31, 2023; b) an email exchange in December 2024 between the Complainant and one "Khalifa Al Shimmari" who indicated that he is willing to sell the disputed domain name for USD 200,000; and c) WhatsApp messages in December 2023 between an employee of the Complainant and one "Khalifa Alshemari" who confirmed that the disputed domain name was in his personal account.

The Respondent has not contradicted any of this evidence nor any of the Complainant's claims in this regard.

The Respondent was undoubtedly aware of the Complainant's AIQ mark when he registered it while on likely secondment to the Complainant, who, at that stage, had been using the AIQ mark for two years. The Complainant's evidence of press coverage predating registration of the disputed domain name also indicates that the mark had acquired a significant amount of exposure prior to registration of the disputed domain name which the Respondent was likely exposed to, especially as a secondee.

In light of the Respondent's offer to sell the disputed domain name to the Complainant for a figure that is likely to be orders of magnitude higher than what he paid to register it strongly suggests that this was the Respondent's intention at the time he registered the disputed domain name in his own name, rather than in the name of the company that was hosting him as a secondee. As the Panel in *Arab Bank for Investment and Foreign Trade v. Sabah Mahmoud Akkou*, WIPO Case No. [D2000-1399](#) stated in a case involving an employee of the complainant who registered the relevant domain name in his own name whilst still an employee:

"The reasonable conviction from the above mentioned facts is that the Respondent had registered the domain names at issue in bad faith in order to benefit from it for valuable consideration at an opportune moment."

The Panel draws an adverse inference from the Respondent's failure to take part in the present proceeding where an explanation is certainly called for. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 4.3.

The Panel finds that the Complainant has established the third element of the Policy.

## 7. Decision

For the foregoing reasons, in accordance with paragraphs 6(i) of the Policy and 15 of the Rules, the Panel orders that the domain name <aiq.ae> be transferred to the Complainant.

*/Jeremy Speres/*

**Jeremy Speres**

Sole Panelist

Date: December 11, 2025