

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

Naturgy Energy Group, S.A. v. Javier Arizón Fanlo
Case No. DAI2026-0049

1. The Parties

The Complainant is Naturgy Energy Group, S.A., Spain, represented by Elzaburu, Spain.

The Respondent is Javier Arizón Fanlo, Spain, self-represented.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <naturgy.ai> is registered with GoDaddy.com, LLC (the “Registrar”).

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the “Center”) on June 8, 2026. On June 8, 2026, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On June 10, 2026, 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 (Registration Private, Domains By Proxy, LLC) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on June 10, 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 June 19, 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 1, 2026. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was July 21, 2026. The Respondent sent an email communication to the Center on July 17, 2026 with no content. Accordingly, the Center notified the commencement of panel appointment process on July 24, 2026.

The Center appointed Manuel Moreno-Torres as the sole panelist in this matter on July 29, 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 Spanish company doing business in the electricity and natural gas sectors and is listed on the Spanish stock market's main benchmark index (IBEX 35).

The Complainant holds a portfolio of trademarks for NATURGY. By way of example:

Spanish Patent and Trademark Office, with registration No. 3665210, filed on May 10, 2017, and registered on November 23, 2017.

European Union Intellectual Property Office, with registration No. 016692527, filed on May 10, 2017, and registered on November 10, 2017.

International Trademark, with registration No. 1395609 registered on December 20, 2017.

The Complainant also holds a portfolio of domain names for NATURGY. As such <naturgy.com>, <naturgy.es> and <naturgy.org>.

The case file has provided evidence to establish that the trademark NATURGY is well-known.

The disputed domain name <naturgy.ai> was registered on September 28, 2023, and redirects to a parking page provided by the Registrar where it assists as a broker to receive purchase offers.

The Complainant sent a cease-and-desist letter to the Respondent on March 16, 2026, who did not answer.

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 that the disputed domain name reproduces the NATURGY mark in its entirety, that the Respondent is not affiliated with or authorized by the Complainant.

When the Complainant sent an inquiry through the Registrar, the Respondent requested an amount for a transfer of the disputed domain name which is clearly more than the reasonable out-of-pocket expenses in relation to its acquisition, that is to say "in the high five-figure to low six-figure range".

Further, the Respondent's use of the disputed domain name implies a high risk of implied affiliation with the Complainant and the registration of a domain name identical to the Complainant's distinctive mark indicates targeting and bad faith.

Regarding the third requirement, the Complainant contends that the disputed domain name does not host any content and only shows a landing page which includes, at the top, a reference to "Get this domain".

B. Respondent

The Respondent did not reply to the Complainant's contentions. On July 17, 2026, the Respondent sent an email communication with no content.

6. Discussion and Findings

Under paragraph 4(a) of the Policy, to succeed the Complainant must satisfy the Panel 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 respect of the disputed domain name; and
- (iii) the disputed domain name was registered and is being used in bad faith.

There are no exceptional circumstances within paragraph 5(f) of the Rules to prevent the Panel from determining the dispute based upon the Complaint, notwithstanding the failure of the Respondents to file a Response. Under paragraph 14(a) of the Rules in the event of such a "default" the Panel is still required "to proceed with a decision on the complaint", whilst under paragraph 14(b) it "shall draw such inferences therefrom as it considers appropriate". This dispute resolution procedure is accepted by the domain name registrant as a condition of registration.

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 entirety of the mark is reproduced within the disputed domain name. Accordingly, the disputed domain name is identical to the mark for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.7.

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 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.

The Panel notes that none of the circumstances described in paragraph 4(c) of the Policy can be inferred from the case file.

Besides, the disputed domain name reproduces the Complainant's NATURGY trademark while the Respondent is not affiliated or authorized somehow to use it in a corresponding domain name. Under these circumstances the Panel cannot imagine any legitimate use by the Respondent especially considering the composition of the disputed domain name suggesting affiliation with the Complainant, the well-known value of NATURGY trademark and, the lack of a response.

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 notes that the Respondent's registration goal was, on balance, to sell the disputed domain name to the Complainant at a profit. The Respondent held the domain name in a parking web and seemingly decided to transfer control of it to the Registrar's brokerage service to make a profit by receiving offers of purchase. These circumstances do not preclude the attempted sale from being considered to have been made by the Respondent, particularly for the well-known reputation of NATURGY trademark. Therefore, the Respondent used the disputed 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 finds that the Respondent knew or should have known about the Complainant and its trademarks. The composition of the disputed domain name, the reputation of the Complainant's trademark and the Respondent's address match with apparent attempt of trademark targeting. Therefore, the Respondent registered the disputed domain name in bad faith.

Moreover, the identity between the disputed domain name and the Complainant's mark, the apparent distinctiveness of the Complainant's NATURGY mark, the lack of any formal Response on the merits, and the absence of any evident legitimate explanation for the registration, the Panel finds that the disputed domain name was registered and is being used in bad faith.

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 <naturgy.ai> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Manuel Moreno-Torres/

Manuel Moreno-Torres

Sole Panelist

Date: August 12, 2026