

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

SAUDI ARABIAN OIL CO. v. david hua, LG
Case No. DCO2025-0029

1. The Parties

Complainant is SAUDI ARABIAN OIL CO., Saudi Arabia, represented by Fish & Richardson P.C., United States of America.

Respondent is david hua, LG, United States of America.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <saudi-aramco.co> ("Domain Name") 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 March 14, 2025. On March 17, 2025, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the Domain Name. On March 18, 2025, the Registrar transmitted by email to the Center its verification response disclosing registrant and contact information for the Domain Name which differed from the named Respondent (Domains By Proxy, LLC) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to Complainant on March 19, 2025, providing the registrant and contact information disclosed by the Registrar, and inviting the Complainant to submit an amendment to the Complaint. Complainant filed an amendment to the Complaint on March 19, 2025. A person using the registrant's email address as confirmed by the Registrar sent an email communication to the Center on March 19, 2025.

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").

In accordance with the Rules, paragraphs 2 and 4, the Center formally notified Respondent of the Complaint, and the proceedings commenced on March 26, 2025. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was April 15, 2025. Respondent did not submit any formal response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Parties of the Commencement of Panel Appointment Process on April 17, 2025.

The Center appointed Marina Perraki as the sole panelist in this matter on May 1, 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

Complainant is a limited liability company created by Royal Decree according to the laws of Saudi Arabia, with its principal place of business in Saudi Arabia.

Complainant maintains operations in the United States of America and internationally, with subsidiaries and affiliates in Saudi Arabia, the United Arab Emirates, China, Egypt, India, Japan, the Netherlands (Kingdom of the), Singapore, Republic of Korea, and the United Kingdom.

Complainant has continuously used the SAUDI ARAMCO trademark in connection with its oil production and related goods and services since at least 1988. "ARAMCO" is an acronym for "Arabian American Oil Company", which is Complainant's former company name.

Complainant owns numerous trademark registrations for SAUDI ARAMCO worldwide, including: the European Union trademark registration No. 000918581, SAUDI ARAMCO (word), filed on August 25, 1998 and registered on December 1, 1999 for goods in international class 4 and the United Arab Emirates trademark registration No. 37627, SAUDI ARAMCO (word), filed on July 30, 2020 and registered on August 28, 2001 for goods in international class 4.

Complainant also owns the domain names <saudiaramco.com> and <aramco.com>, which were registered on August 6, 1997, and January 27, 1994, respectively. The <saudiaramco.com> domain name of Complainant redirects to the current Complainant's website at "www.aramco.com".

The Domain Name was registered on December 1, 2022 and redirects to a competitor third party's website, namely Energy America's website, under "https://ea-global.us/".

5. Parties' Contentions

A. Complainant

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

B. Respondent

Respondent did not formally reply to Complainant's contentions. A person under the contact email address of Respondent replied on March 19, 2025 that the Domain Name does not belong to him and that his email address has been used for multiple other domain names and a Complaint was filed before Go Daddy in January.

6. Discussion and Findings

Paragraph 4(a) of the Policy lists the three elements that Complainant must satisfy with respect to the Domain Name:

(i) the Domain Name is identical or confusingly similar to a trademark or service mark in which Complainant has rights; and

- (ii) Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the Domain Name; and
- (iii) the Domain Name has been registered and is being used in bad faith.

Preliminary Issue – Respondent Identity

On March 19, 2025, a person under the contact email address of Respondent sent an email communication to the Center stating that he is not the holder of the Domain Name.

Given that the named Respondent, per the registrant and contact information disclosed by the Registrar, is listed as the registrant of the Domain Name and that the supposedly underlying registrant did not send any communications to the Center, in these circumstances, the Panel finds that “david hua” is the Respondent as the holder of the Domain Name registration (see paragraph 1 of the Rules).

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 Selected UDRP Questions, Third Edition, (“[WIPO Overview 3.0](#)”), section 1.7.

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.

The entirety of the mark is reproduced within the Domain Name. Accordingly, the Domain Name is confusingly similar to the mark for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 1.7.

Although the addition of a hyphen between the two words SAUDI and ARAMCO may bear on assessment of the second and third elements, the Panel finds that this addition does not prevent a finding of confusing similarity between the Domain Name and the mark for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 1.8.

The country code Top-Level Domain (“ccTLD”) “.co” is disregarded, as ccTLDs typically do not form part of the comparison as they are required for technical reasons (*Rexel Developpements SAS v. Zhan Yequn*, WIPO Case No. [D2017-0275](#); and *Hay & Robertson International Licensing AG v. C. J. Lovik*, WIPO Case No. [D2002-0122](#)).

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 3.0](#), section 2.1.

Having reviewed the available record, the Panel finds Complainant has established a prima facie case that Respondent lacks rights or legitimate interests in the Domain Name. Respondent has not rebutted

Complainant's prima facie showing and has not come forward with any relevant evidence demonstrating rights or legitimate interests in the Domain Name such as those enumerated in the Policy or otherwise.

Panels have held that the use of a domain name to redirect users to a competing site would not support a claim to rights or legitimate interests. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 2.5.3.

Furthermore, the Panel notes that Respondent likely used false contact details when registering the Domain Name as follows from the email of the holder of the email address entered in the Whois record.

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.

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 3.0](#), section 3.2.1.

Because the SAUDI ARAMCO mark had been used and registered by Complainant before the Domain Name registration and enjoyed reputation, as repeatedly recognized (*Saudi Arabian Oil Co. v. Lim Sang Woon*, WIPO Case No. [D2019-2212](#); *Saudi Arabian Oil Co. v. Identity Protect Limited / Joe Lewis, Flashpoint Marketing*, WIPO Case No. [D2018-0907](#)), the Panel finds it more likely than not that Respondent had Complainant's mark in mind when registering the Domain Name. This also in view of the fact that the Domain Name incorporates Complainant's mark in total, along with a hyphen and the ccTLD for Colombia. Furthermore, the Domain Name redirects to a Complainant's competitor website, which clearly shows that Respondent knew of Complainant and targeted the same.

As regards bad faith use, the Panel considers the following factors:

- (i) the use of the Domain Name to redirect to a Complainant's competitor;
- (ii) the failure of Respondent to submit any formal response; and
- (iii) the use of false information when registering the Domain Name.

Having reviewed the record, the Panel finds Respondent's registration and use of the Domain Name constitutes bad faith under the Policy.

The Panel finds that 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 Domain Name <saudi-aramco.co> be transferred to Complainant.

/Marina Perraki/

Marina Perraki

Sole Panelist

Date: May 15, 2025