

## **ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION**

Halliburton Energy Services, Inc. v. Hostmaster, Halliburton Energy Services, Inc.

Case No. D2024-4117

### **1. The Parties**

Complainant is Halliburton Energy Services, Inc., United States of America (“United States”), represented by Polsinelli PC, United States.

Respondent is Hostmaster, Halliburton Energy Services, Inc., United States.

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

The disputed domain name <halliburton.jobs> is registered with EPAG Domainservices GmbH (the “Registrar”).

### **3. Procedural History**

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the “Center”) on October 7, 2024. On October 8, 2024, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On October 22, 2024, 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 (REDACTED FOR PRIVACY) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to Complainant on October 22, 2024, providing the registrant and contact information disclosed by the Registrar, and inviting Complainant to submit an amendment to the Complaint. Complainant filed an amendment to the Complaint on December 6, 2024.

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 December 11, 2024. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was December 31, 2024. Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified Respondent’s default on January 2, 2025.

The Center appointed Georges Nahitchevansky as the sole panelist in this matter on January 13, 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, Halliburton Energy Services, Inc., is a provider of products and services to the global energy industry. Complainant owns and uses the name and mark HALLIBURTON in connection with its many products and services in the global energy industry. Complainant owns trademark registrations for the HALLIBURTON mark in the United States (Registration Nos. 2,575,819 and 2,575,840), which issued to registration on June 4, 2002. Complainant also owns numerous trademark registrations in 60 jurisdictions for its HALLIBURTON mark and other HALLIBURTON-formative marks. Lastly, Complainant owns and uses the domain name <halliburton.com> for a website providing information concerning Complainant and its products and services.

The identity of the true Respondent in this proceeding is not altogether clear. The registrant and contact information verified by the Registrar for the disputed domain name is the same information as used by the Complainant. The disputed domain name was originally registered on September 15, 2005. Although the disputed domain name may have conceivably changed owners at some point, Complainant has not provided evidence establishing such and any purported change of ownership is not apparent to the Panel from the Whois records on file. At least as of October 4, 2024, the disputed domain name resolved to an expired page provided by a DNS management company.

#### **5. Parties' Contentions**

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

Complainant contends that it has satisfied each of the elements required under the Policy for a transfer of the disputed domain name.

Notably, Complainant contends that it is a leading provider of products and services in the global energy industry and that it has used its HALLIBURTON mark with its products and services since 1919.

Complainant asserts that the disputed domain name is identical as it fully incorporates and solely consists of the well-known trademark HALLIBURTON with the generic Top-Level Domain ("gTLD") ".jobs" being irrelevant.

Complainant maintains that Respondent does not have rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name as Respondent (i) is not commonly known by the HALLIBURTON name and mark, and (ii) has not made any legitimate noncommercial or fair use of the disputed domain name as the disputed domain name merely resolves to a blank page.

Lastly, Complainant argues that Respondent has registered and used the disputed domain name in bad faith "for the sole purpose of exploiting Complainant's rights, title, interest and goodwill in the HALLIBURTON mark". In that regard, Complainant notes that the HALLIBURTON mark is well known and that given the many trademark registrations Complainant owns for its HALLIBURTON mark it is more than likely that Respondent was well aware of Complainant and its HALLIBURTON mark when it registered the disputed domain name. Complainant further states that Respondent registered the disputed domain name in September 2024 "without the Complainant's knowledge or consent, and indeed in direct contravention of Complainant's consent".

## **B. Respondent**

Respondent did not reply to Complainant's contentions.

## **6. Discussion and Findings**

Under paragraph 4(a) of the Policy, to succeed Complainant must satisfy the Panel that:

- (i) the disputed domain name is identical or confusingly similar to a trademark or service mark in which Complainant has rights;
- (ii) Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of 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 Selected UDRP Questions, Third Edition, ("[WIPO Overview 3.0](#)"), section 1.7.

Complainant has shown rights in its HALLIBURTON mark for purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 1.2.1. As the disputed domain name fully and solely incorporates the HALLIBURTON mark, the disputed domain name is identical for purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 1.7.

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

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

As the Panel finds, as discussed below, that Complainant has not satisfied the third element of the Policy, it will not discuss the second element.

### **C. Registered and Used in Bad Faith**

The Panel notes that, for 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.

While Respondent has not appeared in this matter, the Panel has reservations about whether Complainant has proven bad faith registration and use of the disputed domain name. To begin, there is a question regarding the actual Respondent in this matter. The Registrar's verification lists Complainant as the owner of the disputed domain name and shows registrant's address and contact information to be the same as Complainant's. The contact email for the disputed domain name, however, is "[...][@halliburton.com](#)", an email address that presumably is associated with Complainant's <halliburton.com> domain name.

Complainant does not make a claim that the disputed domain name changed ownership at any time since its registration and simply claims without any explanation, let alone any evidence, that the disputed domain name was in fact registered on September 15, 2024. However, there is nothing in the record that establishes that some unrelated party registered the disputed domain name at that time, assumed control of the disputed domain name and/or obtained access to the disputed domain name for some nefarious purpose. The Whois provided by Complainant for the disputed domain name shows that the disputed domain name was registered on September 15, 2005, and that an update occurred on September 15, 2024. As Complainant has provided no information regarding this discrepancy, the Panel cannot conclude that the update date is

somehow a change of ownership, particularly as updates to a registrar domain name record can simply be a change of IP address or email address, or the updating of contact information such as an address of the registrant.

Notably, Complainant was provided with the Registrar's verification and given the opportunity to file an amended complaint and could have explained and provided evidence as to why the disputed domain name, registered using Complainant's exact information, was not linked to Complainant or was under the control of some other unknown party unconnected to Complainant. However, Complainant did not substantively address this issue and simply chose to let the matter proceed against the named Respondent, which in this case, appears to be Complainant.

Given the foregoing, the Panel is of the view that the disputed domain name may have been owned or registered on behalf of Complainant in 2005. Indeed, a review of archival pages publicly available through the Wayback Machine at "www.archive.org" shows that, from at least as early as January 2007, the disputed domain name resolved to a page within Complainant's website at "www.halliburton.com" that concerned careers at Complainant and included a highlighted title for "Halliburton.jobs" or "Job Openings."<sup>1</sup> That redirect to Complainant's website appears to have continued at least until August 2018. Again, as Complainant does not address any of the history regarding the disputed domain name or its use since 2005, it is difficult for the Panel to conclude that the disputed domain name was registered in bad faith. From all appearances, and without any evidence to the contrary, it seems that the disputed domain name was actively connected to Complainant and its website for at least eleven years. As such, given Complainant's silence on the issue and the lack of any evidence establishing that the disputed domain name was being used for an illicit purpose, there is a strong possibility that the disputed domain name was registered by or on behalf of Complainant.<sup>2</sup>

In all, the Panel finds that Complainant has failed to prove bad faith registration or use of the disputed domain, and thus the complaint fails on the third element.

## 7. Decision

For the foregoing reasons, the Complaint is denied.

*/Georges Nahitchevansky/*  
**Georges Nahitchevansky**  
Sole Panelist  
Date: January 27, 2025

---

<sup>1</sup> On the topic of a panel conducting such independent research of publicly available sources, see section 4.8 of the [WIPO Overview 3.0](#).

<sup>2</sup> On November 14, 2024, the Center was copied on an email from an individual at Complainant. In that email, it was suggested that the disputed domain name had been controlled at some point by a former employee of Complainant. If that were the case, then absent any explanation from Complainant it would appear that the original registration of the disputed domain name may not have been done in bad faith but perhaps with the permission of Complainant (given its subsequent use as a redirect to a page within Complainant's website at "www.halliburton.com").