

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

Halliburton Energy Services, Inc. v. Mike Avila, Foreshore
Case No. D2024-4378

1. The Parties

The Complainant is Halliburton Energy Services, Inc., United States of America, represented by Polsinelli PC Law firm, United States of America.

The Respondent is Mike Avila, Foreshore, United States of America.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <haliibuton.com> is registered with NameCheap, Inc. (the "Registrar").

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the "Center") on October 24, 2024. On October 24, 2024, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On October 25, 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, Privacy service provided by Withheld for Privacy ehf) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on October 28, 2024, 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 October 28, 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 the Respondent of the Complaint, and the proceedings commenced on October 29, 2024. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was November 18, 2024. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent's default on November 20, 2024.

The Center appointed Joseph Simone as the sole panelist in this matter on November 26, 2024. 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, Halliburton Energy Services, Inc., is one of the world's largest providers of products and services to the energy industry. Founded in 1919, the Complainant now has more than 40,000 employees, representing 130 nationalities, and operations in approximately 70 countries.

The Complainant has an extensive global portfolio of trade marks incorporating the name HALLIBURTON, including the following:

- United States Trade Mark Registration No. 2,575,819 in Classes 37, 40, and 42, registered on June 4, 2002; and
- United States Trade Mark Registration No. 2,575,840 in Classes 1, 6, 7, 9, and 16, registered on June 4, 2002.

The disputed domain name was registered on October 12, 2024.

According to evidence provided by the Complainant, at the time of filing the Complaint, the disputed domain name resolved to a blank website with an error message. At the time of issuance of this Decision, the disputed domain name continues to resolve to the same blank website.

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 registered by the Respondent is identical or confusingly similar to the Complainant's HALLIBURTON trade marks, and that the addition of the generic Top-Level Domain ("gTLD") ".com" does not affect the analysis as to whether the disputed domain name is identical or confusingly similar to the Complainant's trade marks.

Furthermore, the Complainant argues that the typos in the disputed domain name does not eliminate the risk of confusion between the disputed domain name and the Complainant's mark.

The Complainant asserts that it has not authorized the Respondent to use the HALLIBURTON mark, and there is no evidence to suggest that the Respondent has used, or undertaken any demonstrable preparations to use, the disputed domain name in connection with a bona fide offering of goods or services.

The Complainant also claims there is no evidence indicating that the Respondent has any connection to the HALLIBURTON mark in any way, and that there is no plausible good-faith reason for the Respondent to have registered the disputed domain name. The Complainant therefore concludes that the registration and any use of the disputed domain name whatsoever must be in bad faith.

B. Respondent

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

6. Discussion and Findings

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 trade mark and the disputed domain name. WIPO Overview of WIPO Panel Views on Selected UDRP Questions, Third Edition, ("[WIPO Overview 3.0](#)"), section 1.7.

The Panel acknowledges that the Complainant has established rights in the HALLIBURTON trade marks in many jurisdictions around the world.

The Panel finds the mark is recognizable within the disputed domain name. Accordingly, the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to the mark for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 1.7.

Further, the disputed domain name should be considered a case of typo-squatting. Here, the disputed domain name is identical to the Complainant's mark, except that the second "l" has been replaced by a "i" and the "r" has been deleted. Such misspelling does not change the overall visual impression created by the disputed domain name or to avoid a finding of confusing similarity between the disputed domain name and the Complainant's trade mark for the purposes of the Policy ([WIPO Overview 3.0](#), sections 1.7, 1.9, and 1.11.1).

The Panel therefore finds that the Complainant has satisfied the requirements of paragraph 4(a)(i) of the Policy in establishing its rights in the HALLIBURTON trade mark and in showing that the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to its mark.

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.

The Complainant asserts that it has not authorized the Respondent to use its trade marks and there is no evidence to suggest that the Respondent has used, or undertaken any demonstrable preparations to use, the disputed domain name in connection with a bona fide offering of goods or services. Having reviewed the available record, the Panel finds that the Complainant has established a prima facie case that the Respondent lacks rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name.

The Respondent did not file a response and has therefore failed to assert factors or put forth evidence to establish that it enjoys rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name. Meanwhile, no evidence has been provided to demonstrate that the Respondent, prior to the notice of the dispute, had used or demonstrated its preparation to use the disputed domain name in connection with a bona fide offering of goods or services.

There is also no evidence adduced to show that the Respondent has been commonly known by the disputed domain name or the Respondent is making a legitimate noncommercial or fair use of the disputed domain name. As such, the Panel concludes that the Respondent has failed to rebut the Complainant's prima facie showing of the Respondent's lack of rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name, and that none of the circumstances of paragraph 4(c) of the Policy is applicable in this case.

Accordingly, and based on the Panel's findings below, the Panel finds that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name pursuant to paragraph 4(a)(ii) of the Policy.

C. Registered and Used in Bad Faith

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 states that any of the following circumstances, in particular but without limitation, shall be considered as evidence of the registration and use of a domain name in bad faith:

- (i) circumstances indicating that the respondent registered or acquired the domain name primarily for the purpose of selling, renting, or otherwise transferring the domain name registration to the complainant (the owner of the trade mark or service mark) or to a competitor of that complainant, for valuable consideration in excess of the respondent's documented out-of-pocket costs directly related to the domain name; or
- (ii) circumstances indicating that the respondent registered the domain name in order to prevent the owner of the trade mark or service mark from reflecting the mark in a corresponding domain name, provided that the respondent has engaged in a pattern of such conduct; or
- (iii) circumstances indicating that the respondent has registered the domain name primarily for the purpose of disrupting the business of a competitor; or
- (iv) circumstances indicating that the respondent is using the domain name to intentionally attempt to attract, for commercial gain, Internet users to its website or other online location, by creating a likelihood of confusion with the complainant's mark as to the source, sponsorship, affiliation, or endorsement of the respondent's website or location or of a product or service on its website or location.

The examples of bad faith registration and use set forth in paragraph 4(b) of the Policy are not meant to be exhaustive of all circumstances in which bad faith may be found. Other circumstances may also 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).

For reasons discussed under this and the preceding heading, the Panel believes that the Respondent's conduct in this case constitutes bad faith registration and use of the disputed domain name.

When the Respondent registered the disputed domain name, the HALLIBURTON trade marks were already widely known and directly associated with the Complainant's activities. Panels have also consistently found that the non-use of a domain name would not prevent a finding of bad faith under the doctrine of passive holding. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 3.3.

The Panel notes the reputation of the Complainant's trade mark, the typo-squatting nature of the disputed domain name, the failure of the Respondent to submit a response, the Respondent's use of a privacy service to hide his identity, and the implausibility of any good faith use of the disputed domain name – a typo of the Complainant's mark – by the Respondent, and finds that in the circumstances of this case the passive holding of the disputed domain name does not prevent a finding of bad faith under 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 <halibuton.com> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Joseph Simone/

Joseph Simone

Sole Panelist

Date: December 11, 2024