Decision for dispute CAC-UDRP-107302

Case number	CAC-UDRP-107302
Time of filing	2025-02-20 12:26:48
Domain names	hilirobinson.com, hillrobinson.site, hillrobinsonrecruiter.site

Case administrator

Organization	Iveta Špiclová (Czech Arbitration Court) (Case admin)

Complainant

Organization	Hill Robinson International Ltd

Respondents

Name	Fabio Souza
Name	Wesley Prado
Name	Care Citrino

OTHER LEGAL PROCEEDINGS

The Panel is not aware of any other legal proceedings which are pending or decided and which relate to the disputed domain names.

IDENTIFICATION OF RIGHTS

The Complainant relies on unspecified rights in the mark "HILL ROBINSON".

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

The Complaint provides negligible information but it appears from a website at www.hillrobinson.com that the Complainant is part of an international group providing yacht management services for superyachts under the mark HILL ROBINSON.

The disputed domain names <hilirobinson.com>, <hillrobinson.site> and <hillrobinsonrecruiter.site> were registered in the names of the three Respondents with addresses in Brazil with the same Registrar, Hostinger operations, UAB, on 29 January 2025, 31 January 2025 and 11 February 2025.

PARTIES CONTENTIONS

The Complainant contends that the requirements of the Policy have been met and that the disputed domain names should be transferred to it.

No administratively compliant Response has been filed.

RIGHTS

The Complaint states that "Hill Robinson has been a registered trademark in the EU since 2012" but does not identify any specific registration. However, the Panel notes from its own interrogation of the online database provided by the EU Intellectual Property Office that Hill Robinson Group Ltd is the registrant of EU Trade Mark No. 010561017 for a figurative mark containing the name HILL ROBINSON registered in classes 7,12,35, 36, 37, 42 and 45 on 1 October 2012 pursuant to an application filed on 13 January 2012.

The Panel further notes from the online database of the UK Companies Registry (Companies House) that

- at the date on which the Complaint was filed, Hill Robinson Group Ltd had a controlling interest of more than 75% of the shares of the Complainant, Hill Robinson International Ltd;
- Hill Robinson Group Ltd ceased to hold a controlling interest in the Complainant on 28 March 2025 and on the same date Niall Robinson acquired a controlling interest of more than 50% but less than 75% of the Complainant's shares.

The Panel further notes from the online database of the Guernsey Companies Registry that Niall Robinson is a Director of Hill Robinson Group Ltd. Niall Robinson is also described on the website at www.hillrobinson.com as the Founding Partner and CEO based at the Monaco Office. The website identifies a UK office at the same address as the Complainant's registered office.

The Panel is satisfied on the basis of the above matters and in the absence of any challenge by the Respondents that the Complainant has rights in the above mark as a member of the same group of companies as the company registered as its proprietor and permitted by the proprietor to use it.

The Panel is further satisfied that each of the disputed domain names is confusingly similar to this mark. The first of the disputed domain names consists of the name "HILL ROBINSON" run together, with the letter "i" substituted for the second letter "l", and the generic top level domain name suffix. The second disputed domain name consists of the name "HILL ROBINSON" run together and the generic top level domain name suffix. The third disputed domain name consists of the name "HILL ROBINSON" run together, a descriptive term and a generic top level domain name suffix. None of these differences suffices to distinguish the disputed domain name effectively from the Complainant's mark.

The Complainant has, to the satisfaction of the Panel, shown the disputed domain name is identical or confusingly similar to a trademark or service mark in which the Complainant has rights within the meaning of paragraph 4(a)(i) of the Policy.

NO RIGHTS OR LEGITIMATE INTERESTS

The Complainant asserts that the Respondents have no rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain names or corresponding names. It states that the first disputed domain name was used for a copy of its group's website at www.hillrobinson.com with a redirection to a different careers website and that the second disputed domain name was used for phishing emails.

In the absence of any challenge by the Respondents to the Complainant's statements, the Panel is satisfied that the Complainant has shown the Respondents to have no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the disputed domain names within the meaning of paragraph 4(a)(ii) of the Policy.

BAD FAITH

The Complainant asserts that the disputed domain names relate to an incident in which its group's website was cloned and the domain names were used to defraud job seekers.

In the absence of any challenge by the Respondents to the Complainant's statements, the Panel is satisfied that the Complainant has shown that the disputed domain names were registered and were being used at the relevant dates in bad faith within the meaning of paragraph 4(a)(iii) of the Policy.

PROCEDURAL FACTORS

The Complainant sought consolidation on the ground that the disputed domain names all relate to the same incident in which its group's website was cloned and the domain names were used to defraud job seekers. The Complainant also notes that the disputed domain names were registered with the same Registrar by Brazilians. The Panel further notes that the disputed domain names were all registered within the same time period of several days and that the third of the disputed domain names includes the descriptive word "recruiter" which would be relevant to the abuse asserted by the Complainant. In the absence of any objection by any of the Respondents, the Panel is satisfied that there is sufficient evidence of a link between the Registrants to justify consolidation, which is also conducive to procedural efficiency.

The Panel is satisfied that all procedural requirements under UDRP were met and there is no other reason why it would be

inappropriate to provide a decision.

PRINCIPAL REASONS FOR THE DECISION

The disputed domain names contained the word elements of a registered figurative mark owned by a member of the Complainant's group, with the substitution of one letter in one case (typosquatting), the addition of a descriptive term in another and the addition of generic top level domain suffices in all three cases. The Respondents did not challenge the Complainant's statements that they had no rights or legitimate interests and that the disputed domain names were used to host a replica of the Complainant's group's website with redirection to their jobs site and to send phishing e-mails. The Panel accordingly found that the disputed domain names were confusingly similar to an EU mark in which the Complainant had rights, that the Respondents had no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the mark, and that the disputed domain names were registered and used in bad faith.

FOR ALL THE REASONS STATED ABOVE, THE COMPLAINT IS

Accepted

AND THE DISPUTED DOMAIN NAME(S) IS (ARE) TO BE

1. **hilirobinson.com**: Transferred
2. **hillrobinson.site**: Transferred
3. **hillrobinsonrecruiter.site**: Transferred

PANELLISTS

Name	**Jonathan Turner**

DATE OF PANEL DECISION 2025-04-05

Publish the Decision