Decision for dispute CAC-UDRP-108936

Case number	**CAC-UDRP-108936**
Time of filing	**2026-08-20 13:58:13**
Domain names	**equinorrecruit.com**

Case administrator

Name	**Olga Slanařová (Case admin)**

Complainant

Organization	**Equinor ASA**

Complainant representative

Organization	**Valea/Rouse**

Respondent

Name	**Kenzo Official**

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 name.

IDENTIFICATION OF RIGHTS

The Complainant owns the EQUINOR trademark, which enjoys thorough protection through many registrations worldwide.

The Complainant has provided a full listing of its EQUINOR trademarks as well as a list of more than a hundred domain names that include the EQUINOR trademark.

The Complainant is, inter alia, the owner of:

European trademark EQUINOR (word) registration No. 017900772 registered on January 18, 2019;

International trademark EQUINOR (word) registration No. 1444675 registered on July 4, 2018;

United States trademark EQUINOR (word) registration No. 6436681 registered on August 3, 2021.

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

FACTS ASSERTED BY THE COMPLAINANT AND NOT CONTESTED BY THE RESPONDENT:

The Complainant in this administrative proceeding is Equinor ASA a Norwegian corporation, formerly known as Statoil ASA. Equinor ASA is a wide-ranging international energy company with operations in more than 30 countries around the world developing oil, gas, wind and solar energy. Statoil ASA decided to change its name to Equinor in 2018. The name change was announced on the March 15, 2018 and the news was shared and commented on worldwide on different media platforms.

The disputed domain name <equinorrecruit.com> was registered on June 25, 2026.

At the time of this decision the disputed domain is inactive.

Previous UDRP Panels have found that the EQUINOR trademark is well-known and distinctive.

PARTIES CONTENTIONS

COMPLAINANT:

The Complainant contends that:

The disputed domain name is confusingly similar to the Complainant's trademarks

The Complainant asserts that the addition of the term “recruit” is not sufficient to escape the finding that the domain name is confusingly similar to the trademark EQUINOR.

The Complainant concludes that the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to its EQUINOR trademark.

The Respondent does not have any rights or legitimate interest in the disputed domain name

The Complainant contends that the Respondent is not commonly known by the disputed domain name and that the Respondent is not affiliated with or authorized by the Complainant in any way. The Complainant contends that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the disputed domain name, and is not related to the Complainant’s business in any way.

The disputed domain name has been registered and is being used in bad faith

The Complainant states and documents that MX-records have been activated for the disputed domain name and that phishing emails have been sent in a recruitment scam impersonating Equinor's Head of Recruitment.

The Complainant thus contends that the Respondent could not be unaware of the existence of the EQUINOR trademark at the time of registration of the disputed domain name, not only because EQUINOR is a well-known trademark, but also in consideration of the nature of the domain name, which combines the Complainant’s trademark with the generic term “recruit”.

The Complainant further contends that the Respondent’s use of a privacy or proxy service, which is known to block or intentionally delay disclosure of the identity of the actual registrant, is often considered as an indication of bad faith.

The Complainant finally contends that according to section 3.3 in the WIPO Overview 3.0 the fact that the disputed domain name is inactive does not prevent a finding of bad faith under the doctrine of passive holding.

RESPONDENT:

NO ADMINISTRATIVELY COMPLIANT RESPONSE HAS BEEN FILED.

RIGHTS

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 has, to the satisfaction of the Panel, shown the Respondent to have no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the disputed domain name (within the meaning of paragraph 4(a)(ii) of the Policy).

BAD FAITH

The Complainant has, to the satisfaction of the Panel, shown the disputed domain name has been registered and is being used in

bad faith (within the meaning of paragraph 4(a)(iii) of the Policy).

PROCEDURAL FACTORS

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

1. A) Confusing similarity

The Panel finds the entirety of the Complainant's trademark is reproduced and recognizable within the disputed domain name. Accordingly, the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to the mark for the purposes of the Policy.

Although the addition of other term here, "recruit" may bear on assessment of the second and third elements, the Panel finds the addition of such term does not prevent a finding of confusing similarity between the disputed domain name and the Complainant's EQUINOR trademark for the purposes of the Policy.

Consequently, the disputed domain name appears to be confusingly similar with the Complainant's trademark.

1. B) Lack of legitimate rights or interests

The Complainant's assertions that the Respondent is not commonly known by the disputed domain name and is not affiliated with nor authorized by the Complainant are sufficient to constitute a prima facie demonstration of the absence of rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name on the part of the Respondent. The burden of evidence therefore shifts to the Respondent to show, using tangible evidence, that it does have rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name. The Respondent has made no attempt to do so.

Further, Panels have held that the use of a domain name for illegitimate activity, here, claimed phishing and passing off as an employee of the Complainant using the disputed domain name, can never confer rights or legitimate interests on a respondent. WIPO Overview 3.1, section 2.13.1.

Accordingly, the Panel finds that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name.

1. C) Registered or Used in Bad Faith

The Complainant gives sound bases for its contention that the disputed domain name was registered and has been used in bad faith.

Firstly, owing to the distinctiveness of the Complainant's trademark and reputation, it is reasonable to infer that the Respondent registered the disputed domain name with full knowledge of the Complainant's trademarks, and so the Panel finds on the balance of probabilities that the Respondent was aware of the Complainant's trademark when registering the disputed domain name.

Secondly, the Panel accepts the Complainant's unchallenged assertion that the Respondent registered the disputed domain name with the aim of creating a likelihood of confusion with the Complainant's trademark.

Thirdly, as underlined by the Complainant, this appears to be a typical case of phishing and impersonation. In fact, it appears that the disputed domain name has been set up with MX records in order to be actively used for sending fraudulent emails, specifically phishing emails sent in a recruitment scam impersonating Equinor's Head of Recruitment.

This is further evidence that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the disputed domain name and of its registration and use in bad faith. Previous panels have held that the use of a domain name for per se illegitimate activity such as the sale of counterfeit goods or phishing can never confer rights or legitimate interests on a respondent, and that such behavior is considered manifest evidence of bad faith. WIPO Overview 3.1, section 3.1.4.

Fourthly, a further indicator of bad faith may be inferred from the Respondent's use of a privacy or proxy service.

Finally, the Respondent has not responded to nor denied any of the assertions made by the Complainant in this proceeding.

FOR ALL THE REASONS STATED ABOVE, THE COMPLAINT IS

Accepted

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

1. **equinorrecruit.com**: Transferred

PANELLISTS

Name	**Fabrizio Bedarida**

DATE OF PANEL DECISION 2026-09-28

Publish the Decision