

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

Chevron Corporation, Chevron Intellectual Property LLC v. Russel Hickle,
Chukwuemeka Nwosu
Case No. D2025-0697

1. The Parties

The Complainants are Chevron Corporation and Chevron Intellectual Property LLC, United States of America ("USA"), represented by Demys Limited, United Kingdom.

The Respondents are Russel Hickle, USA, and Chukwuemeka Nwosu, Nigeria.

2. The Domain Names and Registrar

The disputed domain names <chevronmobilepro.org> and <chevronrefinery.net> are registered with Hostinger Operations, UAB (the "Registrar").

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the "Center") on February 20, 2025. On February 21, 2025, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain names. On February 24, 2025, the Registrar transmitted by email to the Center its verification response disclosing registrant and contact information for the disputed domain names which differed from the named Respondents (REDACTED FOR PRIVACY, Privacy Protect, LLC; Domain Admin, Privacy Protect, LLC) and contact information in the Complaint.

The Center sent an email communication to the Complainants on February 24, 2025, with the registrant and contact information of nominally multiple underlying registrants revealed by the Registrar, requesting the Complainants to either file separate complaint(s) for the disputed domain names associated with different underlying registrants or alternatively, demonstrate that the underlying registrants are in fact the same entity and/or that all domain names are under common control. The Complainants filed an amended Complaint on February 28, 2025.

The Center verified that the Complaint together with the amended 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 Respondents of the Complaint, and the proceedings commenced on March 12, 2025. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was April 1, 2025. The Respondents did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondents' default on April 3, 2025.

The Center appointed Miguel B. O'Farrell as the sole panelist in this matter on April 7, 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

The First Complainant, Chevron Corporation, is a multinational energy and technology company headquartered in Houston, Texas, USA. It is primarily engaged in the oil and gas industry, including the exploration, production and distribution of petroleum products and chemicals, and the development of alternative energy sources and renewable fuels. The company operates in the world's major oil and gas regions and is one of the largest energy company in the USA. It was founded in 1879 and is currently active in over 180 countries.

The Second Complainant, Chevron Intellectual Property LLC, is the Complainant's group's intellectual property holding company and is incorporated in Houston, Texas, USA. It is the owner of a global portfolio of registered trademarks for the term CHEVRON, including the following.

USA Trademark Registration No. 3211894 CHEVRON, registered on February 20, 2007, in class 36;

United Kingdom Trademark Registration No. UK00000638572 CHEVRON, registered on July 12, 1945, in class 4;

European Union Trademark Registration No. 000095745 CHEVRON, registered on March 8, 1999, in classes 1, 2, 3, 4, 16, 17 and 19.

The Complainants operate an official website at the domain name <www.chevron.com>, amongst others, and contend that the CHEVRON brand is well known around the world and, to illustrate this, have produced screenshots of a selection of example social media websites which are collectively followed by millions of people.

The disputed domain name <chevronmobilepro.org> was registered on November 2, 2024 and <chevronrefinery.net> was registered on September 7, 2024, and resolves to a webpage reading "EXCLUSIVE OIL AND GAS CROWDING INVESTMENT DEALS".

5. Parties' Contentions

A. Complainants

The Complainants contend that they have satisfied each of the elements required under the Policy for a transfer of the disputed domain names.

Notably, the Complainants contend that since the disputed domain names came to the Complainants' attention they each resolve to an active website which appears to offer crowdfunding investment opportunities within the oil and gas industry.

As shown in Annexes 12 and 13 to the Complaint, both websites are almost identical and purport to be operated by, or at least connected to, the Complainants as they:

- Prominently display the Complainants' CHEVRON trademark throughout the website;
- Use images and other graphical illustrations showing the Complainants' CHEVRON branded gas and fuel stations as well as other products;
- Use the Complainants' slogan and image directly copied from the Complainants' official website at <chevron.com> within their website footer;
- Use the Complainants' CHEVRON hallmark as their website favicon and incorporate a self-reference within the HTML title tag as "ChevronRefinery".
- The website to which <chevronrefinery.net> resolves falsely uses an address which is connected to one of the Complainants' product divisions (namely, to "Chevron Richmond, Chevron Products Company, A division of Chevron U.S.A. Inc.") as their own.

The disputed domain names' zone files are configured with MX records, which means that the disputed domain names can be used for email communication.

Considering that the disputed domain names, at worst, directly impersonate the Complainants or, at best, carry a high risk of implied affiliation, any email originating from the disputed domain names would be highly confusing or misleading to the Complainants' employees, business partners, agencies or clients.

In all these circumstances, taken cumulatively or singularly, the Complainants assert that they have established that the Respondents have no rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain names, which were registered and used in bad faith to mislead Internet consumers with the purpose of benefitting from the prestige of the Complainant's well known trademark CHEVRON.

B. Respondents

The Respondents did not reply to the Complainants' contentions.

6. Discussion and Findings

A. Procedural Issue: Consolidation of the Complaints against the two Respondents

In terms of the consolidation of the Complaints, the Complainants have referred to section 4.11.1 of the WIPO Overview of WIPO Panel Views on Selected UDRP Questions, Third Edition ("[WIPO Overview 3.0](#)") and contend they have a specific common grievance against the Respondents, in that the Respondents have targeted both Complainants' rights.

The Complainants further contend that the disputed domain names take unfair advantage of the First Complainant's CHEVRON brand and are confusingly similar to the Second Complainant's registered rights. The Complainants contend that the Respondents will not be prejudiced by the Complaint being brought jointly by both Complainants.

Noting the above, the Panel finds that they have a specific common grievance against the Respondents and accepts this Complaint filed by multiple complainants (referred to below as "the Complainant") in the case at hand, in line with the UDRP precedent.

In terms of the consolidation of the Respondents, the Complainant contends that on balance it is more likely than not that both disputed domain names are under common control and therefore request consolidation of

the Complaint against each of the Respondents.

To support this view, the Complainant has referred to section 4.11.2 of the [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), which relates to the consolidation of a complaint against multiple respondents, and makes the following observations:

- Both disputed domain names appear to target the Complainant by reflecting its CHEVRON name and mark within the disputed domain names;
- The disputed domain names were registered with the same Registrar, namely Hostinger Operations, UAB;
- The disputed domain names were registered only two months apart and are using the same Whois privacy service;
- Both disputed domain names indicate the same nameserver (NS) records, owned by CloudFlare Inc.;
- The disputed domain names resolve to almost identical websites, purporting to be “an international energy and chemical company” and offering investment options while using the Complainant’s name, mark and logotype as shown in Annex 12 and 13 to the Complaint;
- Both websites display the identical HTML title tag (the descriptive title of a website that can be found in the browser title bar and in search engine results pages), self-identifying as “ChevronRefinery” and using the Complainant’s well-known CHEVRON hallmark as their favicon (website address bar icon);
- In both websites the disputed domain names resolve to list “[...]@chevronrefinery.net” within their contact subpage as their email address as shown in Annex 12 and 13, supra.

The Complainant contends that in these circumstances it is more likely than not that the disputed domain names are under common control.

The Panel agrees with the proven and uncontested contentions made by the Complainant for the requested consolidation, which it finds equitable to both Parties and procedurally efficient.

Accordingly, the Panel decides to consolidate the disputes regarding the nominally different disputed domain name registrants (referred to below as “the Respondent”) in a single proceeding.

B. 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 3.0](#), section 1.7.

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

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

C. 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 the Complainant has established a prima facie case that the Respondent lacks rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain names. The Respondent has not rebutted the Complainant’s prima facie showing and has not come forward with any relevant evidence demonstrating rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain names such as those enumerated in the Policy or otherwise.

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

D. 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.

The Panel is satisfied that the Respondent must have been aware of the Complainant’s trademark CHEVRON mentioned in section 4 above (Factual Background) when it registered the disputed domain names <chevronmobilepro.org> on November 2, 2024, and <chevronrefinery.net> on September 7, 2024.

In accordance with section 3.1.4 of [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), the Panel considers that the inclusion of the Complainant’s CHEVRON trademark in the disputed domain names creates a presumption of bad faith registration. The addition of the terms “mobile pro” and “refinery” in the disputed domain names tend to strengthen the confusion between the Complainant’s trademark and the disputed domain names, as they relate to the Complainant’s business.

The Respondent, when registering the disputed domain names, has targeted the Complainant’s business and its trademark CHEVRON with the intention to confuse Internet users and capitalize on the fame of the Complainant’s trademark for its own benefit.

The fact that there is a clear absence of rights or legitimate interests coupled with no credible explanation for the Respondent’s choice of the disputed domain names is also a significant factor in determining that the disputed domain names were registered in bad faith (as stated in section 3.2.1 of the [WIPO Overview 3.0](#)).

Panels have held that the use of a domain name for illegal activity here, claimed passing off, or other types of fraud constitutes bad faith. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 3.4.

Having reviewed the record, the Panel finds the Respondent’s registration and use of the disputed domain names constitute bad faith under the Policy and that the requirements of paragraph 4(a)(iii) of the Policy have been fulfilled.

The Panel finds that the 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 disputed domain names <chevronmobilepro.org> and <chevronrefinery.net> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Miguel B. O'Farrell/

Miguel B. O'Farrell

Sole Panelist

Date: April 17, 2025