

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

Chevron Corporation, Chevron Intellectual Property LLC v. Chevron Buzzy
Chevron
Case No. D2025-1197

1. The Parties

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

The Respondent is Chevron Buzzy Chevron, Nigeria.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <chevrontrading.org> is registered with Hostinger Operations, UAB (the "Registrar").

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the "Center") on March 24, 2025. On March 24, 2025, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On March 25, 2025, 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 Protect, LLC (PrivacyProtect.org)) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on March 27, 2025, 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 amended Complaint on March 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 Respondent of the Complaint, and the proceedings commenced on April 3, 2025. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was April 23, 2025. The Respondent sent email communications to the Center on April 7, 2025, April 9, 2025, and April 16, 2025. On May 5, 2025, the Center notified the Parties that it would proceed to panel appointment.

The Center appointed Reyes Campello Estebaranz as the sole panelist in this matter on May 9, 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 Complainants are related companies part of a multinational energy and technology group. The First Complainant, Chevron Corporation, is a United States based multinational energy and technology company engaged in oil and gas industry, and, the Second Complainant, Chevron Intellectual Property LLC, is a United States based company holding the Complainants' group's intellectual property rights, (collectively hereinafter referred as the "Complainant").

Founded in 1879, the Complainant's group operates in over 180 countries under its trademark and trade name CHEVRON. 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 Complainant's group shares are publicly traded on NASDAQ Stock Market,¹ and it is engaged in supply and trading activities related to commodity transactions, averaging 5 million barrels of liquids (fuel or refined products and chemicals), and 5 billion cubic feet of natural gas each day. The Complainant's group has been ranked among the main companies in the world based on sales, profit, assets and market value, by various publications, including Forbes' Global 2000 and Fortune's Global 500 List.

The Complainant's group holds many trademark registrations worldwide for its CHEVRON brand, including:

- United States Trademark Registration No. 0364683, CHEVRON, word, registered on February 14, 1939, in class 4; and
- United States Trademark Registration No. 3211894, CHEVRON, figurative, registered on February 20, 2007, in class 36, with the following representation:



(hereinafter jointly referred to as the "CHEVRON mark", and separately referred as the "Complainant's word mark" or the "Complainant's figurative mark" respectively).

Prior decisions under the Policy have recognized the international well-known and famous character of the CHEVRON mark.²

The Complainant's group further owns various domain names corresponding to its brand, including <chevron.com> (registered on April 13, 1990), which resolves to one of its official websites.

¹ NASDAQ stands for National Association of Securities Dealers Automated Quotations, an American stock exchange based in New York City that is the most active stock-trading venue by volume in the United States and second on the list of stock exchanges by market capitalization of shares traded.

²See, e.g., *Chevron Corporation, and Chevron Intellectual Property LLC v. Caleb Tan*, WIPO Case No. [D2023-2866](#); *Chevron Corporation and Chevron Intellectual Property LLC v. Jerry Twyman*, WIPO Case No. [D2023-4018](#); *Chevron Corporation and Chevron Intellectual Property LLC v. David Barrette, david enterprise*, WIPO Case No. [D2022-4890](#); *Chevron Corporation and Chevron Intellectual Property LLC v. Chevron Investment – Chevron*, WIPO Case No. [D2023-1685](#); *Chevron Corporation and Chevron Intellectual Property LLC v. Privacy Service Provided by Withheld for Privacy ehf / gabriel levy*, WIPO Case No. [D2022-2616](#); *Chevron Corporation and Chevron Intellectual Property LLC v. Thankgod Awogu, Chizzy pro*, WIPO Case No. [D2024-1900](#); or *Chevron Corporation and Chevron Intellectual Property LLC v. Privacy Service Provided by Withheld for Privacy ehf / victory Solomon*, WIPO Case No. [D2022-2618](#).

The disputed domain name was registered on October 18, 2024, and resolves to an active website that purportedly offers cryptocurrency trading and other investment services in various areas, including “CONSTRUCTION SERVICES”, “REAL ESTATE”, “AGRONOMY”, “TRADING”, “DIGITAL CURRENCY”, and “CHEVRON STOCK HOLDINGS”. This website prominently displays the CHEVRON mark, alone or in combination with the word “trading”, at its heading (within a rectangle with rounded corners), and within its content. Within the content of the site, its owner refers to itself as “CHEVRON TRADING”, or in the “About” section as “Chevron Trading Company”, and the site further includes a downloadable company registration certificate allegedly issued by the Canadian authorities on behalf of the company “CHEVRON TRADING INC.”. The bottom of the site includes a location address in Vancouver, Canada, and an email address. The “About” section further displays a downloadable “Company Profile” that includes at the top of various of its pages within a rectangle with rounded corners, the Complainant’s figurative mark (with identical graphic representation) followed by the words “CHEVRON TRADING”. This website further includes a contact form, as well as user Login and Signup sections, albeit the last one appears to be disabled leading to an error message and not allowing new users to sign up. This website does not contain any information about its lack of relationship with the Complainant. The copyright note of the site indicates, “© Copyright 2019-2025 Chevron Trading | All Rights Reserved”.

According to the evidence provided by the Complainant, the company registration certificate provided at the Respondent’s website includes a registration number that does not match the company name indicated in the document. In this respect, the Complainant has provided an extract of the Canada’s Business Registries.

The evidence provided by the Complainant further indicates the Respondent’s website content was previously different. This website previously included the Complainant’s figurative mark (with the same graphic representation) at its heading followed by the words “CHEVRON TRADING” within a rectangle with rounded corners; and the Sign Up section previously enabled Internet users to register by providing personal information (such as full name, username, email address, password, BITCOIN account, USDT TRC20 account, ETHERUM account, secret question, and secret answer).

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 the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to the CHEVRON mark, as it incorporates the mark in its entirety adding the term “trading”, which is associated to the Complainant and its business activities, as the Complainant’s shares are traded publicly, and the Complainant’s business includes trading with liquids and gas. The generic Top-Level Domain (“gTLD”) “.org” is required only for technical reasons and can be ignored for the purposes of the confusing similarity test under the Policy.

The Complainant further contends the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name. No evidence indicates the Respondent is commonly known or holds any trademark registration over the terms “chevron” or “chevron trading”, and it has not been authorized to use the CHEVRON mark. The disputed domain name carries a high risk of implied affiliation, and the Respondent has not made a legitimate noncommercial or fair use of it. The disputed domain name is used in connection to a website that deceives Internet users; it impersonates the Complainant and generates confusion or affiliation to its business and its famous CHEVRON mark to increase traffic and generate an illegitimate commercial gain. This website further includes a login portal that potentially allows obtaining sensitive confidential information, and the disputed domain name’s zone files are configured with Mail Exchange (“MX”) records, which means it can be used for potentially misleading email communications.

The Complainant finally contends the disputed domain name was registered and is being used in bad faith, with the intention to attract Internet users through confusion and mislead them through a website that impersonates the Complainant, prominently displays its famous trademark, and lacks any disclaimer. Other facts indicating bad faith are the use of a fake company certificate to mislead users into believing the Respondent's business is legitimate, and the configured MX records over the disputed domain name.

B. Respondent

The Respondent sent various email communications to the Center requesting information about the proceeding, and, at its last communication, the Respondent indicated its willingness to transfer the disputed domain name to the Complainant in exchange of some "little money" to be able to purchase a different domain name.

6. Discussion and Findings

The Complainant has made the relevant assertions as required by the Policy and the dispute is properly within the scope of the Policy. The Panel has authority to decide the dispute examining the three elements in paragraph 4(a) of the Policy, taking into consideration all of the relevant evidence, annexed materials and allegations, and performing some limited independent research under the general powers of the Panel articulated, inter alia, in paragraph 10 of the Rules.

A. Procedural matter: Consolidation of Complainants

The Panel finds appropriate for related companies belonging to the same group to bring a joint complaint, as in the present case. The Complainant's group of companies have a specific common grievance against the Respondent, as the Respondent's conduct has affected the Complainants and its complete group of companies in a similar way, and the Panel finds the consolidation is equitable to all parties and procedurally efficient. See WIPO Overview of WIPO Panel Views on Selected UDRP Questions ("[WIPO Overview 3.0](#)"), section 4.11.

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, namely the CHEVRON mark. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 1.2.1.

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

Although the addition of other terms here, the word "trading", 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 mark for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 1.8.

Therefore, 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 name.

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 name such as those enumerated in the Policy or otherwise. The Respondent has simply declared its disposition to transfer the disputed domain name to the Complainant in exchange for a small compensation with no specification of a certain price, in its words it requested, “a little money be sent to me for the purchase for another domain”.

The Panel finds the evidence in the record shows no reference to any possible rights or legitimate interests in the Respondent.

The Panel notes that, according to the Registrar verification, the Respondent identified itself as “Chevron Buzzy Chevron”, and within the content of the Respondent’s website, it identifies itself as “CHEVRON TRADING”, “Chevron Trading Company”, or “CHEVRON TRADING INC.” The mere fact of using various similar names indicates in the Panel’s view a potential intention to generate confusion and lack of true legitimacy in the Respondent, and no further evidence in the file supports the Respondent is commonly known by any of these names.

According to the Complainant’s allegations, the Panel has corroborated through various searches over the Global Brand Database that the Respondent owns no trademark rights over the terms “chevron” or “chevron trading”. These searches reveal that none of the abovementioned Respondent’s company names or trade names (“Chevron Buzzy Chevron”, “CHEVRON TRADING”, “Chevron Trading Company”, or “CHEVRON TRADING INC.”) holds any trademark rights.³

The Panel has further verified that, according to the extract from the Canadian company register provided by the Complainant, the company registration certificate included in the Respondent’s website is erroneous or false, and incomplete, as does not include any address. The company registration number included in the said certificate corresponds to a different company unrelated to the Respondent, which name does not include any reference to the terms “chevron” or “chevron trading”.

The Panel further notes the disputed domain name encompasses an implied risk of affiliation with the Complainant and its famous CHEVRON mark that makes it very difficult to conceive any rights or legitimate interests in the Respondent. The composition of the disputed domain name incorporating the CHEVRON mark with the addition of a dictionary term (“trading”) related to the Complainant’s activity (as trader in the commodities market, and as a company which shares are traded in the NASDAQ Stock Market), generates an implied affiliation or confusion, and suggests the disputed domain name is owned or sponsored by the Complainant or any of its group subsidiaries or authorized distributors and dealers. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 2.5.1.

³Noting in particular the general powers of a panel articulated inter alia in paragraphs 10 and 12 of the UDRP Rules, it has been accepted that a panel may undertake limited factual research into matters of public record if it would consider such information useful to assessing the case merits and reaching a decision. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 4.8.

The Panel further finds the use of the disputed domain name, in connection with a website that impersonates the Complainant, prominently displays its famous trademark and its logo with identical graphic representation cannot be considered a bona fide offering of goods or services under the Policy; this conduct clearly suggests an intention to target the Complainant and its reputed trademark. The Respondent's use of a false or erroneous certificate in its website further indicates an illegitimate or illegal activity, which cannot confer rights or legitimate interests under the Policy. Panels have held that the use of a domain name for illegitimate or illegal activity here, claimed impersonation/passing off, the use of false or erroneous credentials, or other types of fraud can never confer rights or legitimate interests on a respondent. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 2.13.1

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.

In the present case, the Panel notes the international reputation and famous character of the CHEVRON mark, its extensive and continuous use over more than a century, and, its use, in particular, in Africa and Nigeria, where the Respondent is located according to the Registrar verification. In this respect, the Panel notes that Nigeria is included among the countries where the Complainant's group operates according to the extract of the Complainant's official website provided by the Complainant.

The use of the disputed domain name corroborates the targeting to the Complainant and its reputed trademark, including to the Complainant's figurative mark (with identical graphic representation). According to the evidence provided by the Complainant, the Complainant's trademarks were prominently displayed in the Respondent's website and in the material included in this website ("Company Profile", and "Company certificate").

The Panel further notes the Complainant's figurative mark has been removed from the heading and the bottom of the Respondent's website, albeit it is still displayed at the heading of various pages of the Company Profile included in the site, and the "Sing Up" section of the Respondent's website (which originally requested sensitive personal and financial information), has also been apparently modified. The Respondent's reaction to the notification of the Complaint seems to be modifying the content of its website instead of rebutting the Complainant's allegations or bad faith or transferring the disputed domain name to the Complainant as indicated in its communication to the Center. The Panel finds this reaction indicates a lack of bona fide on the Respondent, and the probable misuse of the disputed domain name in connection to any type of phishing scam.

Panels have held that the use of a domain name for illegitimate or illegal activity here, claimed impersonation/passing off, the use of false credentials, 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 name constitutes bad faith under the Policy.

The Panel finds further remarkable the Respondent's efforts for concealing its identity. The Respondent not only used a privacy shield but also used different names within its website and for the registration of the disputed domain name, none of them corroborated by any evidence; and used a false or erroneous company registration certificate.

Accordingly, 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 name <chevrontrading.org> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Reyes Campello Estebaranz/

Reyes Campello Estebaranz

Sole Panelist

Date: May 20, 2025