

## **ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION**

Championx LLC v. Steely Nigel  
Case No. D2025-1817

### **1. The Parties**

Complainant is Championx LLC, United States of America (U.S.), represented by TechLaw Ventures, PLLC, U.S.

Respondent is Steely Nigel, U.S.

### **2. The Domain Name and Registrar**

The disputed domain name <champlonx.com> (the “Disputed Domain Name”) is registered with NameCheap, Inc. (the “Registrar”).

### **3. Procedural History**

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the “Center”) on May 6, 2025. On May 7, 2025, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the Disputed Domain Name. On May 7, 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 service provided by Withheld for Privacy ehf) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to Complainant on May 8, 2025, providing the registrant and contact information disclosed by the Registrar, and inviting Complainant to submit an amendment to the Complaint. Complainant filed an amendment to the Complaint on May 8, 2025.

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 Respondent of the Complaint, and the proceedings commenced on May 9, 2025. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was May 29, 2025. Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified Respondent’s default on May 30, 2025.

The Center appointed Douglas M. Isenberg as the sole panelist in this matter on June 5, 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**

Complainant states that it is “a global leader in chemistry solutions and highly engineered equipment and technologies that help companies drill for and produce oil and gas safely, efficiently and sustainably around the world”; that it “offers products and services that provide efficient and safe operations throughout the lifecycle of a well with a focus on the production phase of wells”; that it “is listed on The Nasdaq Stock Market LLC under the ticker symbol CHX”; and that it “operates through a number of subsidiaries, including Complainant, ChampionX LLC, which is the owner of the trademark CHAMPIONX”.

Complainant states, and provides documentation in support thereof, that it is the owner of trademark registrations in multiple jurisdictions, including U.S. Reg. No. 7,043,666 for a stylized version of CHAMPIONX (registered May 2, 2023) for use in connection with, inter alia, “artificial lift systems”. These registrations are referred to herein as the “CHAMPIONX Trademark”.

The Disputed Domain Name was created on April 29, 2025. According to the Complaint, the Disputed Domain Name is “not in use with a functional website” but, as supported by documentation provided by Complainant, “Respondent used the domain name as an email address appearing to be from Complainant that was sent to at least one customer of Complainant’s as a part of a fraudulent scheme attempting to obtain payment information”.

#### **5. Parties’ Contentions**

##### **A. Complainant**

Complainant contends that it has satisfied each of the elements required under the Policy for a transfer of the Disputed Domain Name. Notably, Complainant contends that:

- The Disputed Domain Name is confusingly similar to the CHAMPIONX Trademark because the domain name “is a misspelling” of the trademark “varying from the correct spelling by the substitution of letters to create domain name with a similar appearance”, and “[a] slight difference in spelling between a trademark and a domain name does not reduce the confusing similarity”.
- Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in the Disputed Domain Name because, inter alia, “Respondent is not an authorized dealer of goods or services in connection with which the mark is used, nor are licensed to use such trademark”; “Respondent used the domain name as an email address appearing to be from Complainant that was sent to at least one customer of Complainant’s as a part of a fraudulent scheme attempting to obtain payment information”; and “Complainant has been unable to find any rights or legitimate interest that Respondent may have in the term ‘charnplonx’”.
- The Disputed Domain Name was registered and is being used in bad faith because, inter alia, Respondent “has used this domain name as a part of a fraudulent scheme involving misrepresentation of identity”.

##### **B. Respondent**

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

## 6. Discussion and Findings

### A. Identical or Confusingly Similar

Based upon the trademark registrations cited by Complainant, it is apparent that Complainant has rights in and to the CHAMPIONX Trademark.

As to whether the Disputed Domain Name is identical or confusingly similar to the CHAMPIONX Trademark, the relevant comparison to be made is with the second-level portion of the Disputed Domain Name only (i.e., “champlonx”) because “[t]he applicable Top-Level Domain (‘TLD’) in a domain name (e.g., ‘.com’, ‘.club’, ‘.nyc’) is viewed as a standard registration requirement and as such is disregarded under the first element confusing similarity test”. WIPO Overview of WIPO Panel Views on Selected UDRP Questions, Third Edition ([“WIPO Overview 3.0”](#)), section 1.11.1.

As set forth in section 1.7 of [WIPO Overview 3.0](#): “in cases where a domain name incorporates the entirety of a trademark, or where at least a dominant feature of the relevant mark is recognizable in the domain name, the domain name will normally be considered confusingly similar to that mark for purposes of UDRP standing.” Further, as set forth in section 1.9 of [WIPO Overview 3.0](#): “A domain name which consists of a common, obvious, or intentional misspelling of a trademark is considered by panels to be confusingly similar to the relevant mark for purposes of the first element.... Examples of such typos include... substitution of similar-appearing characters.”

Here, the letters “r” and “n” adjacent to each other appear visually similar to the letter “m”; and the letter “i” appears visually similar to the letter “l.” See, e.g., *Kimley-Horn and Associates, Inc. v. Name Redacted*, WIPO Case No. [D2024-1253](#) (finding <kirnley-hom.com> confusingly similar to KIMLEY-HORN because “the consecutive letters ‘r’ and ‘n’ in ‘kimley’..., when adjacent to each other in that order on a computer screen, look nearly identical to the letter ‘m’”); and *Titus Group, Inc. v. WhoisGuard, Inc. / Thomas Sal*, WIPO Case No. [D2018-2816](#) (finding <titusIndustrial.com> confusingly similar to TITUS INDUSTRIAL because “[t]his kind of ‘typosquatting’ is based on confusion resulting from typing errors commonly made by Internet users”).

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

### B. Rights or Legitimate Interests

Complainant has argued that Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the Disputed Domain Name because, inter alia, “Respondent is not an authorized dealer of goods or services in connection with which the mark is used, nor are licensed to use such trademark”; “Respondent used the domain name as an email address appearing to be from Complainant that was sent to at least one customer of Complainant’s as a part of a fraudulent scheme attempting to obtain payment information”; and “Complainant has been unable to find any rights or legitimate interest that Respondent may have in the term ‘champlonx’.”

[WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 2.1, states: “[w]hile 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 often impossible 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. If the respondent fails to come forward with such relevant evidence, the complainant is deemed to have satisfied the second element.”

The Panel finds that Complainant has established its prima facie case and without any evidence from Respondent to the contrary, the Panel is satisfied that Complainant has satisfied the second element of the Policy.

### **C. Registered and Used in Bad Faith**

Whether a domain name is registered and used in bad faith for purposes of the Policy may be determined by evaluating four (non-exhaustive) factors set forth in the Policy: (i) circumstances indicating that the registrant has registered or acquired the domain name primarily for the purpose of selling, renting, or otherwise transferring the domain name registration to the complainant who is the owner of the trademark or service mark or to a competitor of that complainant, for valuable consideration in excess of the registrant's documented out-of-pocket costs directly related to the domain name; or (ii) the registrant has registered the domain name in order to prevent the owner of the trademark or service mark from reflecting the mark in a corresponding domain name, provided that the registrant has engaged in a pattern of such conduct; or (iii) the registrant has registered the domain name primarily for the purpose of disrupting the business of a competitor; or (iv) by using the domain name, the registrant has intentionally attempted to attract, for commercial gain, Internet users to the registrant's 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 registrant's website or location or of a product or service on the registrant's website or location. Policy, paragraph 4(b).

Here, Complainant has alleged and provided documentation in support thereof – and Respondent has not disputed – that Respondent has used the Disputed Domain Name “as an email address appearing to be from Complainant that was sent to at least one customer of Complainant's as a part of a fraudulent scheme attempting to obtain payment information”. This is a type of phishing, which clearly constitutes bad faith. See, e.g., [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 3.1.4: “[T]he use of a domain name for per se illegitimate activity such as...phishing... is manifestly considered evidence of bad faith.” See also, e.g., [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 3.4: Bad faith includes cases in which “the respondent's use of the domain name [is] to send deceptive emails, e.g., to obtain sensitive or confidential personal information from prospective job applicants, or to solicit payment of fraudulent invoices by the complainant's actual or prospective customers”.

Accordingly, the Panel finds that Complainant has proven the third element of the UDRP.

### **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 <charnplonx.com> be transferred to Complainant.

*/Douglas M. Isenberg/*

**Douglas M. Isenberg**

Sole Panelist

Date: June 18, 2025