

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

Invenergy LLC. v. 南京因威特新能源科技有限公司(yinyinweite), 南京因威特新能源科技有限公司(nanjingyinweitexinengyuan), cheng lu, beijikuangye
Case No. D2025-4975

1. The Parties

The Complainant is Invenergy LLC., United States of America ("United States"), represented by CM Law PLLC, United States.

The Respondents are 南京因威特新能源科技有限公司(yinyinweite), 南京因威特新能源科技有限公司(nanjingyinweitexinengyuan), China ("First Respondent"); and cheng lu, beijikuangye, United States ("Second Respondent").

2. The Domain Names and Registrars

The disputed domain name <invenergy-evc.com> is registered with Xin Net Technology Corporation.

The disputed domain name <invenergy.site> is registered with NameCheap, Inc.

Xin Net Technology Corporation, and NameCheap, Inc. are separately and collectively referred to below as the "Registrar".

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed in English with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the "Center") on December 2, 2025. On the following day, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain names. On December 3 and 5, 2025, the Registrar transmitted by email to the Center its verification responses disclosing registrant and contact information for the disputed domain names that differed from the named Respondent (Private) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on December 15, 2025 with the registrant and contact information of nominally multiple underlying registrants revealed by the Registrar, requesting the Complainant to either file separate complaints 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 Complainant filed an amendment to the Complaint in English on December 18, 2025.

On December 15, 2025, the Center informed the Parties in Chinese and English, that the language of the Registration Agreement for the disputed domain name <invenergy-evc.com> is Chinese. On December 16, 2025, the Complainant requested English to be the language of the proceeding. The Respondents did not submit any comment on the Complainant's submission.

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 the Respondents in English and Chinese of the Complaint, and the proceedings commenced on December 22, 2025. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was January 11, 2026. The Respondents did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondents' default on January 12, 2026.

The Center appointed Matthew Kennedy as the sole panelist in this matter on January 19, 2026. 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 Complainant is a developer, owner, and operator of clean energy solutions, including power generation, power storage and transmission and distribution. It has been in operation since 2003 and has over 200 projects across four continents. It owns trademark registrations in multiple jurisdictions, including the following:

- United States trademark registration number 2,949,358 for INVENERGY, registered on May 10, 2005, with a claim of first use in commerce in October 2003, specifying services in class 40; and
- United States trademark registration number 6,692,469 for INVENERGY, registered on April 5, 2022, with claims of first use in commerce on January 31, 2003, specifying services in classes 35, 36, 37, 39, and 42.

The above trademark registrations are current. The Complainant registered the domain name <invenergy.com> on May 17, 2000 that it uses in connection with a website where it provides information about itself and its services. The Complainant also holds many other Invenergy-formative domain names.

The First Respondent is a Chinese company named “南京因威特新能源科技有限公司”, which may be translated as “Nanjing Yinweite New Energy Technology Co., Ltd”. Its registrant and organization name are also listed in the Whois database as “yinyinweite” and “nanjingyinweitexinengyuan”, respectively, each of which approximates a transcription of parts of its name.

The Second Respondent is an individual named Cheng Luo and an organization named “beijikuangye”, which may be a transcription of Chinese characters “□ □ 矿业” meaning “North Pole Mining”. Its contact address in the Whois database is manifestly false.

The First Respondent holds Chinese trademark registrations numbers 20234916 and 20235015, both for a figurative NVENERGY 因威能源 mark, registered on July 28, 2017 and October 14, 2017, respectively, specifying goods and services in classes 9 and 37, respectively. The First Respondent also holds Chinese trademark registration number 76745488 for a similar figurative NVE NERGY 因威能源 mark, registered on August 28, 2024, specifying services in class 37. The Chinese characters in the marks can be transcribed and translated as “Yin Wei Energy”. Further, Nanjing Invenergy New Energy Technology Co., Ltd (of the First Respondent's address) filed applications for a figurative INVENERGY mark in the United States, the

United Kingdom, and the European Union on February 26 and 27, 2024, all specifying goods in class 9, but those applications were abandoned or withdrawn in April and May 2024.¹

The First Respondent registered the disputed domain name <invenergy-evc.com> on September 20, 2023. This disputed domain name resolves to a website in English for Nanjing Invenergy New Energy Technology Co., Ltd that prominently displays the First Respondent's NVE NERGY 因威能源 mark and offers for sale "Invenergy type 1" electric vehicle chargers and related equipment such as cables, plugs, and accessories.

A mobile-dedicated website associated with the domain name <invenergy.io> (that is not at issue in this dispute) also displays the First Respondent's NVE NERGY 因威能源 mark and offers for sale "Invenergy" electric vehicle charging stations. This domain name was registered on November 6, 2024. The contact street address on this website matches that shown on the website associated with the disputed domain name <invenergy-evc.com>. Further, the website associated with the domain name <invenergy.io> advises that its operator "Invenergy" has a corporate website associated with the disputed domain name <invenergy.site>.

The disputed domain name <invenergy.site> was registered by the Second Respondent on March 11, 2025. This disputed domain name resolves to a website in English that prominently displays the First Respondent's NVE NERGY □ □ □ □ mark and promotes a company that produces electric vehicle charging stations. The archived screenshots in evidence do not show the company's name, although the copyright notice refers to Nanjing Yingfu New Energy Technology Co., Ltd. The company's contact street address is very similar and appears to refer to the same location as that shown on the website associated with the disputed domain name <invenergy-evc.com>, while two of the websites' respective contact persons are the same. The contact email addresses on the website associated with the disputed domain name <invenergy.site> use the domain name <invenergy.io>. This website publishes a news item announcing the official opening of an Invenergy branch in Mexico.

The evidence also shows a TikTok account named @invenergy.io. In July and September 2025, the Complainant received enquiries from Internet users in Ecuador and Mexico seeking clarification of its relationship with the operator of this account or an investment platform based in China associated with the domain name <invenergy.io> that was seeking investments in electric vehicle chargers. An enquiry received from Colombia in September 2025 also confused the Complainant with another company. A post from the TikTok account in Spanish, dated September 11, 2025, displayed an NVE logo similar to part of the First Complainant's marks and presented Invenergy as an innovator and global leader in clean energy providing infrastructure for the era of electric vehicles.

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 names.

Notably, the Complainant contends that the disputed domain name <invenergy.site> is identical to its INVENERGY mark and the disputed domain name <invenergy-evc.com> is confusingly similar to that mark.

The Respondents have no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the disputed domain names. The Respondents are not affiliated with, or related to, the Complainant in any way, and the Respondents are not

¹ United States trademark application number 98422333; United Kingdom trademark application number UK00004018317, and European Union trademark application number 018990579. The applicant's contact street address as shown in the United States application was that of the First Respondent. The applications were abandoned or withdrawn allegedly after the Complainant contacted the Respondent to object to them.

licensed by the Complainant or otherwise authorized to use the INVENERGY trademark. The Respondents' only purpose in registering the disputed domain names is to divert traffic and create confusion. The disputed domain name <invenergy.site> was registered after the Respondents had received correspondence from the Complainant objecting to its INVENERGY trademark applications. The Respondents' Chinese trademark registrations do not cover "Invenergy". The description of the Respondent's company on the website associated with <invenergy.io> is virtually identical to the description of the Complainant's company on its own website.

The disputed domain names were registered and are being used in bad faith. The Respondents clearly obtained the disputed domain names to divert traffic to their own business and request investments in their own business. By doing so it has necessarily disrupted the Complainant's business and caused confusion in the marketplace.

B. Respondents

The Respondents did not reply to the Complainant's contentions.

6. Discussion and Findings

6.1 Preliminary Issues

A. Consolidation: Multiple Respondents

The amended Complaint was filed in relation to two nominally different domain name registrants. The Complainant alleges that the domain name registrants are the same entity or mere alter egos of each other, or under common control. The Complainant requests the consolidation of the Complaint against the multiple disputed domain name registrants pursuant to paragraph 10(e) of the Rules.

The disputed domain name registrants did not comment on the Complainant's request.

Paragraph 3(c) of the Rules states that a complaint may relate to more than one domain name, provided that the domain names are registered by the same domain name holder.

In addressing the Complainant's request, the Panel will consider whether (i) the disputed domain names or corresponding websites are subject to common control; and (ii) the consolidation would be fair and equitable to all Parties. See WIPO Overview of WIPO Panel Views on Selected UDRP Questions, Third Edition (["WIPO Overview 3.0"](#)), section 4.11.2.

As regards common control, the Panel notes that both disputed domain names incorporate INVENERGY as their sole operational element or initial element. The websites associated with them display very similar homepages related to electric vehicle chargers, including the same logo and the same feature image, with contact street addresses that are very similar and appear to refer to the same location. Two of their respective contact persons are in fact the same. Accordingly, the Panel finds that the disputed domain names or the associated websites, or both, are under common control.

As regards fairness and equity, the Panel sees no reason why consolidation of the disputes would be unfair or inequitable to any Party.

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. Language of the Proceeding

The language of the Registration Agreement for the disputed domain name <invenergy-evc.com> is Chinese and for the disputed domain name <invenergy.site> is English. Pursuant to the Rules, paragraph 11(a), in the absence of an agreement between the parties, or unless specified otherwise in the registration agreement, the language of the administrative proceeding shall be the language of the registration agreement.

The Complaint and the amendment to the Complaint were filed in English. The Complainant requested that the language of the proceeding be English for several reasons, including the fact that the websites associated with the disputed domain names are in English, the Respondent claims to have an office in the United States, the Registration Agreement for one of the disputed domain names is in English, from which it appears that the Respondent is able to communicate in that language. Given that the Complainant is unable to communicate in Chinese, translation of the Complaint would create undue delay in the proceeding and substantial expenses for the Complainant.

Despite the Center having sent an email regarding the language of the proceeding, and the notification of the Complaint, in Chinese and English, the Respondent did not make any submission with respect to the language of the proceeding or indicate any interest in otherwise participating in this proceeding.

In exercising its discretion to use a language other than that of the registration agreement, the Panel has to exercise such discretion judicially in the spirit of fairness and justice to both parties, taking into account all relevant circumstances of the case, including matters such as the parties' ability to understand and use the proposed language, time, and costs. See [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 4.5.1.

Having considered all the matters above, the Panel determines under paragraph 11(a) of the Rules that the language of the proceeding shall be English.

6.2 Substantive Issues

Paragraph 4(a) of the Policy provides that a complainant must demonstrate each of the following elements with respect to each disputed domain name:

- (i) the disputed domain name is identical or confusingly similar to a trademark or service mark in which the complainant has rights; and
- (ii) the respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the disputed domain name; and
- (iii) the disputed domain name has been registered and is being used in bad faith.

The burden of proof of each element is borne by the Complainant.

A. 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. See [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 1.7.

The Complainant has shown rights in respect of the INVENERGY trademark for the purposes of the Policy. See [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 1.2.1.

The Panel finds the mark is recognizable within each disputed domain name. Even though one disputed domain name adds the letters "evc" (which may be short for "electric vehicle chargers") separated from the mark by a hyphen, the INVENERGY mark is clearly recognizable with both disputed domain names. The only other additional element in each disputed domain name is a generic Top-Level Domain ("gTLD")

extension (".com" or ".site") which, as a standard requirement of domain name registration, may be disregarded in the assessment of identity or confusing similarity for the purposes of the first element of the Policy. See [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), sections 1.7, 1.8, and 1.11.1. Accordingly, the disputed domain name <invenergy-evc.com> is confusingly similar, and the disputed domain name <invenergy.site> is identical, to the Complainant's mark.

Therefore, the Panel finds the first element of the Policy has been established.

B. 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. See [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 2.1.

In the present case, the disputed domain name <invenergy-evc.com> resolves to a website offering for sale "Invenergy type 1" electric vehicle chargers and related equipment while the disputed domain name <invenergy.site> promotes the company that produces electric vehicle charging stations. The nature of these goods is related to the Complainant's clean energy solutions. The use of the Complainant's trademark in the disputed domain name <invenergy-evc.com> and on the associated website creates a likelihood of confusion with the Complainant's trademark as to the source, affiliation, or endorsement of the Respondent's websites. The fact that the disputed domain name <invenergy.site> is identical to the Complainant's mark carries a high risk of implied affiliation. Yet the Complainant submits that the Respondent is not affiliated with, or related to, it in any way, and the Respondent is not licensed by the Complainant or otherwise authorized to use the INVENERGY trademark. These circumstances do not indicate that the Respondent is using the disputed domain names in connection with a bona fide offering of goods or services, nor that the Respondent is making a legitimate noncommercial or fair use of the disputed domain names.

The First Respondent does not hold trademark rights in "Invenergy". The trademark applications for INVENERGY have been abandoned or withdrawn. Although the First Respondent holds Chinese trademark registrations for figurative NVENERGY □ □ □ □ and NVE NERGY □ □ □ □ marks, neither the English nor the Chinese elements of the mark clearly correspond to "Invenergy" as used in the disputed domain names. Nor is there any evidence that the first mark is in use.

There is no evidence on the record that the Respondent has been commonly known by the disputed domain names. The First Respondent's company name is "□ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □", which may be translated as "Nanjing Yinweite New Energy Technology Co., Ltd". This does not correspond to the disputed domain names. While the First Respondent appears to translate its company name as "Nanjing *Invenergy* New Energy Technology Co., Ltd" (emphasis added) on one of its websites, and its products are referred to as "Invenergy type 1" on that same website and on another associated with the domain name <invenergy.io>, there is no evidence that the Respondent has been commonly known as "Invenergy". The Second Respondent's name is listed as "Cheng Luo" and "beijikuangye", neither of which resembles "Invenergy" either.

The Panel acknowledges that "energy" is a common dictionary word relevant to the Respondent's business of producing electric vehicle chargers and related equipment. However, the disputed domain names incorporate that word as part of the coined term "invenergy".

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.

Based on the record, the Panel finds the second element of the Policy has been established.

C. 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. The fourth circumstance is as follows:

“(iv) by using the [disputed] domain name, [the respondent has] intentionally attempted to attract, for commercial gain, Internet users to [the respondent'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 respondent's] website or location or of a product or service on [the respondent's] web site or location.”

In the present case, the disputed domain names were registered in 2023 and 2025, many years after the earliest registration of the Complainant's INVENERGY mark. The disputed domain names incorporate that mark as their initial element or sole operational element. The mark is a coined term. The Complainant has made longstanding and widespread use of that mark, including online. The nature of the Respondent's goods is related to the Complainant's services, which increases the likelihood that it was aware of the Complainant's mark. The characters “□ □” (“yin wei”) in the First Respondent's company name and trademarks appear to have been selected for phonetic reasons rather than semantic reasons which, in the circumstances of this case, gives rise to the inference that they were intended (with the term “energy”) to approximate the Complainant's INVENERGY mark. The Respondent provides no other explanation for its choice of the disputed domain names. In view of these circumstances, the Panel finds it more likely than not that the Respondent knew of the Complainant and its mark at the time when it registered the disputed domain names.

As regards use, the disputed domain name <invenergy-evc.com> resolves to a website offering for sale “Invenergy type 1” electric vehicle chargers and related equipment while the disputed domain name <invenergy.site> promotes the company that produces those electric vehicle chargers and related equipment. Given the Panels' findings in Section 6.2B above, the Panel finds, on balance, that the Respondent has intentionally attempted to attract, for commercial gain, Internet users to the Respondent's websites by creating a likelihood of confusion with the Complainant's INVENERGY mark as to the source, affiliation or endorsement of the Respondent's websites and the electric vehicle chargers on those websites, within the terms of paragraph 4(b)(iv) of the Policy.

Therefore, 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 <invenergy-evc.com>, and <invenergy.site> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Matthew Kennedy/

Matthew Kennedy

Sole Panelist

Date: January 28, 2026