

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

Chevron Corporation, Chevron Intellectual Property LLC v. Evans Ling
Case No. D2026-0534

1. The Parties

The Complainants are Chevron Corporation (the “First Complainant”) and Chevron Intellectual Property LLC (the “Second Complainant”), United States of America (“United States”), represented by Com Laude Limited, United Kingdom.

The Respondent is Evans Ling, Hong Kong, China.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <chevroncorpvendor.com> is registered with Global Domain Group LLC (the “Registrar”).

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the “Center”) on February 9, 2026. On February 9, 2026, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On February 13, 2026, the Registrar transmitted by email to the Center its verification response confirming that the Respondent is listed as the registrant and providing the contact details.

The Center verified that 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 Respondent of the Complaint, and the proceedings commenced on February 17, 2026. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was March 9, 2026. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent’s default on March 12, 2026.

The Center appointed Petra Pecar as the sole panelist in this matter on March 18, 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 First Complainant is a multinational energy and technology company headquartered in Texas, United States, established in 1879, and operates primarily in the oil and gas industry, including the exploration, production and distribution of petroleum products and chemicals, as well as the development of alternative and renewable energy sources. The First Complainant operates in over 180 countries, is one of the largest energy companies in the United States, and conducts business under the CHEVRON mark.

The Second Complainant is the intellectual property holding company of the Chevron group, organized under the laws of the State of Delaware, United States, and owns registered rights in the CHEVRON mark and its variations in numerous jurisdictions worldwide, including:

- European Union CHEVRON word mark Registration No. 000095745, registered on March 8, 1999, for goods in International Classes 1, 2, 3, 4, 16, 17, and 19; and
- European Union  figurative mark Registration No. 015759095, registered on December 30, 2016, for services in International Classes 35, 37, and 39.

The Complainants operate a website at the domain name <chevron.com>, which hosts the official website presenting the energy business.

The disputed domain name was registered on August 22, 2025, and at the time of filing of the Complaint, it redirected to the Complainants' official website at "www.chevron.com."

The Respondent is an individual, apparently residing in Hong Kong, China.

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 name.

Notably, the Complainants contend that the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to their CHEVRON mark, supported by longstanding global registrations. The disputed domain name incorporates the CHEVRON mark in its entirety and differs only by the addition of the terms "corp" and "vendor," which do not prevent a finding of confusing similarity but instead reinforce an association with the Complainants and their business activities. The Complainants further assert that the CHEVRON mark is well known worldwide, referring to its extensive global operations and significant presence on social media platforms with millions of followers.

The Complainants contend that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the disputed domain name. The Complainants assert that the Respondent is not commonly known by the disputed domain name, has not been authorized to use the CHEVRON mark, and holds no trademark or other rights in the disputed domain name. The Complainants further assert that the disputed domain name creates a risk of implied affiliation, that its redirection to the Complainants' website at the domain name <chevron.com> is misleading and not a bona fide or legitimate use, and that its configuration enables email use, increasing the likelihood of confusion and potential deception.

The Complainants contend that the disputed domain name was registered and is being used in bad faith. In particular, they submit that the Respondent has redirected the disputed domain name to the Complainants' official website without authorization, which demonstrates an intention to capitalize on user confusion and improperly attract Internet users. The Complainants further assert that the configuration of Mail Exchange ("MX") records in connection with the disputed domain name gives rise to a credible risk of its use for

deceptive email communications impersonating the Complainants. The Complainants also maintain that the composition of the disputed domain name, incorporating the CHEVRON mark together with the terms “corp” and “vendor”, is inherently misleading and suggests an affiliation with the Complainants’ business activities. Finally, the Complainants argue that, in light of the longstanding and well-known nature of the CHEVRON mark, as well as the redirection to the Complainants’ official website, the Respondent knew or ought to have known of the Complainants’ rights at the time of registration.

B. Respondent

The Respondent did not reply to the Complainants’ contentions.

6. Discussion and Findings

Even if the Respondent did not file a Response to the Complainants’ contentions, the Panel shall consider the issues present in the case based on the statements and documents submitted by the Complainant. “A Panel shall decide a complaint on the basis of the statements and documents submitted and in accordance with the Policy, these Rules and any rules and principles of law that it deems applicable”, as indicated in paragraph 15(a) of the Rules.

Under paragraph 4(a) of the Policy, the Complainants are required to prove each of the following three elements:

- (i) the disputed domain name is identical or confusingly similar to a trademark or service mark in which the Complainants have rights;
- (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 by the Respondent in bad faith.

6.1 Procedural Issues: Consolidation of Multiple Complainants

Section 4.11.1 of the WIPO Overview of WIPO Panel Views on Select UDRP Questions ([“WIPO Overview 3.1”](#)) provides that, in cases involving multiple complainants against a single respondent, panels assess whether (i) the complainants have a specific common grievance against the respondent, or whether the respondent has engaged in common conduct affecting the complainants in a similar manner, and (ii) whether it would be equitable and procedurally efficient to permit consolidation.

In the present case, the Complainants submit that they have a specific common grievance against the Respondent. Both Complainants form part of the same corporate group. The disputed domain name takes unfair advantage of the Complainants’ reputation and is confusingly similar to the Second Complainant’s registered CHEVRON trademark. Accordingly, the Complainants share a common legal and commercial interest in the CHEVRON trademark.

In light of the above, the Panel finds that consolidation of the Complaint is appropriate, as the Complainants have a common grievance against the Respondent and consolidation is fair and procedurally efficient in the circumstances.

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. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.7.

The Complainants have shown rights in respect of the CHEVRON mark for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.2.1.

The entirety of the CHEVRON mark is reproduced within the disputed domain name. Accordingly, the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to the mark for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.7.

Although the addition of other terms “corp” and “vendor” may bear on assessment of the second and third elements, the Panel finds the addition of such terms does not prevent a finding of confusing similarity between the disputed domain name and the mark for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.8.

Furthermore, it is well accepted practice by UDRP panels that a generic Top-Level Domain (“gTLD”), such as “.com”, is typically ignored when assessing whether a domain name is identical or confusingly similar to a trademark (see section 1.11. 1 of the [WIPO Overview 3.1](#)). For that reason, the Panel accepts not to take into consideration the gTLD “.com” in the present case when assessing confusing similarity between the disputed domain name and the mark.

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 that 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 3.1](#), section 2.1.

Having reviewed the available record, the Panel finds the Complainants have established a prima facie case that the Respondent lacks rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name. The Respondent has not rebutted the Complainants’ 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.

According to the Complainants, the Respondent is not affiliated with or connected to the Complainants in any way, and the Complainants have not granted the Respondent any license or authorization to use or register a domain name incorporating the CHEVRON mark. The Respondent has failed to respond to the Complaint and has therefore provided no evidence of any rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name.

There is no indication that the Respondent has used, or made demonstrable preparations to use, the disputed domain name in connection with a bona fide offering of goods or services, that it has been commonly known by the disputed domain name, or that it is making any legitimate noncommercial or fair use of it.

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.

In the present case, the Panel notes that the disputed domain name consists of the CHEVRON mark, followed by the additional terms “corp” and “vendor” and the gTLD “.com”. The registration of the disputed domain name, which incorporates the Complainants’ CHEVRON mark along with an additional term being a commonly used abbreviation of the Complainants’ corporate type and another term closely associated with the Complainants’ commercial activities, indicates the Respondent’s awareness of the Complainants and their CHEVRON mark. Furthermore, the fact that the website associated with the disputed domain name is redirected to the Complainants’ official website demonstrates an intentional attempt to exploit the Complainants’ reputation and goodwill.

Regarding bad faith at the time of registration, the Panel finds that the Respondent was aware of the Complainants’ rights in the CHEVRON mark when the disputed domain name was registered, given the long-standing and distinctive nature of the CHEVRON mark in the oil and gas industry, its complete incorporation into the disputed domain name with additional terms related to the Complainants and their commercial activities.

The Panel finds that the disputed domain name was designed to create a misleading association with the Complainants and their activities, with the Complainants’ CHEVRON mark predating the registration of the disputed domain name by approximately 26 years. Consequently, the Panel concludes that the disputed domain name was registered in bad faith.

The Panel additionally notes that the disputed domain name is configured with MX records and is therefore capable of email communication. In circumstances where a disputed domain name is confusingly similar to a complainant’s mark and is used for a website redirected to the complainant’s official website, the ability to send emails from that disputed domain name heightens the risk of deceptive communications and potential email impersonation schemes, and it therefore supports a finding of bad faith registration and use. The same applies to the case at hand. Therefore, the Panel concludes that the Respondent has registered and used the disputed domain name with the purpose of gaining an unfair advantage by misleadingly associating it with the Complainants’ reputation and CHEVRON mark. Such conduct falls within the bad faith circumstances contemplated by paragraph 4(b)(iv) of the Policy, as it reflects an intentional attempt to attract Internet users by creating a likelihood of confusion with the Complainant as to the source, sponsorship, affiliation, or endorsement of the Respondent’s website. These actions have the potential to disrupt the Complainants’ operations and harm their reputation. Accordingly, the Panel finds that the disputed domain name was registered and is being used in bad faith (Policy, paragraphs 4(a)(iii) and 4(b)).

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 <chevroncorpvendor.com> be transferred to the Second Complainant, Chevron Intellectual Property LLC.

/Petra Pecar/

Petra Pecar

Sole Panelist

Date: April 1, 2026