

## **ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION**

Chevron Corporation, Chevron Intellectual Property LLC v. Emma Walker,  
Chevron Technology Ventures  
Case No. D2026-1740

### **1. The Parties**

The Complainants are Chevron Corporation and Chevron Intellectual Property LLC, United States of America (“United States” or “U.S.”), represented by Com Laude Limited, United Kingdom.

The Respondent is Emma Walker, Chevron Technology Ventures, United States.

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

The disputed domain name <chevrontechnologyventures.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 April 23, 2026. On April 24, 2026, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the Disputed Domain Name. On April 27, 2026, 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 the Complainant on April 29, 2026, 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 April 30, 2026.

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 May 4, 2026. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was May 24, 2026. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent's default on May 26, 2026.

The Center appointed Douglas M. Isenberg as the sole panelist in this matter on June 8, 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 Complaint states that Chevron Intellectual Property LLC is the intellectual property holding company for Chevron Corporation, which is "a multinational energy and technology company... 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". Chevron Corporation and Chevron Intellectual Property LLC are referred to herein interchangeably, as the context may allow or require, as "Complainant". The Complaint further states that Complainant "was founded in 1879 and is currently active in over 180 countries"; that it "was ranked as the 30th-largest public company in the world in Forbes' Global 2000 list, an annual ranking of the top 2,000 public companies in the world based on sales, profit, assets and market value"; that it "also ranked No. 16 on the Fortune 500 list, which ranks the 500 largest U.S. companies by total revenue for their fiscal year"; and that it ranked "No. 29 on the Fortune Global 500 list in 2025".

Complainant further states that it launched "Chevron Technology Ventures" in 1999, which is Complainant's "corporate venture capital arm that sources, invests in, and pilots emerging technologies with strategic relevance to its businesses from the startup ecosystem" and that Chevron Technology Ventures has "invested in more than 100 companies with more than 300 co-investors".

Complainant states, and provides documentation in support thereof, that it is the owner of "a global portfolio of registrations for the trademark CHEVRON", including the following:

- U.S. Reg. No. 364,683 for CHEVRON (registered February 14, 1939) for use in connection with "lubricating oils, flushing oils".
- United Kingdom Trade Mark No. UK00000638572 for CHEVRON (registered July 12, 1945) for use in connection with "all goods included in Class 4".
- European Union Trade Mark No. 000095745 for CHEVRON (registered March 8, 1999) for use in connection with, inter alia, "petroleum and products derived from petroleum".

These registrations are referred to herein as the "CHEVRON Trademark".

The Disputed Domain Name was created on March 16, 2026. According to the Complaint, and as supported by a screenshot submitted therewith (dated April 10, 2026), the Disputed Domain Name was previously used in connection with a website that "impersonated the Complainants by misusing their name and address, explicitly referring to itself as 'Chevron's corporate venture capital arm', reproducing content scraped from the Complainants' official website, and displaying a copyright notice reading '2026 Chevron Technology Ventures, all rights reserved'". Complainant states that it filed an abuse report and that the Disputed Domain Name is no longer associated with an active website. Finally, Complainant states, and provides documentation in support thereof, that the Disputed Domain Name "is configured with Mail eXchanger ('MX') and Sender Policy Framework ('SPF') records, which means that the disputed domain name can be used for email communication".

## 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 that:

- The Disputed Domain Name is confusingly similar to the CHEVRON Trademark because the Disputed Domain Name "differ[s] only by the addition of the words 'technology ventures'", which "is closely associated with the Complainants and their technology focused investment and innovation activities" and "therefore does nothing to distinguish the disputed domain name from the Complainants' CHEVRON mark and, on the contrary, serves to increase the likelihood of confusion between the disputed domain name and Chevron".
- Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in the Disputed Domain Name because, inter alia, "Complainants have found no evidence that the Respondent has been commonly known as CHEVRON or CHEVRON TECHNOLOGY VENTURES prior to or after the registration of the disputed domain name"; "Respondent is not a licensee of the Complainants and has not received any permission or consent from the Complainants, either together or singly, to use their CHEVRON name and mark"; "Complainants have found no evidence that the Respondent owns any trademarks incorporating the term CHEVRON"; "Complainants have found no evidence that the Respondent has ever traded legitimately under the business names CHEVRON or CHEVRON TECHNOLOGY VENTURES"; "Respondent's [previous] website was intended to deceive Internet users into believing it is put out by or otherwise is connected with the Complainants"; and Complainant's current failure to use the Disputed Domain Name in connection with an active website constitutes passive holding and there "does not amount to any legitimate non-commercial or fair use or use in connection with a bona fide offering of goods and services".
- Respondent registered and is using the Disputed Domain Name in bad faith because, inter alia, "Respondent has sought to attract Internet users to its website for commercial gain by creating a likelihood of confusion with the Complainants' CHEVRON mark and CTV division as to source, sponsorship, affiliation, or endorsement"; "the website supports the confusion of it being affiliated with or at least authorised by the Complainants"; the lack of a current website associated with the Disputed Domain Name satisfies the passive holding doctrine; and "[t]he MX record configuration creates a clear risk that the disputed domain name could be used to send emails impersonating the Complainants".

### B. Respondent

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

## 6. Discussion and Findings

### A. Preliminary Issue: Consolidation

As set forth above, the Complaint states that Chevron Intellectual Property LLC is the intellectual property holding company for Chevron Corporation, both of which are named as complainants in this proceeding. As set forth in section 1.4.1. of WIPO Overview of WIPO Panel Views on Select UDRP Questions (["WIPO Overview 3.1"](#)), "A trademark owner's affiliate such as a subsidiary of a parent or of a holding company, or an exclusive trademark licensee, is considered to have rights in a trademark under the UDRP for purposes of standing to file a complaint.... Where multiple related parties have rights in the relevant mark on which a UDRP complaint is based, a UDRP complaint may be brought by any one party, on behalf of the other interested parties". In practice, panels routinely accept complaints filed by two parties where one is an intellectual property holding company for the other, and the Panel considers it proper to do so here. The Panel notes that the Complaint has requested transfer of the Disputed Domain Name to Chevron Intellectual Property LLC.

## **B. Identical or Confusingly Similar**

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

As to whether the Disputed Domain Name is identical or confusingly similar to the CHEVRON Trademark, the relevant comparison to be made is with the second-level portion of the Disputed Domain Name only (i.e., “chevrontechnologyventures”) 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 3.1](#), section 1.11.1.

As set forth in section 1.7 of [WIPO Overview 3.1](#): “in cases where a domain name incorporates the entirety of a trademark ..., the domain name will normally be considered confusingly similar to that mark.” Further, as set forth in section 1.8 of [WIPO Overview 3.1](#): “Where the relevant trademark is recognizable within the disputed domain name, the addition of other terms (whether descriptive, geographical, pejorative, meaningless, or otherwise) would not prevent a finding of confusing similarity under the first element.” Finally, as set forth in section 1.15 of [WIPO Overview 3.1](#): Although “[t]he content of the website associated with the domain name is usually disregarded by panels when assessing confusing similarity under the first element[,]... [i]n some instances, panels have however taken note of the content of the website associated with a domain name to confirm confusing similarity whereby it appears prima facie that the respondent seeks to target a trademark through the disputed domain name”. Here, the Disputed Domain Name contains the CHEVRON Trademark in its entirety, which is recognizable within the Disputed Domain Name, and the website associated with the Disputed Domain Name clearly seeks to target Complainant.

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

## **C. Rights or Legitimate Interests**

The Complainant has argued that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the Disputed Domain Name because, inter alia, “Complainants have found no evidence that the Respondent has been commonly known as CHEVRON or CHEVRON TECHNOLOGY VENTURES prior to or after the registration of the disputed domain name”; “Respondent is not a licensee of the Complainants and has not received any permission or consent from the Complainants, either together or singly, to use their CHEVRON name and mark”; “Complainants have found no evidence that the Respondent owns any trademarks incorporating the term CHEVRON”; “Complainants have found no evidence that the Respondent has ever traded legitimately under the business names CHEVRON or CHEVRON TECHNOLOGY VENTURES”; “Respondent’s [previous] website was intended to deceive Internet users into believing it is put out by or otherwise is connected with the Complainants”; and Complainant’s current failure to use the Disputed Domain Name in connection with an active website constitutes passive holding and there “does not amount to any legitimate non-commercial or fair use or use in connection with a bona fide offering of goods and services”.

[WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 2.1, states: “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 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.”

Although the registrant organization name used by Respondent for the Disputed Domain Name is “Chevron Technology Ventures”, there is nothing to indicate that Respondent is actually known as “Chevron Technology Ventures” and, on the contrary, it appears likely that Respondent has selected this name when it registered the Disputed Domain Name purely as a pretext for its cybersquatting activities. See, e.g., *Quest Diagnostics Investments LLC v. Quest*, WIPO Case No. [D2019-1030](#) (“Registration under the name ‘Quest’, which does bear some similarity to the disputed domain name, does not alone suffice to show that the Respondent is commonly known by the disputed domain name”); *De’Longhi Appliances S.r.l v. Delonghi Delong, Delonghi*, WIPO Case No. [D2019-0077](#) (finding that respondent’s name as listed in the Whois record “is not a believable name” where it contained Complainant’s trademark); and *LEGO Juris A/S v. Private Whois, Knock Knock WHOIS Not There, LLC / Legos Deak*, WIPO Case No. [D2019-2385](#) (“the Panel notes that the Respondent’s name includes [Complainant’s trademark], however, no evidence on record suggests the Respondent has been commonly known by the disputed domain names”).

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

#### **D. 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).

By previously using the Disputed Domain Name in connection with a website that appears to be a website for, or associated with, Complainant, Respondent has clearly created a likelihood of confusion pursuant to paragraph 4(b)(iv) of the Policy. See, e.g., *The Dow Chemical Company v. dowaychemical eva\_hwang@21cn.com +86.7508126859*, WIPO Case No. [D2008-1078](#) (finding bad faith where complainant alleged that respondent’s website “fraudulently impersonat[ed] the Complainant” because “[t]he Respondent was clearly specifically targeting the Complainant’s trademark and attempting to divert Internet users searching for the Complainant’s product to the Respondent’s website”); *Emu (Aus) Pty Ltd. and Emu Ridge Holdings Pty Ltd. v. Antonia Deinert*, WIPO Case No. [D2010-1390](#) (“a reasonable person who visited the Respondent’s website was likely to be misled in relation to the source, sponsorship, affiliation, or endorsement of the website and the products purportedly made available for online sale on the website”); and *Cantor Fitzgerald Securities, Cantor Index Limited v. Cantor Index*, WIPO Case No. [D2010-0807](#) (finding bad faith where “Respondent copied text, logos and other elements from Complainant’s website”).

Complainant has set forth additional arguments regarding the passive holding doctrine given that the Disputed Domain Name is no longer associated with an active website following the filing of an abuse report by Complainant. However, the Panel finds it unnecessary to evaluate these arguments and instead is satisfied that Respondent’s prior usage satisfies the bad faith element of the Policy. The Policy’s reference to how a disputed domain name “is being used” need not refer to usage as of a specific date. What matters is what use a respondent has made of a disputed domain name, regardless of whether such usage differs from an earlier date until the current date (albeit also noting that changes after notice of a complainant’s rights may further support a finding of bad faith). To rigidly require otherwise would enable a respondent to

avoid liability under the Policy simply by changing how it uses a disputed domain name. See, e.g., *Merryvale Limited v. Gera Safin*, WIPO Case No. [D2021-1812](#) (finding bad faith based on how the disputed domain name was used “[p]rior to suspension of the Disputed Domain Name by the Registrar after the Complainant’s filing of an abuse report”); *Postnet International v. Manjo Morias*, WIPO Case No. [D2021-3880](#) (finding bad faith where “[t]he disputed domain name previously redirected to a website that purported to offers services which were identical or similar to the services that is offered by the Complainant” and “[t]he fact that the website appears to be unavailable at present does not alter this finding”); and *Ports Group AB v. WhoisGuard Protected, WhoisGuard, Inc. / Ayed Alotaibi*, WIPO Case No. [DCC2020-0008](#) (finding bad faith based on how “the disputed domain name used to resolve” prior to being suspended by the respondent’s hosting provider following a request from the complainant).

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 <chevrontechnologyventures.com> be transferred to Chevron Intellectual Property LLC.

*/Douglas M. Isenberg/*

**Douglas M. Isenberg**

Sole Panelist

Date: June 9, 2026