

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

Ovintiv Trademarks Inc. v. Name Redacted
Case No. D2026-2110

1. The Parties

The Complainant is Ovintiv Trademarks Inc., United States of America (“United States”), represented by Gowling WLG (Canada) LLP, Canada.

The Respondent is Name Redacted.¹

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <oviintiv.com> is registered with Squarespace Domains LLC (the “Registrar”).

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the “Center”) on May 15, 2026. On May 18, 2026, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On May 18, 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) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on May 21, 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 amendment to the Complaint on May 28, 2026.

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”).

¹ The Respondent appears to have used the name of a third party when registering the disputed domain name. Considering the potential identity theft, the Panel has redacted the Respondent’s name from this decision. However, the Panel has attached as Annex 1 to this decision an instruction to the Registrar regarding transfer of the disputed domain name, which includes the name of the Respondent. The Panel has authorized the Center to transmit Annex 1 to the Registrar as part of the order in this proceeding and has indicated Annex 1 to this decision shall not be published due to the exceptional circumstances of this case. See *Banco Bradesco S.A. v. FAST-12785241 Attn. Bradescourgente.net / Name Redacted*, WIPO Case No. [D2009-1788](#).

In accordance with the Rules, paragraphs 2 and 4, the Center formally notified the Respondent of the Complaint, and the proceedings commenced on May 29, 2026. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was June 18, 2026. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent's default on June 23, 2026.

The Center appointed William F. Hamilton as the sole panelist in this matter on June 24, 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 holds the trademark portfolio of the Ovintiv group of companies, which conducts oil and natural gas exploration and production business operations in the United States and Canada. The Ovintiv brand name was adopted in January 2020. The Complainant operates a website located at the domain name <ovintiv.com>.

The Complainant owns registrations for the trademark OVINTIV (the "Mark") in several jurisdictions, including:

- United States Trademark Registration No. 7108219 for the word mark OVINTIV, registered on July 11, 2023;
- United States Trademark Registration No. 7774354 for OVINTIV and design, registered on April 29, 2025;
- Canadian Trademark Registration No. TMA1281899 for the word mark OVINTIV, registered on January 10, 2025; and
- Canadian Trademark Registration No. TMA1365603 for OVINTIV and design, registered on December 5, 2025.

The Mark is registered in connection with the Complainant's oil and natural gas goods and services.

The disputed domain name was registered on February 11, 2026. It resolves to an inactive webpage stating that the site is "under construction".

5. Parties' Contentions

A. Complainant

The Complainant contends that it has satisfied each element required under the Policy for a transfer of the disputed domain name.

The Complainant contends that the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to the Mark. The Complainant submits that the disputed domain name is a deliberate misspelling of the Mark, achieved through the addition of a single letter, and that this typosquatting does not avoid a finding of confusing similarity.

The Complainant contends that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name. The Complainant submits that there is no relationship between the Parties, that the Respondent has not been authorized to use the Mark, that the Respondent is not commonly known by the disputed domain name, and that the Respondent has not used, or made demonstrable preparations to use, the disputed domain name in connection with a bona fide offering of goods or services or a legitimate noncommercial or fair use. The Complainant further submits that typosquatting cannot give rise to rights or legitimate interests.

The Complainant further contends that the disputed domain name was registered and is being used in bad faith. The Complainant submits that the following demonstrates the Respondent's bad faith:

- the Respondent had actual or constructive knowledge of the Mark;
- the Respondent registered the disputed domain name to attract Internet users for commercial gain by creating a likelihood of confusion with the Mark;
- the non-use of the disputed domain name does not prevent a finding of bad faith;
- typosquatting is itself evidence of bad faith; and
- The Respondent provided false contact information by registering the disputed domain name in the name of a third party who has no connection with the disputed domain name.

B. Respondent

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

6. Discussion and Findings

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 of WIPO Panel Views on Select UDRP Questions ("[WIPO Overview 3.1](#)"), section 1.7.

The Complainant has shown rights in respect of the Mark for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.2.1.

The disputed domain name consists of a misspelling of the Mark, with the addition of an extra letter "i", and the Mark remains recognizable within the disputed domain name. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.9.

The generic Top-Level Domain ("gTLD") ".com" is viewed as a standard registration requirement and is disregarded for the purposes of the confusing similarity test. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.11.

The Panel finds the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to the Mark for the purposes of the Policy. 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.

The Panel finds the Complainant has established a prima facie case that the Respondent lacks rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name. There is no evidence that the Respondent has been authorized to use the Mark, that the Respondent is commonly known by the disputed domain name, or 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 or a legitimate noncommercial or fair use. The composition of the disputed domain name, a misspelling of the Mark that carries a risk of implied affiliation with the Complainant as Internet users may not notice the subtle difference between the disputed domain name and the Mark, cannot constitute fair use. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 2.5.1. The Respondent has not rebutted the Complainant’s prima facie case and has not come forward with any relevant evidence demonstrating rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name.

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.

Paragraph 4(b) of the Policy sets out a list of non-exhaustive circumstances that may indicate that a domain name was registered and used in bad faith, but other circumstances may be relevant in assessing whether a respondent’s registration and use of a domain name is in bad faith. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 3.2.1.

The Mark is a coined term with no meaning other than as the Complainant’s trademark. The disputed domain name was registered on February 11, 2026, well after the Complainant had obtained its registrations of the Mark. The disputed domain name consists of an obvious and deliberate misspelling of the Mark. The Panel finds that the Respondent registered the disputed domain name with knowledge of the Complainant and the Mark, and with the intention of targeting the Complainant. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 3.2.2.

The disputed domain name resolves to an inactive “under construction” page. Panels have found that the non-use of a domain name would not by itself prevent a finding of bad faith under the doctrine of passive holding. In examining the totality of the circumstances, the Panel notes the distinctiveness of the Mark, which is a coined term, and the composition of the disputed domain name, which is a deliberate misspelling of the Mark. The Panel finds no plausible good faith use to which the disputed domain name could be put, and the Respondent has not come forward with any evidence of such use. In these circumstances, the passive holding of the disputed domain name does not prevent a finding of bad faith. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 3.3.

The disputed domain name was registered by the Respondent using the name of an employee of the Complainant who has no connection with the disputed domain name. The provision of false contact details further supports the Panel’s finding of bad faith. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 3.3.

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 <oviintiv.com> be transferred to the Complainant.

/William F. Hamilton/

William F. Hamilton

Sole Panelist

Date: July 6, 2026