

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

Chevron Corporation, Chevron Intellectual Property LLC v. James Steve
Case No. D2026-3904

1. The Parties

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

The Respondent is James Steve, Belgium.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <reginternational.com> is registered with TuringSign Inc. d/b/a Cosmotown (the "Registrar").

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the "Center") on September 1, 2026. On the same day, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On September 3, 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 (The RDAP server redacted the value) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainants on September 3, 2026, providing the registrant and contact information disclosed by the Registrar, and inviting the Complainants to submit an amendment to the Complaint. The Complainants filed an amended Complaint on September 4, 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 September 11, 2026. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was October 1, 2026. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent's default on October 2, 2026.

The Center appointed Andrew Brown K.C. as the sole panelist in this matter on October 7, 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, Chevron Corporation, is a multi-national energy and technology company headquartered in Houston, Texas, United States. It is 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.

The first Complainant is the thirtieth largest public company in the world and trades under the CHEVRON trademark and names formed from its CHEVRON mark. It operates the website at “www.chevron.com”.

The second Complainant, Chevron Intellectual Property LLC, is the intellectual property holding company of the first Complainant and is organized under the laws of Delaware, United States.

On February 28, 2022, the first Complainant announced its acquisition of Renewable Energy Group, Inc. (“REG”), a company engaged in converting renewable resources into biodiesel and renewable diesel marketed to industrial, transportation, and aviation customers. Prior to this acquisition, REG had been a founder of the renewable fuels industry – operating 11 refineries across US and Europe. REG’s primary website is located at “www.regi.com”.

Since the acquisition, the Complainants have continued to trade under the REG name and trademark in connection with renewable and low carbon fuel products including biodiesel and renewable diesel.

The second Complainant is the proprietor of registrations for the trademark REG (“the REG Trademark”) including the following:

Jurisdiction	Mark	Number	Registration Date	Class
US	REG	4707187	March 24, 2015	1, 4
US	REG-9000	3642051	June 23, 2009	4

The disputed domain name was registered on April 28, 2026. The landing pages located at the disputed domain name use the name REG International Trading & Commodities B.V. and describes this company as a petroleum refining, wholesale fuel bunkering, and low-carbon fuels and biofuels business. The landing page uses the headings “REG International – Powering the Future of Energy” and “REG International – A Leader in Global Energy Solutions”.

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 they have trademark rights to the REG Trademark in respect of goods in classes 1 and 4. The earliest of these trademark rights is from 2009, some 17 years before registration of the disputed domain name.

The Complainants contend that the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to their REG Trademark. They state that the addition of the word “international” does nothing to distinguish the disputed domain name from their REG Trademark. They further state that the combination REG International Trading & Commodities B.V. corresponds exactly to a company within the Complainants’ group (“REG International”).

The Complainants state that the REG Trademark remains clearly recognizable within the disputed domain name and that the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to their REG Trademark.

The Complainants contend that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the disputed domain name. In this regard the Complainants state that:

- (a) the Complainants have found no evidence that the Respondent has been commonly known as REG International prior to or after registration of the disputed domain name;
- (b) the Respondent is not a licensee of the Complainants nor has the Respondent received any permission or consent from the Complainants to use their REG Trademark;
- (c) the Respondent does not own any trademark incorporating the term “reg” nor has it traded legitimately under that name;
- (d) the Respondent cannot claim “fair use” of the disputed domain name because the nature of the disputed domain name carries a risk of implied affiliation; and
- (e) the disputed domain name is not used in connection with a bona fide offering of goods and services. Rather, the landing pages at the disputed domain name impersonate the Complainants and purport to be a genuine, long-established company within the Complainants’ group.

The Complainants state that the disputed domain name has been registered in bad faith. In particular, they assert that the landing pages at the disputed domain name and statements and particulars provided on those pages show that the Respondent intentionally targeted their REG Trademark. Further, they say that the Respondent set out to mislead Internet users into believing that the disputed domain name and landing pages located there were the Complainants or at least affiliated with or endorsed by the Complainants.

As to use in bad faith, the Complainants rely on the factors just discussed. They further point out that the disputed domain name and landing pages correspond precisely to the name and area of activity of a company within the Complainants’ group, i.e. REG International Trading & Commodities B.V. The Complainants state that it is likely that Internet users who encounter the disputed domain name will be looking for the Complainants’ genuine REG International company.

The Complainants state that the Respondent knew or should have known of their rights to the REG Trademark which predate the registration of the disputed domain name by some 17 years. They state that actual knowledge on the part of the Respondent is shown by the fact that at the website under the disputed domain name the Respondent reproduces exactly the name of one of the Complainants’ companies, its actual address in Netherlands (Kingdom of the) and displays the first Complainant’s CHEVRON mark and logo.

Finally, the Complainants point out that the disputed domain name is configured with MX records, thus enabling email communications. So, anyone receiving an email from the disputed domain name would assume it was from the Complainants.

B. Respondent

The Respondent did not reply to the Complainants’ contentions.

6. Discussion and Findings

6.1. Preliminary Procedural Issue – Consolidation of Complainants

The two Complainants assert that they have a common grievance against the Respondent and that the Respondent has targeted rights belonging to both of them. These are the second Complainant's rights in the REG Trademark and the first Complainant's rights in its CHEVRON brand/logo which is reproduced at the landing pages located at the disputed domain name.

In assessing whether a complaint filed by multiple complainants may be brought against a single respondent, panels look at whether (i) the complainants have a specific common grievance against the respondent, or the respondent has engaged in common conduct that has affected the complainants in a similar fashion, and (ii) it would be equitable and procedurally efficient to permit the consolidation. WIPO Overview of WIPO Panel Views on Select UDRP Questions ("[WIPO Overview 3.1](#)"), section 4.11.1. The Panel finds that the Complainants share a common grievance and sees no reason why it would not be equitable and procedurally efficient to permit the consolidation.

6.2. Substantive Issues

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 Complainants' trademark and the disputed domain name. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.7.

The Complainants have shown rights in respect of a trademark or service mark for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.3.

The Panel finds that the REG Trademark is recognizable 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 (here "international") may bear on assessment of the second and third elements, the Panel finds the addition of such term 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.

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 Complainant has established a prima facie case that the Respondent lacks rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name. 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 name such as those enumerated in the Policy or otherwise.

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 finds that the disputed domain name has been registered in bad faith for the following reasons:

- (a) the Complainants have clearly demonstrated their rights in the REG Trademark;
- (b) the Panel finds that the Respondent knew of the Complainants' REG Trademark prior to registration of the disputed domain name. This is confirmed by the landing pages created at the disputed domain name upon registration which have:
 - adopted the same name, REG International Trading & Commodities B.V. as a pre-existing company within the Complainants' group;
 - used that company's actual registered address in Netherlands (Kingdom of the);
 - created and used a fabricated corporate history describing an incorporation in 2006 and a detailed year-by-year timeline;
 - made use of the first Complainant's CHEVRON brand and logo amongst the list of so-called "business partners"; and
 - described the Respondent's "business" in a way that closely mirrors the Complainants' REG-branded activities.

The Panel is also satisfied that the Respondent has used the disputed domain name in bad faith for the following reasons:

- (a) it is likely that a significant number of Internet users looking for REG International and encountering the disputed domain name and the landing pages there will be misled or deceived into believing that this is one of the Complainants' group companies or that this has been licensed, authorized or endorsed by the Complainants when this is not the case; and
- (b) the Complainants have shown that the disputed domain name is configured with MX records and is therefore capable of email communications. The Panel agrees with the Complainant that Internet users receiving an email from the disputed domain name will reasonably assume that this was sent by the Complainants. Although the Complainants have not produced any evidence of such emails from the Respondent, the Panel is satisfied that, noting also the website content at the disputed domain name, this represents a genuine and appreciable risk; and
- (c) the Panel is entitled to draw and does draw adverse inferences from the failure of the Respondent to respond to the Complaint and the allegations made by the Complainants.

The Panel finds that the Complainants have 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 <reginternational.com> be transferred to the second Complainant, Chevron Intellectual Property LLC.

/Andrew Brown K.C./

Andrew Brown K.C.

Sole Panelist

Date: October 12, 2026