ARBITRATION
AND
MEDIATION CENTER

WIPO
WORLD
INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY
ORGANIZATION

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION
Ovintiv Trademarks Inc. v. Name Redacted
Case No. D2026-4321

1. The Parties

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

Respondent is Name Redacted,[1] United States.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <ovintivs.com> is registered with NameSilo, LLC (the "Registrar").

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the "Center") on September 24, 2026. On September 25, 2026, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On September 25, 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 (PrivacyGuardian.org) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to Complainant on September 28, 2026, providing the registrant and contact information disclosed by the Registrar, and inviting Complainant to submit an amendment to the Complaint. Complainant filed an amendment to the Complaint on September 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] Respondent appears to have used the name of a third party when registering the disputed domain name. In light of the potential identity theft, the Panel has redacted 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 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Annex 1 to the Registrar as part of the order in this proceeding, and has indicated Annex 1 to this decision shall not be published due to the exceptional circumstances of this case.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 Respondent of the Complaint, and the proceedings commenced on September 29, 2026. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was October 19, 2026. Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified Respondent's default on October 21, 2026.

The Center appointed Scott R. Austin as the sole panelist in this matter on October 26, 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

Without contest by Respondent, Complainant asserts in its Complaint and its attached Annexes provide evidence sufficient to support that:

Complainant, formerly known as Encana Corp., changed its name as part of a corporate reorganization completed in January 2020. Complainant is a North American oil and natural gas exploration and production company located in the United States and Canada, providing its products and services under the OVINTIV trademark (the "OVINTIV Mark"). Complainant reports revenues of approximately USD 10.929 billion in 2023 and more than USD 32 billion during 2021 through 2023.

Complainant holds trademark registrations incorporating the OVINTIV Mark in the United States and Canada, including the following:

United States Trademark Registration No. 7,108,219 for OVINTIV, registered July 11, 2023, for a range of fuel products, oil and gas exploration and production related services in International Classes 4, 35, 37, 40 and 42 and claiming a first use date of January 24, 2020;

United States Trademark Registration No. 7,774,354 for OVINTIV plus design, registered April 29, 2025, for a range of fuel products, oil and gas exploration and production related services in International Classes 4, 35, 37, 40 and 42 and claiming a first use date of January 24, 2020;

Canadian Registration No. TMA1281899 for OVINTIV, registered January 10, 2025, for a range of fuel products, oil and gas exploration and production related services in International Classes 4, 35, 37, 39, 40 and 42; and

Canadian Registration No. TMA1365603 for OVINTIV and design, registered December 5, 2025, for a range of fuel products, oil and gas exploration and production related services in International Classes 4, 35, 37, 39, 40 and 42.

Complainant has registered and maintains a domain name incorporating the OVINTIV Mark, <ovintiv.com>, used to access the official OVINTIV Mark website (the "Official OVINTIV Mark Website") which enables Complainant to promote its oil and natural gas exploration and production goods and services online.

The disputed domain name <ovintivs.com> was registered on September 5, 2026, and resolved to a parking page featuring sponsored links to businesses under the headings "Technology & Computing" and "Business and Finance", including those Complainant asserts are in competition with its business.

5. Parties' Contentions

A. Complainant

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

B. Respondent

Respondent did not reply to Complainant's contentions.

6. Discussion and Findings

Paragraph 15 of the Rules provides that the Panel is to decide the Complaint on the basis of the statements and documents submitted in accordance with the Policy, the Rules, and any rules and principles of law that it deems applicable.

In view of Respondent's failure to submit any Response, the Panel shall decide this administrative proceeding on the basis of Complainant's undisputed representations pursuant to paragraphs 5(f), 14(a) and 15(a) of the Rules and draw such inferences it considers appropriate pursuant to paragraph 14(b) of the Rules. The Panel is entitled to accept all reasonable allegations and inferences set forth in the Complaint as true unless the evidence is clearly contradictory.

Where no substantive Response is filed, however, Complainant must still make out its case in all respects under paragraph 4(a) of the Policy. To succeed, Complainant must demonstrate that all the elements listed in paragraph 4(a) of the Policy have been satisfied.

As the proceedings are administrative, the standard of proof under the Policy is often expressed as the "balance of the probabilities" or "preponderance of the evidence" standard. Under this standard, an asserting party needs to establish that it is more likely than not that the claimed fact is true. WIPO Overview of WIPO Panel Views on Select UDRP Questions ("WIPO Overview 3.1"), section 4.2.

Thus, for Complainant to succeed it must prove within the meaning of paragraph 4(a) of the Policy and on the balance of probabilities that:

1. The disputed domain name is identical or confusingly similar to a trademark or service mark in which Complainant has rights;
2. Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the disputed domain name; and
3. The disputed domain name has been registered and is being used in bad faith.

The Panel finds that Complainant has met its burden in all three elements of the Policy and will deal with each of these elements in more detail below.

A. Identical or Confusingly Similar

The first element functions primarily as a standing requirement. The Panel determines whether the trademark in which the Complainant has established rights is recognizable within the disputed domain name. WIPO Overview 3.1, section 1.7.

Complainant's rights in the OVINTIV Mark are established by trademark registration evidence Complainant submitted in the form of the electronic copies of its valid and subsisting United States and Canadian trademark registrations in the name of Complainant referenced in Section 4 above. Ownership of a nationally registered trademark constitutes prima facie evidence that the complainant has the requisite rights in a mark for purposes of paragraph 4(a)(i) of the Policy. WIPO Overview 3.1, section 1.2.1.

With Complainant's rights in the OVINTIV Mark established, the remaining question under the first element of the Policy is whether the disputed domain name is identical or confusingly similar to Complainant's OVINTIV Mark. Prior UDRP panels have held "in cases where a domain name incorporates the entirety of a trademark, or where at least a dominant feature of the relevant mark is recognizable in the domain name, the domain name will normally be considered confusingly similar to that mark" for purposes of UDRP standing. WIPO Overview 3.1, section 1.7.

A side-by-side comparison between the disputed domain name and Complainant's Mark shows the disputed domain name is almost identical to the OVINTIV Mark. The disputed domain name reproduces the OVINTIV Mark in full and adds only the terminal letter "s", which minor alteration does not prevent recognition of the mark and constitutes a typical example of confusing similarity through intentional misspelling of Complainant's OVINTIV Mark. WIPO Overview 3.1, section 1.9; see also *DaimlerChrysler Corporation v. Peter Carrington*, WIPO Case No. D2002-0756; *ESPN, Inc. v. XC2*, WIPO Case No. D2005-0444.

Prior UDRP panels have found the Top-Level Domain, being viewed as a standard registration requirement, may typically be disregarded under the paragraph 4(a)(i) analysis. See, WIPO Overview 3.1, section 1.11.1.

Based on the above, this Panel finds that the addition of the letter "s" to the end of Complainant's registered OVINTIV Mark does not prevent a finding of confusing similarity between the disputed domain name and Complainant's OVINTIV Mark.

Accordingly, the Panel finds Complainant has satisfied its burden under paragraph 4(a)(i) of the Policy.

B. Rights or Legitimate Interests

Paragraph 4(c) of the Policy identifies circumstances that may establish rights or legitimate interests. Once a complainant makes a prima facie showing, the burden of production shifts to the respondent, while the ultimate burden of proof remains on the complainant. If the respondent fails to come forward with such evidence, a complainant is generally deemed to have satisfied the second element. WIPO Overview 3.1, section 2.1.

Complainant states that it has never authorized Respondent to use the OVINTIV mark, and the record contains no indication that Respondent is commonly known by the disputed domain name or has made demonstrable preparations for a bona fide offering under that name.

The addition of a single letter "s" to Complainant's distinctive mark is consistent with "typosquatting" found where a respondent reconfigures a complainant's mark through intentional misspelling in an attempt to capture misdirected Internet traffic. WIPO Overview 3.1, section 1.9; see also *DaimlerChrysler Corporation v. Peter Carrington,* supra.

The disputed domain name has been used for a registrar parking page bearing advertising categories, rather than for any demonstrated independent business of Respondent. Panels have generally found that pay-per-click links capitalizing on the reputation of a complainant's mark do not constitute a bona fide offering, particularly where they compete with or exploit the complainant's business. WIPO Overview 3.1, section 2.9;

see also *B and J García, S.L., Arnedo, Spain v. Gorila*, WIPO Case No. D2004-1071; *Lowen Corporation d/b/a Lowen Sign Company v. Henry Chan*, WIPO Case No. D2004-0430. Considering the evidence here of the parking page in conjunction with typosquatting to mislead Internet users, the Panel finds it reasonable to conclude Respondent's parked page does not represent a bona fide offering, even without proof that every displayed category directly competed with Complainant. See *Research In Motion Limited v. International Domain Names Inc./Moniker Privacy Services,* WIPO Case No. D2008-0780; *Lowen Corporation d/b/a Lowen Sign Company v. Henry Chan*, supra.

These facts establish Complainant's prima facie showing. Respondent has not provided any basis on which that showing may be overcome. Complainant has, therefore, successfully met their burden under paragraph 4(a)(ii) of the Policy.

C. Registered and Used in Bad Faith

Paragraph 4(b) of the Policy provides non-exhaustive examples of circumstances evidencing bad faith registration and use. WIPO Overview 3.1, section 3.2.1. The Panel assesses the totality of the record.

The bad faith factors present here include the following. The OVINTIV trademark registrations preceded the registration date of the disputed domain name. The selection of the distinctive OVINTIV Mark and Respondent's reconfiguration of it with an intentional misspelling with a terminal "s" strongly supports an inference that Respondent knew of and targeted Complainant when registering the disputed domain name. The apparent typographical variation is relevant evidence of bad faith. WIPO Overview 3.1, section 3.1.4; see also *ESPN, Inc. v. XC2*, supra; *Longs Drug Stores California, Inc. v. Shep Dog*, WIPO Case No. D2004-1069.

The disputed domain name resolved to a registrar parking page displaying advertising categories. Complainant contends that the page contained sponsored links, including links related to competing goods or services. Use of a confusingly similar domain name to attract Internet users to a page carrying commercial links may support a finding under paragraph 4(b)(iv), even where the registrar or another intermediary receives the resulting advertising revenue. WIPO Overview 3.1, section 3.5; see also *Port Aventura, S.A. v. Fred McCaw c/o Chelsey McCaw Publishing, Inc.*, WIPO Case No. D2008-0177; *Villeroy & Boch AG v. Mario Pingerna*, WIPO Case No. D2007-1912. The Panel does not rely on the mere existence of a parking page as independently proving competitive targeting; rather, the inference arises from the typosquatting configuration of the disputed domain name to confuse consumers and its commercial parking use viewed together.

Complainant further argues in the amendment to its Complaint that Respondent supplied false registration contact information. The registrar-disclosed details use Complainant's Denver business address and company name as Respondent's company name, and identify individuals seemingly unrelated individuals. These discrepancies raise substantial concerns as to the accuracy of the registration data, but the Panel does not find solely from the differing names that the registrant's identity has been conclusively falsified. Where established, deliberately false contact details can reinforce an inference of bad faith. WIPO Overview 3.1, section 3.6; see also *World Market Management Services, LLC v. Rupert Pearl, RupertPearl*, WIPO Case No. D2024-0371; *Action Instruments, Inc. v. Technology Associates*, WIPO Case No. D2003-0024. Respondent's election to substitute Complainant's company name and business address for Respondent's contact details in its registration data, without any established authorization, adds weight to that concern, and based on this substitution along with false and conflicting third party registration data, the Panel is confronted with the strong possibility of identity

misappropriation, compelling redacting the identity of the nominal Respondent name revealed by the concerned registrar.

On the balance of probabilities, the Panel finds the highly distinctive mark, the near-identical domain name composition with typosquatting added to confuse users, the commercial parking context with competing links, the unexplained irreconcilable registration data details, and Respondent's failure to respond with any alternative explanation, collectively support the conclusion that the disputed domain name was registered and used in bad faith within the meaning of paragraph 4(b)(iv) of the Policy.

Complainant has satisfied its burden under 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 <ovintivs.com> be transferred to Complainant.

/Scott R. Austin/
Scott R. Austin
Sole Panelist
Date: November 4, 2026