

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

Venturi v. Anthony Chan, Venturi Engineering Solutions Inc.
Case No. DAI2026-0044

1. The Parties

The Complainant is Venturi, Monaco, represented by BBLM Avocats, France.

The Respondent is Anthony Chan, Venturi Engineering Solutions Inc., Canada, represented by Kingsgate Legal, Canada.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <venturi.ai> is registered with NameCheap, Inc. (the “Registrar”).

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the “Center”) on June 4, 2026. On June 4, 2026, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On June 5, 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 June 5, 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 June 9, 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 June 11, 2026. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was July 1, 2026. The Respondent requested an extension to file a Response pursuant to the Rules, paragraphs 5(e). Accordingly, the new due date for Response was July 8, 2026. The Response was filed with the Center on July 6, 2026.

The Center appointed W. Scott Blackmer as the sole panelist in this matter on July 22, 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 is a company incorporated and headquartered in Monaco, specialized in the design and manufacture of high-performance vehicles, as described on its website at “www.venturi.com” (the domain name was registered in 1995), with linked social media accounts. The Complainant’s vehicles include “Formula E” electric racing cars and other electric vehicles, as well as a lunar exploration vehicle.

The Complainant holds multiple trademark registrations for VENTURI, including the following:

Mark	Jurisdiction	Reg. Number	Reg. Date	International Class
VENTURI (word)	Monaco	03.23818	November 28, 2003	12
VENTURI (word)	United Kingdom	UK00905485685	July 17, 2008	12
VENTURI (word)	European Union	005485685	July 17, 2008	12

The disputed domain name was created on May 25, 2021, and is registered by the Respondent Anthony Chan, listing the organization “Venturi” with a postal address in Edmonton, Alberta, Canada and a contact email address at “[xxx]@venturies.com”. The Response was filed on behalf of both Mr. Chan and Venturi Engineering Solutions Inc. (“Venturi Engineering”), a Canadian federal corporation incorporated on May 7, 2015, and extra-provincially registered in the Province of Alberta on May 11, 2015, as documented in extracts from the Corporations Canada database and the Alberta Corporation Registration System attached to the Response. These documents and the Statement of Anthony Chan attached to the Response reveal that Mr. Chan is the CEO and co-founder of the company, as well as a director and major shareholder. Given their commonality of interests, the Panel refers hereafter to Mr. Chan and Venturi Engineering collectively as the “Respondent”.

The Respondent is “an engineering company that provides services to oil and gas companies in North America, including the use of machine learning to provide real-time recommendations for pipeline optimization”. The Respondent uses “www.venturies.com” as its “primary website”. This website describes the Respondent’s business and names clients such as AltaGas, Enbridge, Interpipeline, Phillips 66, and National Research Council Canada.

At the time of this Decision, the disputed domain name does not resolve to an active website. The Complainant demonstrates that in 2021 and 2026 the disputed domain name resolved to a parking page with third-party pay-per-click (“PPC”) advertising links, including links relating to electric cars as well as machine learning and pipeline automation.

The Statement of Anthony Chan says that the disputed domain name (this should have been “primary website”) “reflects the Venturi Engineering Solutions Inc. name, with ‘ES’ corresponding to Engineering Solutions” and that the disputed domain name was registered “in connection with potential data analytics work” related to that business. However, the Panel notes that the Internet Archive’s Wayback Machine has no archived screenshots showing that the disputed domain name was ever developed for an independent website or redirected to the Respondent’s website at “www.venturies.com”.¹

The Complainant sent an email through DomainAgents in an attempt to contact the Respondent but received no reply. The Respondent says it received no notice of this attempted communication.

¹Noting the general powers of a panel articulated in paragraphs 10 and 12 of the Rules, it is commonly accepted that a panel may undertake limited factual research into matters of public record, as the Panel has done in these proceedings. WIPO Overview of WIPO Panel Views on Select UDRP Questions, Third Edition (“[WIPO Overview 3.1](#)”), section 4.8.

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 identical to its registered VENTURI word mark. The Complainant asserts that the Respondent has no authorization from the Complainant to use its marks and finds no evidence of rights or legitimate interests, as the disputed domain name was used only for a landing page with PPC advertising and the Respondent did not reply to an attempt to communicate. The Complainant infers bad faith from this conduct and cites the passive holding doctrine.

The Complainant concludes that "[i]n the present case, it is obvious that the Respondent had VENTURI's Trademarks in mind when it registered the Disputed Domain Name." The Complainant notes that its marks are long-established and argues that the Respondent must have been aware of them:

"It is important to note that the VENTURI Trademarks are intrinsically distinctive and enjoy a strong reputation. VENTURI has long enjoyed international recognition in the fields of sports cars, high-performance electric vehicles and electric motor racing (Formula E), and recently in the fields of advanced mobility and space technologies. [...] The choice of the ".ai" extension further increases the likelihood of association with the Complainant. [...] It is all the more the case since the current market environment, where automotive manufacturers, electric vehicle companies, deep-tech actors, and space industry operators are increasingly developing and promoting artificial intelligence solutions and autonomous technologies."

The Complainant highlights the fact that some of the PPC links on the landing page associated with the disputed domain name refer to electric vehicles, and that recent examples of the landing page feature sites with artificial intelligence components. The Complainant characterizes this as evidence of opportunistic bad faith.

B. Respondent

The Respondent contends that the Complainant has not satisfied all three of the elements required under the Policy for a transfer of the disputed domain name.

The Respondent argues against confusing similarity as follows:

"The Canadian registration relied upon by the Complainant is for VENTURI & Design, not the word 'VENTURI' alone, and is directed to automobile and vehicle-related goods and services. [...] Although the Canadian registration includes engineering-related wording, that wording is specifically tied to automobiles, namely 'Travaux d'ingénieurs, services de mise au point de véhicules automobiles.'"

The Respondent states that "the disputed domain name (according to Annex 3 to the Response, this should have been "its primary website") was registered on January 18, 2005, and subsequently purchased following the incorporation of Venturi Engineering Solutions Inc. ... The Disputed Domain Name was registered in May 2021 for potential data analytics work, which was consistent with the Respondent's engineering and technical services business." The Respondent contends that the ".ai" extension is also consistent with the Respondent's "energy analytics, machine learning, and pipeline optimization work, and does not support an inference that the Respondent was targeting the Complainant".

The Respondent points out that "venturi" has "an independent technical meaning in fluid dynamics, which is consistent with the Respondent's engineering business" and denies any intent to target the Complainant's mark in a completely different business focused on automobiles and vehicle-related goods and services. The Respondent also "does not accept" that links generated on the landing page by the Registrar or another third-party demonstrate that the Respondent selected such links and targeted the Complainant in bad faith.

The Response attaches a Statement of Anthony Chan denying that the Parties compete or that the disputed domain name was registered to exploit the Complainant's marks in any way, or that the Respondent selected links on the parking page targeting the Complainant.

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 3.1](#), section 1.7.

The Complainant has shown rights in respect of a trademark or service mark (the registered VENTURI word mark) for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.2.1.

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

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 Complainant's prima facie case of a lack of rights or legitimate interests was based on the facts that the Respondent was initially unidentified, did not publish a website associated with the disputed domain name, and did not reply to the Complainant's attempt to communicate through a third-party associated with a landing page.

However, the Respondent has come forward in this proceeding, and the Panel finds on this record that the Respondent has been commonly known by a name correspondent to the disputed domain name. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 2.3. The Respondent Venturi Engineering has been federally registered in Canada since 2015, and the record shows that it does business in North America under that name and operates a website at "www.venturies.com". The Panel notes that the Wayback Machine has screenshots of that website, advertising the Respondent's business, as early as 2018.

Thus, the Respondent has rebutted the Complainant's prima facie case unless the evidence shows that the Respondent's choice of a company name in 2015, as well as its later registration of the disputed domain name, cannot be considered a "legitimate interest" because it represents a deliberate effort to exploit the Complainant's trademark. That possibility is better addressed in the following section on bad faith.

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. These all require evidence from

which the Panel can infer the Respondent's prior awareness of the Complainant's mark and intent to exploit or attack it.

In the present case, the Complainant infers the Respondent's prior knowledge of the Complainant and its VENTURI mark because of its duration and notoriety, largely in the automotive industry, and the fact that the landing page with PPC links included references to electric vehicles and artificial intelligence. This is strained reasoning, given that the Respondent operates in a very different market (oil and gas pipeline analytics) and PPC links are typically generated by the Registrar's algorithms, which in this case produced links relevant to both the Complainant and the Respondent. The Panel is not persuaded that the mere use of the ".ai" extension establishes targeting of the Complainant, as the Panel finds no references to "AI" or "artificial intelligence" on the Complainant's website.

In any event, the Respondent denies any intent to target the Complainant's mark, and the Respondent's alternative explanation for using the term "venturi" in the disputed domain name is credible. That is the dominant term in the Respondent's company name "Venturi Engineering Solutions Inc", relating to its business serving oil and gas companies in North America, which is a genuine business operation that clearly does not compete with the Complainant's highly specialized vehicle design and manufacturing business. Moreover, the company name is relevant to the business dealing with oil and gas pipeline analytics. The Panel notes that "venturi" (named after the Italian physicist Giovanni Battista Venturi) is defined in the online Merriam-Webster Dictionary as "a short tube with a tapering constriction in the middle that causes an increase in the velocity of flow of a fluid". (See also the Wikipedia article on the "Venturi effect" when moving fluids in pipelines). The term is potentially relevant both to fluid dynamics in the Respondent's business and to aerodynamics in the Complainant's business. The Complainant has the burden of proof on this issue, and the Respondent has credible reasons for choosing "venturi" in 2015 for its company name and its domain name, and in 2021 for the (thus far undeveloped) disputed domain name. The Respondent potentially would remain responsible for use of the disputed domain name – for example, for PPC advertising links that misdirected Internet users – but the Respondent cannot be deemed to have registered the disputed domain name in bad faith without a finding that it did so in contemplation of the Complainant's mark. On this record, the Panel finds it more likely that the Respondent registered the disputed domain name to correspond to its own company name, having to do with its dictionary meaning and not its trademark value associated with the Complainant.

The evidence in the case file as presented does not indicate that the Respondent's aim in registering the disputed domain name was to profit from or exploit the Complainant's trademark.

The Panel finds the third element of the Policy has not been established.

The same evidence confirms the Panel's finding above with respect to the Complainant's failure to establish the second element of the Complaint.

D. Reverse Domain Name Hijacking

Paragraph 15(e) of the Rules provides that, if after considering the submissions, the Panel finds that the Complaint was brought in bad faith, for example in an attempt at Reverse Domain Name Hijacking or to harass the domain-name holder, the Panel shall declare in its decision that the Complaint was brought in bad faith and constitutes an abuse of the administrative proceeding. The mere lack of success of the complaint is not, on its own, sufficient to constitute reverse domain name hijacking. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 4.16.

While the Complaint ultimately fails, the Panel does not find that it was brought in bad faith. At the time of filing, the Respondent's identity was concealed by a privacy service, the disputed domain name resolved to PPC parking pages, and the Complainant possessed longstanding trademark rights. The Panel considers that these circumstances provided a sufficient basis for the Complainant to seek clarification through the UDRP proceedings.

While the Respondent ultimately provided a credible explanation for its registration and use of the disputed domain name, the circumstances of this case do not support a finding of Reverse Domain Name Hijacking.

7. Decision

For the foregoing reasons, the Complaint is denied.

/W. Scott Blackmer/

W. Scott Blackmer

Sole Panelist

Date: August 3, 2026