

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

Chewy, Inc. v. Hezekiah Ailunia
Case No. DCO2026-0028

1. The Parties

1.1 The Complainant is Chewy, Inc., United States of America (“United States”), represented by Rodenbaugh Law, United States.

1.2 The Respondent is Hezekiah Ailunia, Nigeria.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

2.1 The disputed domain name <chewypets.co> (the “Domain Name”) is registered with NameCheap, Inc. (the “Registrar”).

3. Procedural History

3.1 The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the “Center”) on March 18, 2026. At that time, publicly available Whois details did not identify the underlying registrant of the Domain Name.

3.2 On March 18, 2026, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the Domain Name. On March 19, 2026, the Registrar transmitted by email to the Center its verification response disclosing underlying registrant and contact information for the Domain Name. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on the same day, providing the registrant and contact information disclosed by the Registrar, and requesting the Complainant to submit an amendment to the Complaint. The Complainant filed an amendment to the Complaint on March 19, 2026.

3.3 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”).

3.4 In accordance with the Rules, paragraphs 2 and 4, the Center formally notified the Respondent of the Complaint, and the proceedings commenced on March 24, 2026. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the original due date for Response was April 13, 2026. The Response was filed with the Center on March 25, 2026. On April 7, 2026, the proceeding was suspended at the Complainant’s request

for the parties' settlement discussions, and the suspension period was extended to June 6, 2026. On June 8, 2026, the proceeding was reinstated, and the new Response due date was June 14, 2026.

3.5 The Center appointed Matthew S. Harris as the sole panelist in this matter on June 23, 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

4.1 The Complainant is a corporation organised under the laws of the State of Delaware in the United States, with its principal place of business in the State of Florida.

4.2 The Complainant was founded in 2011 as an online retailer for pet supplies, including food, treats, and veterinary pharmaceutical products and services. It supplies its products and services under the "Chewy" name and through a website operating from the domain name <chewy.com>. In 2023, the Complainant was ranked #362 in the Fortune 500 list of companies and in 2024 it was added to Standard & Poor's MidCap 500 index. In 2024 the Complainant's net sales amounted to approximately USD 12 billion.

4.3 The Complainant's website adopts a predominantly blue and white colour scheme and uses the following logo:



4.4 The Complainant is the owner of various registered trade marks around the world that comprise or incorporate the term "Chewy". They include

(i) United States registered trade mark No. 4,346,308 for CHEWY.COM as a standard character mark in Class 35, and registered on June 4, 2013;

(ii) United States registered trade mark No. 5,028,009 for CHEWY as a standard character mark in Class 35, registered on August 23, 2016;

(iii) European Union registered trade mark No. 016605834 for CHEWY as a word mark in Class 35, registered on August 10, 2017; and

(iv) Australian registered trade mark No. 2060121 for CHEWY as a word mark in Class 35, registered on August 10, 2020.

4.5 The Domain Name was registered on March 3, 2026. Following registration, it was used for a website that purports to offer puppies and other pets for sale in United States Dollars. The website adopts a similar colour scheme to that of the Complainant's website and displays the following logos:



4.6 The website also provides a United States telephone number and other footer material which would ordinarily be associated with a commercial retail website. It also displays a copyright notice at the bottom of each webpage that reads “Copyright © 2026, Chewy, Inc.”.

5. Parties’ Contentions

A. Complainant

5.1 The Complainant contends that it has satisfied each of the elements required under the Policy for a transfer of the Domain Name. Although the Complaint refers extensively to previous UDRP decisions, many involving the Complainant, and makes various references to aspects of the Policy, it is sufficient to record that the Complainant contends that the website operating from the Domain Name

“impersonates [the] Complainant by displaying the CHEWY logo and trademarks and by presenting itself as an official Chewy online store offering pet-related products and animals for sale.”

B. Respondent

5.2 The Respondent’s “Response” took the form of an email sent to the Center. It did not give a name of the individual sending the email, and it did not comply with the formal requirements of a response set out in paragraph 5(c)(viii) of the Rules.

5.3 The email included the following statement:

“I am a student and independent developer. My sole intent in creating this prototype was to develop a ‘proof of concept’ to present to your marketing team. My vision was to demonstrate how Chewy could potentially expand its reach from pet nutrition into pet rehoming services. This was intended as a creative portfolio piece to support a future employment application or a formal pitch to your brand.

Regarding the site’s content, it was a non-functional mock-up used for demonstration purposes only. No commercial transactions have taken place, and no personal gain has been sought or realized through the use of your trademark.

I have:

- * Deactivated the website in question.
- * Ceased all use of Chewy’s name, logo, and trademarks.
- * Committed to not using these assets in any future public-facing projects.”

6. Discussion and Findings

A. Identical or Confusingly Similar

6.1 It is generally 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 trade mark and the domain name. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.7.

6.2 The Complainant has shown that it has rights in registered trade marks for CHEWY. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.2.1.

6.3 The only sensible reading of the Domain Name is as the term “Chewy” combined with the word “pets” and the “.co” country code Top-Level Domain. Accordingly, the entirety of the Complainant’s mark is

reproduced within the Domain Name and as a consequence that mark is clearly recognisable in the Domain Name.

6.4 It follows that the Domain Name is confusingly similar to the Complainant's marks for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.7. Further, the addition of the word "pets" does not prevent a finding of confusing similarity between the Domain Name and the Complainant's marks for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.8.

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

B. Rights or Legitimate Interests, and Registered and Used in Bad Faith

6.6 It is usual for panels under the Policy to consider the issues of rights or legitimate interests, and registration and use in bad faith, in turn. However, in this case it is more convenient to consider those issues together (see [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 2.15).

6.7 The reason for this is that the Complainant contends that the Domain Name has been registered to falsely impersonate it, and the Panel accepts that this is the case. Not only is there the use of the Complainant's mark, but the website operating from the Domain Name reproduced the Complainant's logo and used a copyright notice that falsely represented that this was a website of the Complainant.

6.8 There is no right or legitimate interest in holding a domain name for the purpose of falsely impersonating a trade mark owner (see section 2.5 of the [WIPO Overview 3.1](#)), and the fact that a domain name is or has been used for such a purpose is evidence that no such right or legitimate interest exists. Further, the registration and use of a domain name for such a purpose involves registration and use in bad faith (see section 3.2.1 of the [WIPO Overview 3.1](#)).

6.9 The Panel is also prepared to give little or no weight to the Respondent's assertions in an unsigned email that does not comply with the formal requirements of a response set out in paragraph 5(c)(viii) of the Rule. The reasons for this were explained by this Panel in *Audiotech Systems Ltd. v. Videotech Systems Ltd.* WIPO Case No. [D2008-0431](#) and *MMJ Apparel IP LLC v. Krix Luther* WIPO Case No. [D2025-3031](#). However, even if the Respondent's assertions were taken at face value it would not change the Panel's assessment of rights or legitimate interests and bad faith. Producing a website that misrepresents the operator of that website "to support a future employment application or a formal pitch" is still commercial activity that falls within the example of circumstances evidencing bad faith set out in paragraph 4(b)(iv) of the Policy. Further, the examples of bad faith registration and use set out in paragraph 4 of the Policy are non-exhaustive and even if the website were created for entirely non-commercial purposes (and therefore did not strictly fall within the scope of paragraph 4(b)(iv) of the Policy), the use made of the Domain Name would still involve an impermissible targeting by way of impersonation of the Complainant.

6.10 Accordingly the Panel finds that both the second and third elements of the Policy have been established.

7. Decision

7.1 For the foregoing reasons, in accordance with paragraphs 4(i) of the Policy and 15 of the Rules, the Panel orders that the Domain Name <chewpets.co> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Matthew S. Harris/

Matthew S. Harris

Sole Panelist

Date: June 24, 2026