

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

Invenergy LLC v. cheng luo, beijikuangye
Case No. DIO2025-0053

1. The Parties

The Complainant is Invenergy LLC, United States of America (“United States”), represented CM Law PLLC, United States.

The Respondent is cheng luo, beijikuangye, United States.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

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

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the “Center”) on December 5, 2025. On December 5, 2025, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On December 5, 2025, 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 and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on December 15, 2025 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 December 17, 2025.

The Center verified that the Complaint together with the amendment to the Complaint satisfied the formal requirements of the .IO Domain Name Dispute Resolution Policy (the “Policy”), the Rules for .IO Domain Name Dispute Resolution Policy (the “Rules”), and the WIPO Supplemental Rules for .IO 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 December 18, 2025. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was January 7, 2026. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent’s default on January 8, 2026.

The Center appointed Evan D. Brown as the sole panelist in this matter on January 13, 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 in the business of providing clean energy solutions. It owns the trademark INVENERGY, for which it enjoys the benefits of registration in a number of jurisdictions around the world, including the United States (e.g., Reg. No. 6692469, registered on April 5, 2022).

The Complainant has owned the domain name <invenergy.com> since 2000.

According to the Whois records, the disputed domain name was registered on November 6, 2024. The Respondent has used the disputed domain name to operate a website that prominently features the NVE NERGY 因威能源 trademark in connection with electric vehicle charging stations, and referring itself as "Invenergy".

5. Parties' Contentions

A. Complainant

The Complainant contends that the disputed domain name is identical or confusingly similar to the Complainant's trademark; that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the disputed domain name; and that the disputed domain name was registered or is being used in bad faith.

The Complainant states that it had previously objected to the Respondent's attempts to register the INVENERGY mark in the United States, the United Kingdom, and the European Union, and that the Respondent continued its conduct – including registering the disputed domain name – despite knowledge of the Complainant's prior rights.

B. Respondent

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

6. Discussion and Findings

To succeed, the Complainant must demonstrate that all of the elements listed in paragraph 4(a) of the Policy have been satisfied: (i) the disputed domain name is identical or confusingly similar to a trademark or service mark in which the Complainant has rights, (ii) the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the disputed domain name, and (iii) the disputed domain name has been registered or is being used in bad faith. The Panel finds that all three of these elements have been met in this case.

A. Identical or Confusingly Similar

This first element functions primarily as a standing requirement. See WIPO Overview of WIPO Panel Views on Selected UDRP Questions, Third Edition ("WIPO Overview 3.0"),¹ section 1.7. A registered trademark provides a clear indication of rights in a mark. The Complainant has demonstrated rights in the INVENERGY mark through its registrations. See [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 1.2.1.

The disputed domain name <invenergy.io> is identical to the INVENERGY mark. The addition of the Top-Level Domain ".io" is typically disregarded under the confusing similarity test. See [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 1.11.1 ("The applicable Top Level Domain [...] is viewed as a standard registration requirement and [...] is disregarded under the first element confusing similarity test.").

¹ The Policy is substantively similar to the Uniform Domain Name Dispute Resolution Policy (UDRP). Accordingly, guidance from the [WIPO Overview 3.0](#) and previous panel decisions under the UDRP are instructive and have been considered by the Panel where appropriate.

The Panel finds that the Complainant has established this first element under the Policy.

B. Rights or Legitimate Interests

The Panel evaluates this element of the Policy by first looking to see whether the Complainant has made a *prima facie* showing that the Respondent lacks rights or legitimate interests in respect of the disputed domain name. If such a showing is made, the burden of production shifts to the Respondent. See [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 2.1.

On this point, the Complainant asserts that: (1) the Respondent is not licensed or authorized to use the INVENERGY trademark; (2) the Complainant has no relationship with the Respondent that could give rise to any implied license or right; (3) the Respondent is not commonly known by “Invenergy” and has no rights in the mark; (4) the Respondent uses the trademark to mislead consumers, and trade off the Complainant’s goodwill; and (5) the Respondent is not making a legitimate noncommercial or fair use of the domain name without intent for commercial gain.

The Panel finds that the Complainant has made the required *prima facie* showing. The Respondent has not submitted a response and nothing in the record otherwise tips the balance in the Respondent’s favor.

Accordingly, the Panel finds that the Complainant has established this second element under the Policy.

C. Registered or Used in Bad Faith

The Policy requires the Complainant to establish that the disputed domain name was registered and is being used in bad faith.

Here, the Complainant’s evidence indicates that the Respondent registered the disputed domain name with full knowledge of the Complainant’s prior rights in the INVENERGY mark, after a company seemingly related to the Respondent filed trademark applications and received correspondence objecting to those applications.² Despite this, the Respondent proceeded to launch a website at the disputed domain name marketing energy-related services competing with those of the Complainant, using language resembling that used by the Complainant (e.g., claiming to be a global leader in clean energy in a social media post which is apparently related to the Respondent and the disputed domain name). This supports a finding that the Respondent intentionally attempted to attract, for commercial gain, Internet users by creating a likelihood of confusion with the Complainant’s mark as to source, sponsorship, or affiliation. See [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 3.1.4.

The Panel finds that the Respondent’s conduct falls squarely within the circumstances of bad faith described in paragraph 4(b)(iv) of the Policy. Accordingly, the Panel finds that the Complainant has established this third element under 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, <invenergy.io>, be transferred to the Complainant.

/Evan D. Brown/

Evan D. Brown

Sole Panelist

Date: January 27, 2026

² The Panel observes that Nanjing Invenergy New Energy Technology Co., Ltd., a Chinese company sharing the Respondent’s website address, filed these trademark applications.