Decision for dispute CAC-UDRP-107879

Case number	CAC-UDRP-107879
Time of filing	2025-09-03 09:25:00
Domain names	lyondsellbasell.com

Case administrator

Name	Olga Slanařová (Case admin)

Complainant

Organization	LyondellBasell Industries Holdings B.V.

Complainant representative

Organization	Barzanò & Zanardo S.p.A.

Respondent

Organization	Lyond Basel

OTHER LEGAL PROCEEDINGS

The Panel is not aware of any other legal proceedings which are pending or decided and which relate to the disputed domain name.

IDENTIFICATION OF RIGHTS

In these proceedings, the Complainant mainly relies on the following trademarks:

- LYONDELBASELL (word), US Registration No. 3634012, registered as of May 7, 2008, in the name of LyondellBasell Industries Holdings B.V. (the Complainant) and duly renewed;

- LYONDELBASELL (device), US Registration No. 5096173, registered as of March 6, 2015, in the name of LyondellBasell Industries Holdings B.V. (the Complainant) and duly renewed;

- LYONDELBASELL (word), EUTM No. 006943518, registered as of May 16, 2008, in the name of LyondellBasell Industries Holdings B.V. (the Complainant) and duly renewed;

- LYONDELBASELL (device), EUTM No. 013804091, registered as of March 6, 2015, in the name of LyondellBasell Industries Holdings B.V. (the Complainant) and duly renewed.

It is worth noting that the Complainant owns many similar trademarks in various countries, including in the USA, where the Respondent is apparently located. Relevant lists have been cited in these proceedings, covering both LYONDELLBASELL and LYONDELL trademarks.

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

The Complainant is a large multinational chemical company with European and American roots, initially founded back in 1953. Ever since, the Complainant has become one of the largest plastics, chemicals and refining company, having acquired commercial presence all around the world through dozens of sites and its thousands of employees. The Complainant is notably the holder of more than 6000 patents (registered and pending) worldwide, which are being licensed.

The Complainant owns a large-sized portfolio of trademarks including the wording "LyondellBasell", among which a US registration dating back to 2008. It also owns a multitude of related domain names, like <lyondellbasell.com> and <lyondell.com> since October 23, 2007 and February 21, 1997, respectively.

The disputed domain name <lyondsellbasell.com> was registered on March 11, 2025 by the Respondent, as confirmed by the Registrar.

PARTIES CONTENTIONS

COMPLAINANT

The Complainant contends that the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to its LyondellBasell trademark, as it is a misspelling of this wholly incorporated trademark. This last element is sufficient to support the finding that the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to the Complainant's trademark. Indeed, the mere misspelling of the Complainant’s trademark does not change the overall impression of a most likely connection with the trademark LyondellBasell of the Complainant. As to the gTLD “.com”, the Complainant suggests that it should be disregarded, as per the usual practice.

The Complainant maintains that the Respondent lacks rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name because the Respondent is not known by the disputed domain name, the Complainant is not affiliated with nor has it ever authorised the Respondent to register its trademark as a domain name and the Complainant has no business with the Respondent.

According to the Complainant, given the distinctiveness and reputation of the LyondellBasell trademark, the Respondent registered the disputed domain name with full knowledge of the Complainant's trademark in an intentionally designed way with the aim to create a likelihood of confusion with the Complainant’s trademarks and domain names, and this is evidence of the fact that the disputed domain name was registered in bad faith.

With respect to use in bad faith, the Complainant points out that the Respondent has not used the domain name at all, which is considered as a clear indication of bad faith. It is, indeed, impossible to conceive any actual or contemplated use that would not be illegitimate.

For all these reasons, the Complainant concludes that the Respondent registered and used the disputed domain name in bad faith.

RESPONDENT

No administratively compliant Response has been filed.

RIGHTS

The Complainant has, to the satisfaction of the Panel, shown the disputed domain name is identical or confusingly similar to a trademark or service mark in which the Complainant has rights (within the meaning of paragraph 4(a)(i) of the Policy).

The disputed domain name consists of the Complainant's whole trademark (LyondellBasell), written in a misspelled way. The mere addition of a letter (“s”) in the disputed domain name is not sufficient to escape the finding that the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to the trademark of the Complainant. This is a clear case of typosquatting.

As far as the gTLD ".com" is concerned, it is generally recognized that top level domains do not have any bearing in the assessment of identity or confusing similarity, according to paragraph 4(a)(i) of the Policy.

Hence, the Panel is satisfied that the first requirement under the Policy is met.

NO RIGHTS OR LEGITIMATE INTERESTS

The Complainant has, to the satisfaction of the Panel, shown the Respondent to have no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the disputed domain name (within the meaning of paragraph 4(a)(ii) of the Policy).

Since proving a negative fact is almost impossible, Panelists in UDRP proceedings have generally agreed that it is sufficient for the

Complainant to establish a prima facie case that the Respondent lacks rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name to shift the burden of proof to the Respondent.

In the case at issue, the Complainant argued that it had never authorised the Respondent to register the LyondellBasell trademark in a domain name, and that it had never licensed its trademark to the Respondent.

Furthermore, the Respondent has not demonstrated any use of the disputed domain name in connection with a bona fide offering of goods and services or a legitimate non-commercial or fair use of the disputed domain name.

Finally, there is no other evidence in the case file that could demonstrate that the Respondent has been commonly known by the disputed domain name.

In view of the foregoing, the Panel is satisfied that the Complainant has established a prima facie case that the Respondent lacks rights and legitimate interests in the disputed domain name. In order to rebut the Complainant's arguments, the Respondent had the possibility to make his own defense. However, the Respondent has chosen not to file a Response.

Therefore, the Panel is satisfied that also the second requirement under the Policy is met.

BAD FAITH

The Complainant has, to the satisfaction of the Panel, shown the disputed domain name has been registered and is being used in bad faith (within the meaning of paragraph 4(a)(iii) of the Policy).

As far as registration in bad faith is concerned, given the reputation of the Complainant's trademark and the fact that the disputed domain name fully incorporates this trademark (even in a misspelled way), it is evident that, at the time of the registration of the disputed domain name, the Respondent was well aware of the Complainant's trademark. The registration as domain name of a third party's well-known trademark with full knowledge of the fact that the rights over this trademark belong to a third party amounts to registration in bad faith.

With respect to use in bad faith, the disputed domain name resolves to an inactive / parking website, where the host’s name is mentioned. Such use of a domain name can show bad faith under some circumstances, such as when the complainant’s trademark has such a strong reputation that it is widely known, and when it is impossible to conceive any plausible actual or contemplated active use of the domain name by the Respondent that would not be illegitimate. This fact is to be combined with the full incorporation of the Complainant’s reputable trademark in the disputed domain name. These are exactly the circumstances that apply in the case at issue. The trademark LYONDELLBASELL enjoys wide and extensive reputation. Therefore, it is impossible to conceive any plausible active use of the disputed domain name that would be legitimate.

Therefore, the Panel finds it clear that the disputed domain name was used in bad faith.

For all circumstances mentioned above, the Panel is satisfied that also the third requirement under the Policy is satisfied.

PROCEDURAL FACTORS

The Panel is satisfied that all procedural requirements under UDRP were met and there is no other reason why it would be inappropriate to provide a decision.

PRINCIPAL REASONS FOR THE DECISION

The disputed domain name wholly incorporates the Complainant's trademark, written in a misspelled way. The disputed domain name is therefore confusingly similar to the Complainant's trademark.

The Respondent was not authorised to include the Complainant's trademark in the disputed domain name, and the Complainant never licensed its trademarks to the Respondent. The Respondent is not using the disputed domain name in connection with a bona fide offering of goods or services, or a legitimate non-commercial or fair use.

The Respondent registered the disputed domain name with full knowledge of the Complainant's well-known trademark. His use of the disputed domain name as an inactive website, where the host’s name is mentioned, is in bad faith, as there is no conceivable use of the disputed domain name that could amount to a legitimate use.

FOR ALL THE REASONS STATED ABOVE, THE COMPLAINT IS

Accepted

AND THE DISPUTED DOMAIN NAME(S) IS (ARE) TO BE

1. **lyondsellbasell.com**: Transferred

PANELLISTS

Name	**Sozos-Christos Theodoulou**

DATE OF PANEL DECISION 2025-10-10

Publish the Decision