Decision for dispute CAC-UDRP-108231

Case number	CAC-UDRP-108231
Time of filing	2025-12-19 11:07:37
Domain names	lyonsdellsbasell.com

Case administrator

Name	Olga Slanařová (Case admin)

Complainant

Organization	LyondellBasell Industries Holdings B.V.

Complainant representative

Organization	Barzanò & Zanardo Milano S.p.A.

Respondent

Name	vao tama

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

LyondellBasell Group is formed of various affiliated companies, all of them under the ultimate control of LyondellBasell Industries N.V., headquartered in the Netherlands:

LyondellBasell Industries Holdings B.V., owner of several trademarks including the wording “LYONDELLBASELL”, such as:

- US trademark no. 3634012 - serial no. of the application 77467965 (word) LYONDELLBASELL since May 7, 2008 in classes 1, 4, 17, 35, 42;

- US trademark no. 5096173 - serial no. of the application 86555801 (device) LYONDELLBASELL in classes 1, 4, 17, 42, 45;

- European Union Trademark (EUTM) no. 006943518 (word) LYONDELLBASELL since May 16, 2008 in classes 1, 4, 17, 42, 45;

- European Union Trademark (EUTM) no. 013804091 (device) LYONDELLBASELL since March 6, 2015 in classes 1, 4, 17, 42, 45,

Lyondell Chemical Company, owner of a large portfolio of trademarks including the wording “LYONDELL” in several countries, such as:

- European Union Trademark (EUTM) no. 001001866 (word) LYONDELL since Nov 26, 1998 in classes 1, 4, 12, 17, 20, 25, 42.

LyondellBasell Industries N.V. owns multiple domain names consisting in, inter alia, the wordings “LYONDELLBASELL” and

“LYONDELL”, such as <lyondellbasell.com> used as the main website of LyondellBasell since October 23, 2007 and <lyondell.com> registered on February 21, 1997.

The disputed domain name <lyonsdellsbasell.com> was registered on November 24, 2025 but in the related WHOIS no information about the current holder. The disputed domain name is not actively used in connection with a website, it is set up with active MX records, indicating that it is used to send and receive emails.

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

Complainant is a multinational chemical company with European and American roots going back to 1953-54 when the predecessor company scientists Professor Karl Ziegler and Giulio Natta (jointly awarded the Nobel Prize in Chemistry in 1963) made their discoveries in the creation of polyethylene (PE) and polypropylene (PP).

Ever since, Complainant has become the third largest plastics, chemicals and refining company and the largest licensor of polyethylene and polypropylene technologies in the world, for which it holds over 6,200 patents and patent applications worldwide. The Complainant has over 20,300 employees around the globe and manufactures at 75 sites in 20 countries. Its products are sold in over 100 countries.

Complainant manages its operations through five operating segments:

- Olefins and Polyolefins—Americas: produces and markets olefins and co-products, polyethylene and polypropylene.
- Olefins and Polyolefins—Europe, Asia, International: produces and markets olefins and co-products, polyethylene, and polypropylene, including polypropylene compounds.
- Intermediates and Derivatives: produces and markets propylene oxide and its derivatives, oxyfuels and related products and intermediate chemicals, such as styrene monomer, acetyls, ethylene oxide and ethylene glycol.
- Refining: refines heavy, high-sulfur crude oil and other crude oils of varied types and sources available on the U.S. Gulf Coast into refined products including gasoline and distillates.
- Technology: develops and licenses chemical and polyolefin process technologies and manufactures and sells polyolefin catalysts.

According to the 2024 annual report Complainant generated $1.4 billion in net income and EBITDA of $4.3 billion.

Complainant is listed on the New York Stock Exchange since 2010.

On December 20, 2017 the Complainant celebrated the 10-year anniversary of the merger of Lyondell Chemical Company and Basell AF SCA, a transaction that created one of the largest plastics, chemicals and refining companies in the world.

The Complainant is also widely promoted on most popular social media with channels and pages specifically dedicated to it, i.a. on Twitter (https://twitter.com/LyondellBasell) and Facebook (https://www.facebook.com/LyondellBasell), used also for promotional and advertising purposes.

Due to its longstanding use and the huge promotional and advertising investments, the LYONDELL trademark is certainly well known. Previous Panelists in other UDRP procedures have recognized that “the word lyondell is highly distinctive as it is a fanciful term” (e.g., LyondellBasell Industries Holdings B.V. v. Wiiliams Wales - lyondell terminal, Case n. 102018)

PARTIES CONTENTIONS

The Complainant contends that the requirements of the Policy have been met and that the disputed domain name should be transferred to it.

No administratively compliant Response has been filed.

The Complainant, among other things, contends the following in support of the complaint.

The Complainant states that the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to its trademark LYONDELLBASELL and its associated domain name.

The Complainant contends that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the disputed domain name and he is not related in any way to the Complainant. The Complainant does not carry out any activity for, nor has any business with, the Respondent.

Given the distinctiveness of the Complainant's trademark and its well-known character, it is reasonable to infer that the Respondent has registered the domain name with full knowledge of the Complainant's trademark. Furthermore, the disputed domain name is not actively used but resolves to a parking page. The Complainant contends that the Respondent has not demonstrated any activity in respect of the disputed domain name, and it is not possible to conceive of any plausible actual or contemplated active use of the

domain name by the Respondent that would not be illegitimate, such as by being a passing off, an infringement of consumer protection legislation, or an infringement of the Complainant's rights under trademark law. The disputed domain name is set up with active MX records, indicating that it is used to send and receive emails, most likely for phishing purposes.

This is a typical case of typo squatting, merely adding an "S" after "LYON" and "DELL" in Complainant's trademark LYONDELLBASELL, it is found that the disputed domain name <lyonsdellsbasell.com> is confusingly similar to Complainant´s trademark LYONDELLBASELL.

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).

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).

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).

Given the circumstances of the case among others well-known character of Complainant's trademark LYONDELLBASELL, it is inconceivable to the Panel in the current circumstances that the Respondent registered the disputed domain name without prior knowledge of the Complainant and the Complainant's marks and domain names.

The Panel therefore finds that the disputed domain name was registered in bad faith.

The incorporation of a well-known mark into a domain name, coupled with an inactive website, may in itself be evidence of bad faith registration and use.

It is not possible for the Panel to conceive of any plausible actual or contemplated active use of the domain name by the Respondent that would not be illegitimate, such as by being a passing off, an infringement of consumer protection legislation, a phishing purpose based on the related MX-records or an infringement of the Complainant's rights under trademark law.

The Panel finds that the disputed domain has been registered and is being used in bad faith.

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 three essential issues under the paragraph 4(a) of the Policy are whether:

i. the disputed domain name is identical or confusingly similar to a trademark or service mark in which the Complainant has rights; and

ii. the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests with respect to the disputed domain name; and

iii. the disputed domain name has been registered and is being used in bad faith.

2. The Panel reviewed carefully all documents provided by the Complainant. The Respondent did not provide the Panel with any documents or statements. The Panel also visited all available websites and public information concerning the disputed domain name, namely the WHOIS databases.

3. The UDRP Rules clearly say in their Article 3 that any person or entity may initiate an administrative proceeding by submitting a complaint in accordance with the Policy and these Rules.

4. The Panel therefore came to the following conclusions:

a) The Complainant states and proves that the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to its trademark and its domain names. Indeed, the disputed domain name is merely a minor hardly noticeable miss-spelling of the Complainant's trademark.

The disputed domain name is therefore deemed confusingly similar.

b) The Respondent is not generally known by the disputed domain name and has not acquired any trademark or service mark rights in the name or mark, nor is there any authorization for the Respondent by the Complainant to use or register the disputed domain name. The Panel therefore finds that the Respondent does not have rights or a legitimate interest with respect to the disputed domain name.

c) It is clear that the Complainant's trademarks and website(s) were used by the Complainant long time before the disputed domain name was registered.

The Panel finds it inconceivable that the Respondent was unaware of the Complainant's trademark and domain names at the time of registering the disputed domain name and therefore finds that the disputed domain name was registered in bad faith.

The incorporation of a well-known mark into a domain name, coupled with an inactive website, may in itself be evidence of bad faith registration and use.

The Panel therefore finds that the disputed domain name has been registered and is being used in bad faith.

For the reasons stated above, it is the decision of this Panel that the Complainant has satisfied all three elements of paragraph 4(a) of the Policy.

FOR ALL THE REASONS STATED ABOVE, THE COMPLAINT IS

Accepted

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

1. **lyonsdellsbasell.com**: Transferred

PANELLISTS

Name	**Lars Karnoe**

DATE OF PANEL DECISION 2026-01-21

Publish the Decision