Decision for dispute CAC-UDRP-108230

Case number	CAC-UDRP-108230
Time of filing	2025-12-19 11:07:51
Domain names	lyondellbasellgroup.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	Zara Narang

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

The Complainant is the owner of several trademarks, inter alia the European Union Trademark 006943518 LYONDELLBASELL registered on February 2, 2009 in several classes, being in effect.

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

The Complainant is part of a multinational chemical company with European and American roots going back to 1953-54.

Since then, the Complainant has, as part of its group, become the third largest plastics, chemicals and refining company and the largest licensor of polyethylene and polypropylene technologies in the world. The Complainant has over 20,000 employees around the globe and manufactures at 75 sites in 20 countries. Its products are sold in over 100 countries.

According to the 2024 annual report, the Complainant generated $1.4 billion in net income.

The Complainant has been listed on the New York Stock Exchange since 2010.

The disputed domain name was registered on August 23, 2025 and was redirected to the Complainant´s website. It is, however, set up with active MX records, indicating that it is used to send and receive scam e-mails to the Complainant’s clients requesting a

consistent payment. The Respondent´s identity was initially not indicated in the whois-registry.

PARTIES CONTENTIONS

The Complainant contends that the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to the Complainant´s trademark „LYONDELLBASELL“ since it incorporates it in its entirety. The Complainant further contends that the Respondent is not affiliated with nor authorized by the Complainant in any way. The Complainant contends that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the disputed domain name.

Given the Complainant's trademark being well-known, the Complainant finally contends that the Respondent has registered and used the domain name with full knowledge of the Complainant's trademark.

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).

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).

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

In order to succeed in its claim, the Complainant must demonstrate that all of the elements enumerated 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; 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.

A. Identical or Confusingly Similar

The Complainant has established the fact that it has valid trademark rights for “LYONDELLBASELL.

The disputed domain name is confusingly similar to the Complainant´s mark since the addition of the descriptive element „group“ does not have a relevant influence on the similarity of signs, which remain phonetically highly similar.

The Panel therefore considers the disputed domain name to be confusingly similar to the trademark „LYONDELLBASELL“ in which the Complainant has rights in accordance with paragraph 4(a)(i) of the Policy.

B. Rights or Legitimate Interests

The Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name, since the Respondent is not a licensee of the Complainant nor has the Complainant granted any permission or consent to the Respondent to use its trademarks or designations confusingly similar to its trademarks. Furthermore, the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name, since there is no indication that the Respondent is commonly known by the name “LYONDALLBASELLGROUP“ or that the Respondent is using the disputed domain name in connection with a bona fide offering of goods or services.

The Panel therefore finds that the Respondent does not have rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name.

C. Registered and Used in Bad Faith

In view of the size of the company of the Complainant, the Respondent must have been aware of the Complainant and its trademarks when registering the disputed domain name. The Complainant has not authorized the Respondent to make use of a designation that is similar to its marks.

The Panel does not believe that the application of a domain name being highly similar to a distinctive trademark as the one from the Complainant is accidental.

This Panel does not see any conceivable legitimate use that could be made by the Respondent of this particular disputed domain name without the Complainant’s authorization.

In particular, the setup as an MX site being able to send scam e-mails to the Complainant´s customers is not a legitimate use, but an indication of bad faith.

The circumstances of this case, in particular the high similarity of the signs in connection with the set up of MX records to send scam e-mails to the Complainant´s customers indicate that the Respondent registered and uses the disputed domain name primarily with the intention of attempting to attract, for commercial gain, Internet users to its potential website or other online locations, by creating a likelihood of confusion with the Complainant’s mark as to the source, sponsorship, affiliation, or endorsement of such website or location, or of a product or service on such website or location.

The Panel therefore considers the disputed domain name to have been registered and used in bad faith in accordance with paragraph 4(a)(iii) of the Policy.

FOR ALL THE REASONS STATED ABOVE, THE COMPLAINT IS

Accepted

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

1. **lyondellbasellgroup.com**: Transferred

PANELLISTS

Name	**Dietrich Beier**

DATE OF PANEL DECISION 2026-01-26

Publish the Decision