

Decision for dispute CAC-UDRP-108849

Case number	CAC-UDRP-108849
Time of filing	2026-07-29 15:35:54
Domain names	lyondellbasell.com

Case administrator

Organization	Iveta Špiclová (Czech Arbitration Court) (Case admin)
--------------	---

Complainant

Organization	LyondellBasell Industries Holdings B.V.
--------------	---

Complainant representative

Organization	Barzanò & Zanardo S.p.A.
--------------	--------------------------

Respondent

Name	Cristina Vargas
------	-----------------

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 states that it is the owner of the following international, EU and US national trademark registrations:

- 77467965 "LYONDELLBASELL" (US), registered on 9 June 2009 for goods and services in classes 1, 4, 17, 35, 42;
- 86555801 "LYONDELLBASELL" (US), registered on 6 December 2016, for products and services in classes 1, 4, 17, 42, 45;
- 006943518 "LYONDELLBASELL" (EUTM), registered on 21 January 2009, for goods and services in classes 1, 4, 17, 42, 45;
- 013804091 "lyondellbasell" (EUTM), registered on 2 July 2015, for goods and services in classes 1, 4, 17, 42, 45;
- 972681 "LYONDELLBASELL" (international), registered on 20 May 2008, for products and services in classes 1, 4, 17, 42, 45;
- 001001866 "LYONDELL" (EUTM), registered on 22 May 2000, for products and services in classes 1, 4, 12, 17, 20, 25, 42.

The Complainant proved ownership of the aforementioned trademark registrations by submitting extracts from the WIPO Madrid database and EUIPO register.

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

LyondellBasell Group (referred to as LyondellBasell) 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, LyondellBasell 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 detains 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 into over 100 countries.

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

On 20 December 2017, the company 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.

According to the 2025 annual report LyondellBasell generated \$563 million in net income and EBITDA of \$2.5 billion.

LyondellBasell Industries N.V. owns multiple domain names consisting of, inter alia, the wordings “LYONDELLBASELL” and “LYONDELL”, such as <lyondellbasell.com> used as the main website of LyondellBasell since 23 October 2007 and <lyondell.com> registered on 21 February 1997.

LyondellBasell is also widely promoted on most popular social media (Twitter/X, Facebook).

The disputed domain name <lyondellbasellc.com> (hereinafter “disputed domain name”) was registered on 29 June 2026. According to the Registrar, the Respondent is ‘Cristina Vargas’. The Respondent’s provided address as being in the US.

PARTIES CONTENTIONS

COMPLAINANT:

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

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 UDRP).

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 UDRP).

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 UDRP).

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

There is no evidence that the Respondent has acquired any rights in a trademark or trade name corresponding to the disputed domain name.

The disputed domain name is set up to send emails, therefore indicating that they have been registered to be involved in phishing

activities/storage spoofing. Such use of the domain name is clearly not a bona fide, legitimate or fair use under the UDRP.

The Respondent did not file any Response to the Complaint. Thus, the Respondent failed to demonstrate rights or legitimate interest in the disputed domain name.

To the satisfaction of the Panel, the Complainant made a prima facie case that there is no connection between the Complainant and the Respondent and that the Respondent does not have authorization in the disputed domain name or in the "LYONDELLBASELL" and "LYONDELL" trademarks and verbal elements themselves from the Complainant.

Above, the Panel found that the Complainant owns numerous international, EU and US national trademark registrations for the "LYONDELLBASELL" and "LYONDELL" wording.

Moreover, past panels have declared that the "LYONDELL" word is highly distinctive (cf. e.g. the CAC Case No. 102018).

This Panel is of the opinion that the Respondent must have been aware of the Complainant, its trademark and business activities at the moment of registering the disputed domain names.

The Respondent cannot be recognized under the disputed domain name, since her identity is hidden in the submitted Whois information for the disputed domain name.

In conclusion, the Panel is of the view that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interest in the disputed domain name.

Therefore, the Panel finds that the Complainant has satisfied the requirement under Paragraph 4(a)(ii) of the UDRP.

3. THE REGISTRATION AND USE OF THE DISPUTED DOMAIN NAME IN BAD FAITH

The Panel finds that the Respondent registered and uses the disputed domain name in bad faith.

The WIPO Overview 3.1 in Paragraph 3.1.4 states: "Panels have consistently found that the mere registration of a domain name that is identical or confusingly similar (particularly domain names comprising typos or incorporating the mark plus a descriptive term) to a famous or widely-known trademark by an unaffiliated entity can by itself create a presumption of bad faith [...]."

In the WIPO Case No. D2020-2116, VFS Global Services Private Limited v. WhoisGuard, Inc., Quijano & Associates / Narendra Singhmanushi, the Panel stated: "The Panel also determines that the Respondent's use of the privacy protection service, WhoisGuard in the circumstances of the present case constitutes additional evidence of bad faith. Absent any explanation from the Respondent, the Panel cannot conceive of any plausible good faith use of the disputed Domain Name that could be made by the Respondent. The Respondent's conduct in registering the disputed Domain Name therefore constitutes opportunistic bad faith."

In the Forum Case No. FA 877979, Microsoft Corporation v. Domain Registration Philippines, the panel stated that: "In addition, Respondent's misspelling of Complainant's MICROSOFT mark in the <microsoft.com> domain name indicates that Respondent is typosquatting, which is a further indication of bad faith registration and use pursuant to Policy ¶ 4(a)(iii)."

In the CAC Case No. 102827, JCDECAUX SA v. Handi Hariyono, the Panel stated that: "There is no present use of the disputed domain name but there are several active MX records connected to the disputed domain name. It is concluded that it is inconceivable that the Respondent will be able to make any good faith use of the disputed domain name as part of an e-mail address."

Above, the Panel found that the Complainant owns numerous international, EU and US national trademark registrations for the "LYONDELLBASELL" and "LYONDELL" verbal elements. It was already mentioned that past panels have found that the "LYONDELL" word is highly distinctive (cf. e.g. the CAC Case No. 102018).

This Panel is of the opinion that the Respondent must have been aware of the Complainant, its trademarks and business activities at the moment of registering the disputed domain names on 29 June 2026.

The Panel cannot find any indicators of the Respondent's good faith in registering or using the disputed domain name.

Firstly, the Panel found the disputed domain name to be confusingly similar (cf. part 1 above).

Secondly, from the Whois information, it is clear that the identification of the Respondent is hidden (privacy protected).

Thirdly, the Complainant submitted a screenshot of the MX Toolbox, according to which the disputed domain name has been set up with MX records, and so the disputed domain name may be actively used for e-mail purposes. Based on the above findings, the Panel cannot see any possibility of legitimate email activities in connection with the disputed domain name by the Respondent. Especially when the disputed domain name is redirecting Internet users to the Complainant's official website (<lyondellbasell.com>), the Respondent is not recognized under the disputed domain name and her identification is hidden in the Whois information.

Finally, the Complainant assumes that the disputed domain name might have been registered to be involved in the "storage (terminal) spoofing". This Panel agrees with the Complainant that it might be the case. This fact only supports the finding of bad faith on the Respondent's part.

Based on the previously mentioned facts, the Panel is of the view that the Respondent did not register and is not using the disputed domain name in good faith.

Following the above-mentioned, the Panel finds that the Complainant has satisfied the conditions pursuant to Paragraph 4(a)(iii) of the UDRP.

FOR ALL THE REASONS STATED ABOVE, THE COMPLAINT IS

Accepted

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

- 1. lyondellbasellc.com: Transferred

PANELLISTS

Name	Radim Charvát
------	---------------

DATE OF PANEL DECISION 2026-08-28

Publish the Decision