

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

Canadian Tire Corporation, Limited v. Domain Admin
Case No. D2024-2411

1. The Parties

The Complainant is Canadian Tire Corporation, Limited, Canada, represented by Cassels Brock & Blackwell, LLP, Canada.

The Respondent is Domain Admin, Israel.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <telcanadiantire.com> is registered with Communigal Communications Ltd. (the "Registrar").

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the "Center") on June 12, 2024. On June 13, 2024, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On June 14, 2024, 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 ("REGISTRANT INFORMATION UNAVAILABLE") and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on June 14, 2024, 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 amended Complaint on June 18, 2024.

The Center verified that the Complaint together with the amended Complaint satisfied the formal requirements of the Uniform Domain Name Dispute Resolution Policy (the "Policy" or "UDRP"), the Rules for Uniform Domain Name Dispute Resolution Policy (the "Rules"), and the WIPO Supplemental Rules for Uniform 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 June 21, 2024. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was July 11, 2024. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent's default on July 17, 2024.

The Center appointed Edoardo Fano as the sole panelist in this matter on July 23, 2024. 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.

The Panel has not received any requests from the Complainant or the Respondent regarding further submissions, waivers or extensions of deadlines, and the Panel has not found it necessary to request any further information from the Parties.

Having reviewed the communication records in the case file provided by the Center, the Panel finds that the Center has discharged its responsibility under the Rules, paragraph 2(a), "to employ reasonably available means calculated to achieve actual notice to [the] Respondent". Therefore, the Panel shall issue its Decision based upon the Complaint, the Policy, the Rules and the Supplemental Rules and without the benefit of a response from the Respondent.

The language of the proceeding is English, being the language of the Registration Agreement, as per paragraph 11(a) of the Rules.

4. Factual Background

The Complainant is Canadian Tire Corporation, Limited, a Canadian company founded in 1922, operating in a diverse range of sectors, ranging from automotive and hardware goods, to furniture and housewares, and owning several trademark registrations all over the world for CANADIAN TIRE, among which:

- Canadian Trademark Registration No. TMA279853 for CANADIAN TIRE, registered on May 27, 1983;
- Canadian Trademark Registration No. TMA240380 for CANADIAN TIRE and design, registered on March 7, 1980.

The Complainant also operates on the Internet, its main website being "www.canadiantire.ca", and "www.tellcdntire.com" being its website for hosting a customer satisfaction survey.

The Complainant provided evidence in support of the above.

According to the Registrar's record, the disputed domain name was registered on November 8, 2009, and it resolves to a parking page with pay-per-click ("PPC") links to third party customer satisfaction survey services.

5. Parties' Contentions

A. Complainant

The Complainant contends that it has satisfied each of the elements required under the Policy for a transfer of the disputed domain name.

Notably, the Complainant contends that the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to its trademark CANADIAN TIRE, as the disputed domain name wholly incorporates the Complainant's trademark CANADIAN TIRE, with the addition of the term "tell", concerning the Complainant's business in connection with its customer satisfaction survey.

Moreover, the Complainant asserts that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the disputed domain name, since it has not been authorized by the Complainant to register the disputed domain name or to use its trademark within the disputed domain name. The Respondent is not commonly known by the disputed domain name, and it is not making either a bona fide offering of goods or services or a legitimate noncommercial or fair use of the disputed domain name. The disputed domain name resolves to a parking page with PPC links to third party customer satisfaction survey services.

The Complainant submits that the Respondent has registered the disputed domain name in bad faith, since the Complainant's trademark CANADIAN TIRE is distinctive and well known in the field of automotive and hardware goods, furniture, and housewares. Therefore, the Respondent targeted the Complainant's trademark at the time of registration of the disputed domain name, and the Complainant contends that, by resolving to a parking page with PPC links to third parties, the use of the disputed domain name to attract, for commercial gain, Internet users to the Respondent's website, creating a likelihood of confusion with the Complainant's trademark as to the source, sponsorship, affiliation, or endorsement of the Respondent's website, qualifies as bad faith registration and use.

B. Respondent

The Respondent has made no reply to the Complainant's contentions and is in default. In reference to paragraphs 5(f) and 14 of the Rules, no exceptional circumstances explaining the default have been put forward or are apparent from the record.

A respondent is not obliged to participate in a proceeding under the Policy, but if it fails to do so, reasonable facts asserted by a complainant may be taken as true, and appropriate inferences, in accordance with paragraph 14(b) of the Rules, may be drawn. WIPO Overview of WIPO Panel Views on Selected UDRP Questions, Third Edition ("[WIPO Overview 3.0](#)"), section 4.3.

6. Discussion and Findings

Paragraph 4(a) of the Policy lists three elements, which the Complainant must satisfy in order to succeed:

- (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 and is being used in bad faith.

A. Identical or Confusingly Similar

It is well accepted that the first element functions primarily as a standing requirement. The standing (or threshold) test for confusing similarity involves a reasoned but relatively straightforward comparison between the Complainant's trademark and the disputed domain name. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 1.7.

Based on the available record, the Panel finds the Complainant has shown rights in respect of a trademark or service mark for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 1.2.1.

The entirety of the mark is reproduced within the disputed domain name. Accordingly, the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to the mark for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 1.7.

Although the addition of other terms, here "tell", may bear on assessment of the second and third elements, the Panel finds the addition of such term does not prevent a finding of confusing similarity between the disputed domain name and the mark for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 1.8.

It is also well accepted that a generic Top-Level Domain, in this case ".com", is typically ignored when assessing the similarity between a trademark and a domain name. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 1.11.1.

Based on the available record, the Panel finds the first element of the Policy has been established.

B. Rights or Legitimate Interests

Paragraph 4(c) of the Policy provides a list of circumstances in which the Respondent may demonstrate rights or legitimate interests in a disputed domain name.

While the overall burden of proof in UDRP proceedings is on the complainant, panels have recognized that proving a respondent lacks rights or legitimate interests in a domain name may result in the often impossible task of “proving a negative”, requiring information that is often primarily within the knowledge or control of the respondent. As such, where a complainant makes out a prima facie case that the respondent lacks rights or legitimate interests, the burden of production on this element shifts to the respondent to come forward with relevant evidence demonstrating rights or legitimate interests in the domain name. If the respondent fails to come forward with such relevant evidence, the complainant is deemed to have satisfied the second element. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 2.1.

Having reviewed the record, the Panel finds the Complainant has established a prima facie case that the Respondent lacks rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name. The Respondent has not rebutted the Complainant’s prima facie showing and has not come forward with any relevant evidence demonstrating rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name such as those enumerated in the Policy or otherwise. The disputed domain name resolves to a parking page with PPC links to third party websites with consumer surveys. The use of a disputed domain name to host a parked page comprising PPC links does not represent a bona fide offering where such links compete with or capitalize on the reputation and goodwill of the Complainant’s trademark. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 2.9.

Moreover, the Panel finds that the composition of the disputed domain name, including the term “tell”, is an attempt to mimic the Complainant’s own customer satisfaction survey business under its “telldntire” domain name, and thereby carries a risk of implied affiliation as it effectively impersonates or suggests sponsorship or endorsement by the Complainant. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 2.5.1.

Based on the available record, the Panel finds the second element of the Policy has been established.

C. Registered and Used in Bad Faith

The Panel notes that for the purposes of paragraph 4(a)(iii) of the Policy, paragraph 4(b) of the Policy establishes circumstances, in particular but without limitation, that if found by the Panel to be present, shall be evidence of the registration and use of a domain name in bad faith.

In the present case, regarding the registration in bad faith of the disputed domain name, the reputation of the Complainant’s trademark CANADIAN TIRE in the field of automotive and hardware goods, furniture, and housewares is clearly established, and given the composition of the disputed domain name which mimics the Complainant’s own survey portal the Panel finds that the Respondent must have known of the Complainant, and deliberately registered the disputed domain name in bad faith. The Panel also notes the content of the parking page to which the disputed domain name resolves, which consists of PPC links to third party customer satisfaction survey services, which is the same activity carried out by the Complainant on its own customer satisfaction survey website. By replacing the abbreviation “cdn” (used by the Complainant in its own domain name) with the term “canadian” in the disputed domain name, the Respondent has attempted to mislead Internet users, passing itself off as the Complainant.

In fact, the Panel finds that the disputed domain name is also used in bad faith since, on the relevant parking page there are PPC links, which, even in the case where they were automatically generated, refer to customer satisfaction survey services, that is, to the same service specifically provided by the Complainant on its customer satisfaction survey website, and the Respondent cannot disclaim responsibility for the parking page content. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 3.5. The Panel therefore notes that the disputed domain name is being used in bad faith since the Respondent is trying to attract Internet users to its website by creating a likelihood of confusion with the Complainant’s trademark as to the disputed domain name’s source, sponsorship, affiliation or endorsement, an activity clearly detrimental to the Complainant’s business.

The above suggests to the Panel that despite the composition of the disputed domain name bearing hallmarks of a potential fair use, the Respondent intentionally registered and is using the disputed domain name in order to both disrupt the Complainant’s business, and to attract Internet users to its website in accordance with paragraph 4(b)(iii-iv) of the Policy.

The Panel finds that the Complainant has presented evidence to satisfy its burden of proof with respect to the issue of whether the Respondent has registered and is using the disputed domain name in bad faith, also taking into consideration the fact that the Respondent did not participate in this proceeding. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 4.3.

Furthermore, the Panel considers that the nature of the inherently misleading disputed domain name, which includes the Complainant's trademark in its entirety (and is very similar to the domain name used by the Complainant for its customer satisfaction survey website, namely <tellcdntire.com>), further supports a finding of bad faith. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 3.2.1.

Based on the available record, the Panel finds the third element of the Policy has been established.

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 <tellcanadiantire.com> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Edoardo Fano/

Edoardo Fano

Sole Panelist

Date: July 31, 2024