

## **ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION**

Magna International Inc. v. Lauren Wong, Magna  
Case No. D2025-2765

### **1. The Parties**

The Complainant is Magna International Inc., Canada, represented by Gowling WLG (Canada) LLP, Canada.

The Respondent is Lauren Wong, Magna, Canada.

### **2. The Domain Name and Registrar**

The disputed Domain Name <infos-magna.com> is registered with NameCheap, Inc. (the “Registrar”).

### **3. Procedural History**

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the “Center”) on July 14, 2025. On July 14, 2025, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On July 14, 2025, 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 (“Redacted for Privacy”) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on July 16, 2025, 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 July 18, 2025.

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 July 21, 2025. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was August 10, 2025. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent’s default on August 13, 2025.

The Center appointed Edward C. Chiasson K.C. as the sole panelist in this matter on August 21, 2025. 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.

#### 4. Factual Background

The Complainant, Magna International Inc., is a company incorporated pursuant to the laws of Ontario, Canada. It was founded in 1957.

The Complainant is a global automotive supplier, with manufacturing facilities in Canada, the United States of America ("United States"), and elsewhere in the world.

The Complainant employs over 166,000 people at over 340 manufacturing operations and over 100 product development, engineering and sales centers, across 28 countries and five continents. It had global sales in 2024 alone of over USD 42.8 billion, and the Complainant is listed and traded on the Toronto Stock Exchange in Canada and the New York Stock Exchange in the United States.

In connection with its business, the Complainant is the owner of a significant global portfolio of trademark registrations that consist of or comprise "MAGNA" (the "MAGNA Trademarks") which it has used for over 40 years in association with its businesses.

The Complainant is the owner of many trademark registrations for the MAGNA Trademarks. These trademarks include the MAGNA Trademark registrations set out below.

Trademark	Reg. No.	Reg. Date	Jurisdiction
MAGNA	TMA303870	June 21, 1985	Canada
MAGNA	1837713	May 31, 1994	United States

The Complainant's MAGNA Trademarks noted above were registered in Canada, the United States, and elsewhere in the world decades prior to the registration of the Disputed Domain Name.

The Complainant registered the domain name <magna.com> in 1991 and has operated a website from that domain name since at least as early as 2001. This website prominently features the MAGNA Trademarks (described herein) and promotes the Complainant's businesses in association with those trademarks.

Without the permission of the Complainant, in or around May 19, 2025, the Respondent registered the Disputed Domain Name: <infos-magna.com>. The Disputed Domain Name currently resolves to a copy of the Complainant's "www.magna.com" website with the URL "https://infos-magna.com/www.magna.com/index.html". The Respondent's "copy site" is rendered through the use of a well-known website copier tool, HTTrack Website Copier.

It appears that Mail Exchange (MX) records associated with the Disputed Domain Name have been activated.

A fake LinkedIn account impersonating the Complainant, which references the Disputed Domain Name and the Respondent's "copy site" has also been identified.

There has never been any relationship between the Complainant and the Respondent. The Respondent is not licensed, or otherwise authorized, directly or indirectly, to register or use, any of the MAGNA Trademarks, in any manner whatsoever, including in, or as part of, the Disputed Domain Name.

The Respondent provided false registrant information when registering the Disputed Domain Name identifying him or herself as "Lauren Wong, Resources Manager, Magna" and listing the Complainant's actual street address in Aurora, Ontario, but providing an unrelated email address and telephone number. The Complainant does not employ any "Resources Manager" by the name "Lauren Wong". The Respondent/Lauren Wong has never been authorized to register the Disputed Domain Name while posing as an employee of the Complainant.

The Complainant on its website has posted Fraud Alerts to the public advising of various fraud attempts and scams which misuse the Complainant's trademarks and names.

## 5. Parties' Contentions

### A. Complainant

The Complainant contends that the Disputed Domain Name is confusingly similar to a trademark in respect of which the Complainant has rights.

The Complainant is the owner of the registered MAGNA Trademarks as well as unregistered (common law) rights established through the Complainant's extensive and continuous use in Canada, the United States, and elsewhere in the world for many decades.

Trademark registrations for the MAGNA Trademarks date back many decades. The Disputed Domain Name was registered by the Respondent in May 2025, long after the Complainant first registered and used the MAGNA Trademarks.

The Disputed Domain Name misappropriates the whole of the Complainant's registered MAGNA Trademark.

The only other element included within the Disputed Domain Name is the descriptive and nondistinctive term "infos". As provided in the [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), the addition of terms (whether descriptive, geographical, pejorative, meaningless, or otherwise) does not prevent a finding of confusing similarity under this element. See [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 1.8. Prior UDRP panels have found that the addition of the term "infos" to domain names which target a complainant's marks does not obviate a finding of confusion (see e.g. *Carrefour SA v Jerome Barrier*, WIPO Case No. [D2023-0766](#)).

An objective bystander would naturally assume that the element "Magna" as used in the Disputed Domain Name was invoking the Complainant's MAGNA Trademarks, to suggest some official association with the Complainant and its MAGNA business. The use of the meaningless or at best descriptive term "infos" (as in "information") merely reinforces the connection with the Complainant and the MAGNA business.

The Complainant asserts that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in the Disputed Domain Name.

Use which intentionally trades on the goodwill and reputation of another cannot constitute a bona fide offering of goods or services and to conclude otherwise would mean that a respondent could rely on intentional infringement to demonstrate a legitimate interest, an interpretation which is obviously contrary to the Policy (*Chanel, Inc. v. Cologne Zone*, WIPO Case No. [D2000-1809](#); *Pfizer Inc. v Enamcorp.com*, WIPO Case No. [D2001-0791](#)).

The Respondent has created a "copy site" of the Complainant's actual "www.magna.com" website which is being hosted at the Disputed Domain Name, as well as a LinkedIn account impersonating the Complainant, which references the Disputed Domain Name.

In addition, the Respondent has provided false registrant information wherein the Respondent is posing as an employee of the Complainant and lists the Complainant's actual street address as its own address. Prior UDRP Panels have found that where a "copy site" or "mirror" created using the HTTracker Website Copier tool of a Complainant's legitimate website is being hosted by a Respondent at a domain name, cannot give rise to rights or legitimate interests on the part of the Respondent. It is clear from the Respondent's use of the Disputed Domain Name, to "mirror" the Complainant's official website, that the Respondent has used the Disputed Domain Name for deceptive purposes, which cannot give rise to rights or legitimate interests on the part of the Respondent. See *Federation of the Swiss Watch Industry FH v Farrukh Hussain, Web Solution Provider*, WIPO Case No. [D2024-2446](#); see also: *BKS Bank AG v.*

*WhoisGuard Protected, WhoisGuard, Inc. / Mack John, Wikina*, WIPO Case No. [D2020-2811](#); *BKS Bank AG v. WhoisGuard Protected, WhoisGuard, Inc. / Mikell Karo*, WIPO Case No. [D2020-0575](#).

The Respondent has activated MX records associated with the Disputed Domain Name for the purpose of hosting email addresses at the Disputed Domain Name.

The activation of an MX record, in view of the nature of the Disputed Domain Name which incorporates the MAGNA Trademark and which resolves to a copy of the Complainant's "www.magna.com" website, indicates that the Respondent is preparing to or already is using the Disputed Domain Name to host email accounts and send emails while posing as the Complainant.

Where a disputed domain name incorporates a complainant's trademark in its entirety along with descriptive/non-distinctive matter, it will be found that such activities potentially convey to unsuspecting Internet users the false belief that any website or email connected to that domain name is associated with the complainant, and such a risk of affiliation or association with the complainant and its mark cannot constitute fair use (*K&L Gates LLP v. Jason Jonnes*, WIPO Case No. [D2023-1098](#)).

It must be inferred that the Respondent's registration and use of the Disputed Domain Name is intended to trade off or disrupt the goodwill and reputation in the MAGNA Trademarks. In the absence of any other reasonable explanation, such use by the Respondent cannot be deemed legitimate, or noncommercial, or fair (*F. Hoffmann-La Roche AG v Private Whois Service*, WIPO Case No. [D2012-0081](#)).

The Disputed Domain Name was acquired by the Respondent very recently and there is no evidence to suggest that the Respondent has ever been commonly known by the name Magna.

Any conceivable use of the Disputed Domain Name will be manifestly commercial (if not criminal) in nature. There is no conceivable use of the Disputed Domain Name by the Respondent other than to use it to represent themselves as the Complainant. It is presently doing this through the use of a fake "copy site" of the Complainant's actual "www.magna.com" website hosted at the Disputed Domain Name and its use of the Disputed Domain Name as part of a fake LinkedIn account impersonating the Complainant.

The Complainant submits that the Disputed Domain Name was registered and is being used in bad faith.

The Complainant has provided evidence that the Complainant enjoys significant rights in the MAGNA Trademarks and that those marks have acquired significant reputation in Canada, the United States and elsewhere. In light of this reputation and the Complainant's prior registration and use of its own very similar domain name <www.magna.com>, and given the nature of the Disputed Domain Name, it must be concluded that the Respondent had knowledge of the Complainant's MAGNA Trademarks at the time of registration.

Any use of the Disputed Domain Name will be highly disruptive to the Complainant, as third parties are likely to be confused into believing that the Respondent's activities are affiliated with, or sponsored by, the Complainant, when that is not the case.

A complainant need not wait until a disputed domain name has been used to commit a fraud or other bad faith activity before bringing a complaint under the UDRP to recover a domain name.

The active MX records associated with the Disputed Domain Name, even without evidence that the Respondent has issued emails impersonating the Complainant, indicates the present ability to do so. Without any legitimate, independent use of the Disputed Domain Name and given the confusing similarity to the Complainant's actual <magna.com> domain name, a consumer easily could be led to believe that an email from an account associated with the Disputed Domain Name came from the Complainant.

Creation of MX records in similar circumstances (and even in the absence of an active website or evidence of active use of email accounts associated with a domain name) has been found to constitute likely bad faith

intent: see e.g., *Banque Palatine v. Ophelie Bichon*, WIPO Case No. [D2024-3920](#); *K&L Gates LLP v. Jason Jonnes*, WIPO Case No. [D2023-1098](#); *PN II, Inc. v. Alejandro Alvarado*, *The PHomes*, WIPO Case No. [D2023-1038](#); *BOLLORE SE v. Contact Privacy Inc. Customer 1247853759 / Angela Chaney*, WIPO Case No. [D2020-2050](#).

The Respondent's bad faith is apparent through the use of a "copy site" hosted at the Disputed Domain Name, the identification of a fake LinkedIn account referencing the Disputed Domain Name, which is being used to impersonate the Complainant, and the provision of false registrant information wherein the Respondent is posing as an employee of the Complainant.

There is no plausible reason for the Disputed Domain Name to have been registered other than for the purpose of some type of phishing scam or other fraudulent activity, as part of an intentional attempt to unlawfully attract commercial gain for the Respondent's benefit. This is bad faith registration and use.

UDRP panels have consistently found that the mere registration of a domain name that is confusingly similar (particularly those 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 (*K&L Gates LLP v. Jason Jonnes*, WIPO Case No. [D2023-1098](#)).

The use of a disputed domain name for what appears to be a phishing scheme by creating a likelihood of confusion with the Complainant's mark as to the source, sponsorship, affiliation, or endorsement of the Respondent's activities...constitutes bad faith use under the Policy" (*The Governor and Company of Adventurers of England Trading into Hudson's Bay AKA Hudson's Bay Company v. Domain Administrator, PrivacyGuardian.org*, WIPO Case No. [D2020-0053](#)).

The Respondent registered the Disputed Domain Name in order to fraudulently represent itself as, or as endorsed or affiliated with, the Complainant. The Disputed Domain Name incorporates the MAGNA Trademarks, and is being used to host a "copy site" of the Complainant's own website. These facts, together with the provision of false registrant information wherein the Respondent is posing as an employee of the Complainant, are sufficient to establish bad faith (*British Airways PLC v. Wayne Nicholas / Berocha Holdings B.V.I. Limited*, WIPO Case No. [D2009-0110](#)).

## **B. Respondent**

The Respondent did not reply to the Complainant's contentions.

## **6. Discussion and Findings**

### **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 of WIPO Panel Views on Selected UDRP Questions, Third Edition, ("[WIPO Overview 3.0](#)"), section 1.7.

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.

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.

Although 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 difficult 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 (although the burden of proof always remains on the complainant). 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 available 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 active MX records associated with the Disputed Domain Name, even without evidence that the Respondent has issued emails impersonating the Complainant, indicates the present ability to do so. Panels have held that the use of a domain name for illegal activity e.g., phishing, impersonation/passing off, can never confer rights or legitimate interests on a respondent. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 2.13.1.

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.

Paragraph 4(b) of the Policy sets out a list of non-exhaustive circumstances that may indicate that a domain name was registered and used in bad faith, but other circumstances may be relevant in assessing whether a respondent’s registration and use of a domain name is in bad faith. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 3.2.1.

In the present case, the Complainant has shown evidence that the Disputed Domain Name has been used in connection with a “copy site” website. It is clear from that, and from the Respondent’s adoption of a domain name incorporating the Complainant’s trademark that the Respondent was targeting the Complainant when it registered the Disputed Domain Name. Having reviewed the record, the Panel finds the Respondent’s registration and use of the disputed domain name constitutes bad faith under the Policy.

The Panel finds that the Complainant has established the third element of the Policy.

## **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 <infos-magna.com> be transferred to the Complainant.

*/Edward C. Chiasson K.C./*

**Edward C. Chiasson K.C.**

Sole Panelist

Date: September 4, 2025