

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

Canva Pty Ltd v. JW L, Hong Kong Vision World Ai Limited
Case No. D2026-0256

1. The Parties

The Complainant is Canva Pty Ltd, Australia, represented by SafeNames Ltd., United Kingdom.

The Respondent is JW L, Hong Kong Vision World Ai Limited, Hong Kong, China.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <canvalook.com> (the “Domain Name”) is registered with Amazon Registrar, Inc. (the “Registrar”).

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the “Center”) on January 22, 2026. On January 22, 2026, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the Domain Name. On January 22, 2026, the Registrar transmitted by email to the Center its verification response disclosing registrant and contact information for the Domain Name which differed from the named Respondent (On behalf of canvalook.com owner, Identity Protection Service) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on January 23, 2026, 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 January 23, 2026.

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 January 27, 2026. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was February 16, 2026. The Respondent sent an email communication to the Center on January 27, 2026.

The Center appointed Piotr Nowaczyk as the sole panelist in this matter on February 20, 2026. 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 is an online design and publishing platform founded in 2012 and launched in 2013. It provides a drag-and-drop platform offering a vast library of templates for presentations, social media content, and print products.

The Complainant generated revenue of USD 3.5 billion in 2025. It currently has over 220 million monthly active users and recorded more than 260 million users per month in 2025.

The Complainant is the owner of numerous CANVA trademark registrations, including:

- the International Trademark Registration for CANVA (figurative trademark) No. 1689790, registered on March 21, 2022;
- the European Union Trade Mark Registration for CANVA (word trademark) No. 017056656, registered on December 15, 2017; and
- the Australian Trademark Registration for CANVA (word trademark) No. 1483138, registered on March 29, 2012.

The Complainant is also the owner of numerous domain names incorporating the CANVA trademark, including <canva.com>, which serves as its primary domain name for offering its services.

The Domain Name was registered on June 10, 2025.

At the time of the filing of the Complaint, the Domain Name resolved to a website featuring the Complainant's CANVA trademark and offering an AI tool described as a "Professional AI Art Generator," which purported to transform photos into anime-style images using AI technology or provide a similar graphic-style image transformation service.

As of the date of this Decision, the Domain Name does not resolve to any active website.

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 Domain Name.

First, the Complainant contends that the Domain Name is confusingly similar to the trademark in which the Complainant has rights.

Second, the Complainant argues that the Respondent has neither rights nor legitimate interests in the Domain Name.

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

B. Respondent

On January 27, 2026, the Respondent sent an email communication to the Center stating that it intended to submit a formal Response within the prescribed deadline.

In that communication, the Respondent denied that the Domain Name was registered or is being used in bad faith. The Respondent asserts that the Domain Name is used for an independently operated website offering services that are neither similar to nor competitive with those of the Complainant.

The Respondent further states that the website is not affiliated with, endorsed by, or otherwise connected to the Complainant.

Finally, the Respondent maintains that the Complaint fails to demonstrate that it lacks rights or legitimate interests in the Domain Name or that the Domain Name was registered and is being used in bad faith.

6. Discussion and Findings

6.1. Preliminary Matters – The Respondent’s email communication

Following notification of the Complaint, the Respondent sent an email communication to the Center on January 27, 2026. The Respondent stated that it intended to submit a formal Response within the prescribed deadline. In the same communication, the Respondent also addressed the merits of the case.

Paragraph 10 of the UDRP Rules vests the panel with the authority to determine the admissibility, relevance, materiality and weight of the evidence, and also to conduct the proceedings with due expedition.

Considering the content of the Respondent’s communication dated January 27, 2026, the Panel finds that the communication constitutes substantive submissions addressing the merits of the case and shall therefore be admitted and taken into account in its assessment of the dispute.

6.2. Substantive Matters – Three Elements

Paragraph 4(a) of the Policy places a burden on the Complainant to prove the presence of three separate elements, which can be summarized as follows:

- (i) the 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 the Domain Name; and
- (iii) the Domain Name has been registered and is being used in bad faith.

The applicable standard of proof in UDRP cases is the “balance of probabilities” or “preponderance of the evidence”; some panels have also expressed this as an “on balance” standard. Under this standard, a party should demonstrate to a panel’s satisfaction that it is more likely than not that a claimed fact is true. See section 4.2 of the WIPO Overview of WIPO Panel Views on Select UDRP Questions (“[WIPO Overview 3.1](#)”).

A. Identical or Confusingly Similar

Under the first element, the Complainant must establish that the Domain Name is identical or confusingly similar to the trademark in which the Complainant has rights.

The Complainant holds valid registrations for the CANVA trademark. The Domain Name incorporates this trademark in its entirety. As numerous UDRP panels have held, in cases where a domain name incorporates the entirety of a trademark, the domain name will normally be considered confusingly similar to that mark. See section 1.7 of the [WIPO Overview 3.1](#).

The addition of the term “look” in the Domain Name does not prevent a finding of confusing similarity between the Domain Name and the Complainant’s CANVA trademark. Panels have consistently held that where the relevant trademark is recognizable within the disputed domain name, the addition of other terms (whether descriptive, geographical, pejorative, meaningless, or otherwise) would not prevent a finding of confusing similarity under the first element. See section 1.8 of the [WIPO Overview 3.1](#).

The Top-Level Domain (“TLD”) “.com” in the Domain Name is viewed as a standard registration requirement and as such is typically disregarded under the first element confusing similarity test. See section 1.11.1 of the [WIPO Overview 3.1](#).

Given the above, the Panel finds that the Domain Name is confusingly similar to the Complainant’s CANVA trademark. Thus, the Panel finds the first element of the Policy has been established.

B. Rights or Legitimate Interests

Under the second element, the Complainant must prove that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in the Domain Name.

A right or legitimate interest in the Domain Name may be established, in accordance with paragraph 4(c) of the Policy, if the Panel finds any of the following circumstances:

- (i) that the Respondent has used or made preparations to use the Domain Name or a name corresponding to the Domain Name in connection with a bona fide offering of goods or services prior to the dispute; or
- (ii) that the Respondent is commonly known by the Domain Name, even if the Respondent has not acquired any trademark rights; or
- (iii) that the Respondent is making a legitimate noncommercial or fair use of the Domain Name without intent for commercial gain to misleadingly divert consumers or to tarnish the trademark.

In the present case, the Panel finds that the Complainant has established a prima facie case that the Respondent does not have any rights or legitimate interests in the Domain Name, and the burden of production of evidence shifts to the Respondent. See section 2.1 of the [WIPO Overview 3.1](#). Although given the opportunity, the Respondent has not submitted any evidence indicating that any of the circumstances foreseen in paragraph 4(c) of the Policy are present in this case, including in his correspondence of January 27, 2026.

On the contrary, it results from the evidence on record that the Complainant’s CANVA trademark registrations predate the Respondent’s registration of the Domain Name. There is no evidence in the case record that the Complainant has licensed or otherwise permitted the Respondent to use the CANVA trademark or to register the Domain Name incorporating this trademark. There is also no evidence to suggest that the Respondent has been commonly known by the Domain Name.

The Panel considers that the composition of the Domain Name carries a risk of implied affiliation with the Complainant. See section 2.5.1. of the [WIPO Overview 3.1](#).

Moreover, it results from the evidence on record that the Respondent does not make use of the Domain Name in connection with a bona fide offering of goods or services, nor does it make a legitimate noncommercial or fair use of the Domain Name. On the contrary, at the time of the filing of the Complaint, the Domain Name resolved to a website prominently displaying the Complainant’s CANVA trademark and offering an AI-based image generator functionally comparable to the Complainant’s own tools. Such use of the Domain Name in this case does not confer rights or legitimate interests on the Respondent.

In sum, the Respondent has failed to invoke any circumstances, which could demonstrate, pursuant to paragraph 4(c) of the Policy, any rights or legitimate interests in respect of the Domain Name. Thus, there is no evidence in the case file that refutes the Complainant's prima facie case. The Panel concludes that the second element of the Policy has been established.

C. Registered and Used in Bad Faith

Under the third element, the Complainant must prove that the Domain Name has been registered and is being used in bad faith.

Bad faith under the UDRP is broadly understood to occur where a respondent takes unfair advantage of or otherwise abuses a complainant's mark. See section 3.1 of the [WIPO Overview 3.1](#).

Under paragraph 4(b) of the Policy, evidence of bad faith registration and use includes, without limitation:

- (i) circumstances indicating the domain name was registered or acquired primarily for the purpose of selling, renting, or otherwise transferring the domain name registration to the owner of a trademark or to a competitor of the trademark owner, for valuable consideration in excess of the documented out-of-pocket costs directly related to the domain name; or
- (ii) circumstances indicating that the domain name was registered in order to prevent the owner of a trademark from reflecting the mark in a corresponding domain name, provided it is a pattern of such conduct; or
- (iii) circumstances indicating that the domain name was registered primarily for the purpose of disrupting the business of a competitor; or
- (iv) circumstances indicating that the domain name has intentionally been used in an attempt to attract, for commercial gain, Internet users to a website or other online location, by creating a likelihood of confusion with a trademark as to the source, sponsorship, affiliation, or endorsement of the website or location or of a product or service on a website or location.

Although the Respondent denies in its correspondence of January 27, 2026, that the Domain Name was registered or is being used in bad faith, it has failed to provide any supporting evidence for this assertion. On the contrary, the evidence contained in the case file indicates that the Domain Name has been registered and is being used in bad faith.

As indicated above, the Complainant's rights in the CANVA trademark predate the registration of the Domain Name. This Panel finds that the Respondent was or should have been aware of the Complainant's CANVA trademark at the time of registration, as it has been proven to the Panel's satisfaction that this trademark is well known, and unique to the Complainant. Thus, the Respondent could not ignore the reputation of the CANVA trademark.

Furthermore, at the time the Complaint was filed, the Domain Name resolved to the website which prominently featured the Complainant's CANVA trademark and promoted a "Professional AI Art Generator" providing image-transformation services similar to those offered by the Complainant. As of the date of this Decision, the Domain Name does not resolve to any active website. The Panel finds, having regard to the totality of the circumstances of the case, that the Respondent has intentionally attempted to attract, for commercial gain, Internet users to the website by creating a likelihood of confusion with the Complainant's trademark as to the source, sponsorship, affiliation, or endorsement of this website.

Finally, as evidenced by the Complainant, the Domain Name has been configured with MX records to enable sending and receiving emails from the Domain Name, which creates a risk of phishing (see *W.W. Grainger, Inc. v. WhoisGuard Protected, WhoisGuard, Inc. / Daniel Thomas*, WIPO Case No. [D2020-1740](#)).

For the reasons discussed above, 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 Domain Name <canvalook.com> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Piotr Nowaczyk/

Piotr Nowaczyk

Sole Panelist

Date: March 6, 2026