

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

BetterCampus, Inc. v. dadada zheng, xiansheng zheng,
Vasile-Ionut Crangan, Lead Total Limited, Raghav Gupta
Case No. D2026-1497

1. The Parties

The Complainant is BetterCampus, Inc., United States of America (“United States”), internally represented.

The Respondents are dadada zheng, xiansheng zhen, China, both represented by Unitalen Attorneys at Law, China; Vasile-Ionut Crangan, Lead Total Limited, Hong Kong, China; and Raghav Gupta, India.

2. The Domain Names and Registrars

The disputed domain name <better-campus.com> is registered with CloudFlare, Inc. The disputed domain name <better-canvas.com> is registered with NameSilo, LLC. The disputed domain name <better-canvas.net> is registered with Spaceship, Inc. The disputed domain name <bettercanvas.net> is registered with NameCheap, Inc. CloudFlare, Inc., NameSilo, LLC, Spaceship, Inc. and NameCheap, Inc will be collectively referred herein as the “Registrars”.

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the “Center”) on April 8, 2026. On April 9, 2026, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain names. On April 10 and 13, 2026, the Registrars transmitted by email to the Center their verification response disclosing registrant and contact information for the disputed domain names which differed from the named Respondents (PrivacyGuardian.org, Withheld for Privacy ehf, Privacy-protected (registrant details withheld from RDAP)) and contact information in the Complaint.

The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on April 16, 2026 with the registrant and contact information of nominally multiple underlying registrants revealed by the Registrars, requesting the Complainant to either file separate complaint(s) for the disputed domain names associated with different underlying registrants or alternatively, demonstrate that the underlying registrants are in fact the same entity and/or that all domain names are under common control. The Complainant filed an amended Complaint April 16, 2026. The Complaint filed a further submission with the Center on April 22, 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 Respondents of the Complaint, and the proceedings commenced on April 22, 2026. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was May 16, 2026. The Response on behalf of the Respondents dadada zheng and xiansheng zheng was filed with the Center on May 16, 2026. On May 22 and June 26, 2026, the Complainant filed supplemental submissions in reply to the Response.

The Center appointed John Swinson, Tony Willoughby, and David E. Sorkin as the Administrative Panel in this matter on June 8, 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 a corporation from the United States. The Complainant develops a software product that is an extension to the Canvas web-based learning management system (LMS) software product. Instructure Holdings, Inc. is an educational technology company based in Utah, United States, that is the developer and publisher of Canvas. The Complainant is not an affiliated company of Instructure Holdings, Inc.

The Complainant’s software product was launched about six years ago under the name BETTERCANVAS. In about September 2025, the Complainant rebranded its software product (according to the Complainant, “in consultation with Instructure”) as BETTERCAMPUS.

The Complainant owns United States Trademark Registration No. 8252044 for “BetterCampus” that was filed on October 8, 2025, and registered on May 12, 2026.

The Complainant uses the domain name <bettercampus.com>.

The disputed domain name <better-canvas.com> was registered on May 27, 2025, by the First Respondent, dadada zheng.

The disputed domain name <better-campus.com> was registered on October 3, 2025, by the Second Respondent, xiansheng zhen.

The disputed domain name <bettercanvas.net> was registered on January 31, 2026, by the Fourth Respondent, Raghav Gupta.

The disputed domain name <better-canvas.net> was registered on February 9, 2026, by the Third Respondent, Vasile-Ionut Crangan of Lead Total Limited.

At the present time, the website at the disputed domain name <better-canvas.com> diverts to a website at <better-lms.com> and has a heading “Better Canvas” and sub-heading “Transform Your Canvas with Better Canvas Extension”. The copyright notice on this website states “© 2025 Better LMS. Not affiliated with, authorized by, endorsed by, or sponsored by BetterCampus, Instructure, Moodle Pty Ltd, D2L, Anthology, or any educational institution. All product names, logos, and brands are property of their respective owners”.

At the present time, the website at the disputed domain name <better-campus.com> does not resolve to an active website.

At the present time, the website at the disputed domain name <bettercanvas.net> resolves to a page stating “Error 451. ... This website is unavailable for legal reasons”.

At the present time, the website at the disputed domain name <better-canvas.net> has a heading “Better Canvas: Enhance Your Canvas LMS Experience” and sub-heading “Transform Canvas LMS with a sleek **dark mode**, **GPA calculator**, smart **to-do list**, and AI-powered study tools — all in one free extension”. This website includes a disclaimer “An independent community resource for Canvas LMS users. Not affiliated with Instructure, Inc. or the official Better Canvas developers”.

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 names.

In summary, the Complainant makes the following submissions in the Complaint.

The Complainant is the developer of a browser extension used by over two million students to enhance the Canvas Learning Management System.

The Complainant operated under the name “BetterCanvas” for approximately five years (circa 2020–2025), building substantial brand recognition. The Complainant has established substantial common-law trademark rights in BETTERCANVAS through approximately five years of continuous, widespread commercial use.

Each website at a disputed domain name impersonates the Complainant’s product, uses the Complainant’s copied branding and user-statistic claims, and either links to the Complainant’s genuine Chrome/Firefox listings (<bettercanvas.net>; historically <better-canvas.com>) or diverts users to competing extensions (current <better-canvas.com>). Both uses monetize misdirected traffic.

The website at the disputed domain name <better-canvas.com> embeds Google AdSense tags and generates advertisement revenue.

All four disputed domain names were registered with knowledge of the Complainant’s widely used product and mark. The four disputed domain names target the Complainant’s marks.

All four websites at the disputed domain name were operated to attract Internet users seeking the Complainant’s product and to monetize that traffic through advertising and competitor-diversion funnels.

On November 13, 2025, Instructure, Inc.’s counsel sent a cease-and-desist letter to the Complainant regarding disputed domain name <better-canvas.com> in the mistaken belief that the Complainant operated that site. That the Canvas LMS trademark holder’s own counsel could not distinguish the Complainant from the fraudulent site is direct evidence of actual confusion.

The website at <better-canvas.net> was taken down between April 8 and April 16, 2026, after notice of a UDRP filing.

The website at <bettercanvas.net> linked users to the Complainant's genuine Chrome extension and Firefox add-on while claiming the Complainant's product metrics.

B. Respondent

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

The First Respondent and the Second Respondent (hereafter referred to as "the Respondent" unless stated otherwise) contend that the Complainant has not satisfied all three of the elements required under the Policy for a transfer of the disputed domain names <better-canvas.com> and <better-campus.com>.

In summary, the Respondent makes the following submissions.

There is no evidence in the Complaint that the Complainant has common law trademark rights in BETTERCANVAS. The Complainant has not provided evidence to show that BETTERCANVAS is a distinctive identifier that consumers associate with the Complainant. The Complainant makes broad unsupported assertions without providing evidence to support these allegations.

"Canvas" refers to a LMS developed by Instructure, and the use of "better" could be understood as reference to a tool that improves the performance of the Canvas LMS.

The Complainant has moved to abandon the Complainant's rights in BETTERCANVAS.

The Complainant applied to register "BetterCampus" as a trademark after the Respondent registered the disputed domain name <better-campus.com>. The Complainant failed to provide evidence of use of "BetterCampus" prior to the Respondent's registration of the disputed domain name. "BetterCampus" has not become a distinctive identifier in the minds of consumers.

The Respondent's website at <better-canvas.com> includes a clear disclaimer that shows that the Respondent is not trying to pass its services off as those of the Complainant. The Respondent's use of this disputed domain name is purely descriptive, and this website is an informational resource, not a rival service. The mere presence of advertisements is insufficient to establish bad faith.

The Respondent never intended to sell the disputed domain names to the Complainant.

6. Discussion and Findings

To succeed, the Complainant must demonstrate that all of the elements enumerated in paragraph 4(a) of the Policy have been satisfied, namely:

- (i) the disputed domain names are identical or confusingly similar to a trademark or service mark in which the Complainant has rights;
- (ii) the Respondents have no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the disputed domain names; and
- (iii) the disputed domain names have been registered and is being used in bad faith.

The onus of proving these elements is on the Complainant.

Each of the disputed domain names must be considered separately.

Consolidation: Multiple Respondents

The amended Complaint was filed in relation to nominally different domain name registrants. The Complainant alleges that the domain name registrants are the same entity or mere alter egos of each other, or under common control. The Complainant requests the consolidation of the Complaint against the multiple disputed domain name registrants pursuant to paragraph 10(e) of the Rules.

The Third Respondent and the Fourth Respondent did not comment on the Complainant's request.

The First Respondent and the Second Respondent are represented by the same legal representative and did not oppose the consolidation in respect of <better-canvas.com> and <better-campus.com> but stated that the disputed domain names <bettercanvas.net> and <better-campus.net> are not under common control with the disputed domain names <better-canvas.com> and <better-campus.com>, and that it would not be fair and equitable to consolidate all four disputed domain names in the same proceeding.

Paragraph 3(c) of the Rules states that a complaint may relate to more than one domain name, provided that the domain names are registered by the same domain name holder.

In addressing the Complainant's request, the Panel will consider whether (i) the disputed domain names or corresponding websites are subject to common control; and (ii) the consolidation would be fair and equitable to all Parties. See WIPO Overview of WIPO Panel Views on Select UDRP Questions ("[WIPO Overview 3.1](#)"), section 4.11.2.

As regards common control, the Panel notes that the four disputed domain names have different registrants, from different locations, with different contact details, involving four different registrars, and registered on different dates. The websites at the disputed domain names promote similar products, but the design, wording, and look-and-feel of these websites differ in material ways. The Panel declines to find that the four disputed domain names are under common control.

It is not disputed that <better-canvas.com> and <better-campus.com> are under common control. The Panel sees no reason why consolidation of the disputes regarding these two disputed domain names would be unfair or inequitable to any party.

Accordingly, the Panel decides to consolidate the disputes regarding the nominally different disputed domain name registrants, being the First Respondent and the Second Respondent (referred to below as "the Respondent") in a single proceeding.

The Panel declines to consolidate the disputes regarding the Third Respondent and the Fourth Respondent in this proceeding. Accordingly, the Panel makes no further findings in respect of <bettercanvas.net> and <better-campus.net>.

Supplemental Submissions

The Complainant filed Supplemental Submissions.

Paragraphs 10 and 12 of the Rules grant the Panel sole discretion to determine the admissibility of unsolicited supplemental filings. While paragraph 10(d) states that: “The Panel shall determine the admissibility, relevance, materiality and weight of the evidence”, paragraph 12 provides that: “In addition to the complaint and the response, the Panel may request, in its sole discretion, further statements or documents from either of the Parties.” As a general matter, unsolicited supplemental filings are generally discouraged, unless specifically requested by the panel.

The Complainant has not shown reasons that convince the Panel that a supplemental submission is warranted or that there are exceptional circumstances in this case. The submissions and the additional evidence provided, if relevant, should have been provided in the Complaint.

The supplemental submission of May 22, 2026, included details of the Complainant’s trademark registration for “BetterCampus” that registered after the filing of the Complaint. The Panel was independently aware of this registration due to a public search of the United States trademarks register conducted by the Panel.

Whether or not the Panel considered the supplemental submission outside of making a determination as to whether or not the submission should procedurally be accepted, the result would not differ because the supplemental submission did not provide new arguments to address the issues discussed below that the Panel decides against the Complainant.

On June 26, 2026, the Complainant filed additional submissions regarding a domain name that was registered on April 25, 2026.

The additional submissions have not been accepted by the Panel. Even if the submissions were considered, the outcome of the Complaint would be the same.

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 3.1](#), section 1.7.

The Complainant owns a U.S. registered trademark for BETTERCAMPUS that was filed on October 8, 2025, and registered on May 12, 2026. This was not registered when the Complainant filed its Complaint, but has been registered shortly thereafter and before the date of this decision. The Complainant has shown rights in respect of a trademark or service mark for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.2.1.

In respect of the disputed domain name <better-campus.com>, the Panel finds the mark BETTERCAMPUS is recognizable within the disputed domain name. Accordingly, the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to the mark for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.7.

In respect of the disputed domain name <better-canvas.com>, the Complainant has no registered trademark rights in BETTERCANVAS. The Panel considers that the term “BetterCanvas” was a term that was, at one time, known to refer to the Complainant’s product. The Complainant rebranded last year to “BetterCampus” and ceased use of “BetterCanvas” as the name of its software product. The exact reason why the Complainant rebranded was not made known to the Panel. (It is open to the Panel to conclude that the Complainant rebranded either because of a possible infringement claim by Instructure Holdings, Inc. or because it realized that it would not be able to develop trademark rights in BETTERCANVAS as discussed further below.)

The term CANVAS in BETTERCANVAS is a reference to the CANVAS trademark owned by Instructure Holdings, Inc., who is not a party in this proceeding and not an affiliate of the Complainant.

The Panel does not accept that the Complainant has demonstrated common law or unregistered trademark rights in BETTERCANVAS for the purposes of the Policy. The Panel doubts that the Complainant could develop or has developed trademark rights simply by adding a laudatory term (better) to the beginning of a well-known third-party trademark (Canvas). A consumer looking for educational software seeing BETTERCANVAS would in the Panel's view likely focus on "canvas" and dismiss "better" as a descriptor of Instructure Holdings, Inc.'s software product.

The Panel finds the first element of the Policy has been established in respect of the disputed domain name <better-campus.com>.

The Panel finds the first element of the Policy has not been established in respect of the disputed domain name <better-canvas.com>.

Below, <better-campus.com> is referred to as the disputed domain name. The Panel makes no further findings in respect of <better-canvas.com>.

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 that 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 3.1](#), 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 Complainant states that it never authorized the Respondent to use BETTERCAMPUS in a domain name or otherwise, and that the Respondent is not commonly known by the name "BetterCampus".

The website at the disputed domain name <better-campus.com> is not currently in active use, and there is no evidence before the Panel to demonstrate bona fide use of it.

The Respondent's submissions and evidence in respect of the second element of the Policy focused on <better-canvas.com> and not <better-campus.com>.

The Panel finds the second element of the Policy has been established.

C. Registered and Used in Bad Faith

Generally speaking, a finding that a domain name has been registered and is being used in bad faith requires an inference to be drawn that the respondent in question has registered and is using the disputed domain name to take advantage of its significance as a trademark owned by (usually) the complainant.

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 3.1](#), section 3.2.1.

The Respondent asserts that it is difficult to conceive of how the Respondent could have known of the Complainant when the Respondent registered the disputed domain name <better-campus.com> on October 3, 2025, because the Complainant did not file for its trademark registration for BETTERCAMPUS until October 8, 2025. However, there is evidence before the Panel that the Complainant rebranded in September 2025. The Respondent does not state that the Respondent was unaware of the Complainant's rebranding when registering the disputed domain name. It is also too coincidental that the Respondent, who appears well aware of the Complainant and its "BetterCanvas" product, would independently register a domain name for the Complainant's new brand within weeks of the Complainant carrying out the rebrand.

The Panel notes that the Respondent's website at <better-canvas.com> includes a disclaimer referring to BetterCampus, although it is uncertain when that disclaimer was added. The Panel considers that the Respondent is a competitor of the Complainant.

The Panel concludes that it is more likely than not that the Respondent was aware of the Complainant and its "BetterCampus" product when registering the disputed domain name <better-campus.com>, and that the Respondent did so with the intent to take advantage of the Complainant's rebranding.

There is no evidence of exactly how the disputed domain name <better-campus.com> was used by the Respondent. The Complainant did not provide screenshots of any websites at the disputed domain name <better-campus.com>. The Respondent states that the Respondent temporarily suspended the website at the disputed domain name following the Complaint as a precautionary measure to prevent potential confusion while this dispute is being resolved.

Based on all the circumstances, the Panel considers that the Respondent registered and used the disputed domain name <better-campus.com> because of the Complainant's "BetterCampus" product and to take advantage of the Complainant's rebranding to "BetterCampus".

On balance, the Panel concludes that the Respondent registered the disputed domain name with the intent to disrupt the Complainant's business and rebranding. This is evidence of bad faith registration and use under paragraph 4(b)(iii) of the Policy.

The Panel finds that the Complainant has established the third element of the Policy in respect of the disputed domain name <better-campus.com>.

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 <better-campus.com> be transferred to the Complainant.

For the foregoing reasons, the Complaint is denied in respect of the disputed domain name <better-canvas.com>.

For the foregoing reasons, namely failure to prove consolidation, the Complaint is denied (without prejudice, but noting the reasoning applied as to <better-canvas.com>) in respect of the disputed domain names, <better-canvas.net> and <bettercanvas.net>.

/John Swinson/
John Swinson
Presiding Panelist

/Tony Willoughby/
Tony Willoughby
Panelist

/David E. Sorkin/
David E. Sorkin
Panelist
Date: June 22, 2026