

## **ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION**

Carvana, LLC v. Rajesh Parekh, Carvanacanada  
Case No. D2026-1804

### **1. The Parties**

The Complainant is Carvana, LLC, United States of America (the “United States”), internally represented.

The Respondent is Rajesh Parekh, Carvanacanada, Canada.

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

The disputed domain name <carvanacanada.com> is registered with GoDaddy.com, LLC (the “Registrar”).

### **3. Procedural History**

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the “Center”) on April 27, 2026. On April 28, 2026, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On April 29, 2026, 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 (Unknown / Registration Private, Domains By Proxy, LLC) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on April 29, 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 May 1, 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 May 13, 2026. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was June 2, 2026. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent’s default on June 3, 2026.

The Center appointed Gustavo Patricio Giay as the sole panelist in this matter on June 11, 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 limited liability company incorporated in Arizona, United States. The Complainant operates an e-commerce platform for the purchase and sale of used automobiles, offering online vehicle dealership and financing services throughout the United States under the CARVANA mark. The Complainant conducts its core business operations through its primary website at <carvana.com>. According to the evidence on record, the Complainant is a Fortune 500 company and has expended substantial resources in promoting and building consumer recognition of its CARVANA brand.

The Complainant is the owner of several trademark registrations incorporating the CARVANA mark in the United States. For the purposes of these proceedings, the Panel notes in particular the following registrations: CARVANA, (i) Reg. No. 4328785, registered on April 30, 2013, for classes 35 and 36; (ii) Reg. No. 5022315, registered on August 16, 2016, for class 39; (iii) Reg. No. 6037292, registered on April 21, 2020, for classes 35, 36 and 39; and CARVANACARE, Reg. No. 4971997, registered on June 7, 2016, for class 36.

All of the above registrations substantially predate the registration of the disputed domain name.

The disputed domain name <carvanacanada.com> was registered on January 30, 2026, with the Registrar. At the time of filing of the Complaint and as of the date of this Decision, the disputed domain name resolves to a website, built using the Registrar's website builder, which displays the heading "Launching Soon" and includes a contact form soliciting the name and email address of visitors. The website bears no disclaimer clarifying that it is unaffiliated with the Complainant.

The Respondent is identified as Rajesh Parkeh, associated with the organization name "Carvanacanada", reportedly located in Canada. The record does not indicate any relationship between the Complainant and the Respondent. The Respondent did not submit a Response.

#### **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 CARVANA trademark, in which it claims rights based on multiple United States registrations dating back to at least 2013. The Complainant asserts that the disputed domain name incorporates the CARVANA mark in its entirety, and that the addition of the term "canada" does not distinguish the disputed domain name from the Complainant's mark but rather reinforces the association with it.

The Complainant further contends that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name, having never been authorized to use the CARVANA mark, not being commonly known by the disputed domain name, and having no plausible basis for its adoption given that CARVANA is an invented term with no independent meaning.

The Complainant additionally contends that the disputed domain name was registered and is being used in bad faith, submitting that the Respondent registered the disputed domain name with knowledge of the Complainant's well-known mark, and that the passive holding of the disputed domain name without any legitimate use further evidences bad faith.

The Complainant requests that the Panel order the transfer of the disputed domain name to the Complainant.

## **B. Respondent**

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

## **6. Discussion and Findings**

According to paragraph 4(a) of the Policy, for this Complaint to succeed in relation to the disputed domain name, the Complainant must prove each of the following, namely that:

- i. the disputed domain name is identical or confusingly similar to a trademark or service mark in which the Complainant has rights; and
- ii. the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the disputed domain name; and
- iii. the disputed domain name was 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 of WIPO Panel Views on Select UDRP Questions ("[WIPO Overview 3.1](#)"), section 1.7.

The Complainant has shown rights in respect of a trademark or service mark for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.2.1.

The record shows that the Complainant is the owner of trademark registrations for the CARVANA mark in the United States, as set out in the Factual Background above.

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 3.1](#), section 1.7.

Disregarding the generic Top-Level Domain ("gTLD") ".com", the disputed domain name differs from the Complainant's CARVANA mark solely by the addition of the term "canada".

Although the addition of the term "canada" 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 3.1](#), section 1.8.

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 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 asserts that it has not authorized, licensed, or otherwise permitted the Respondent to use the CARVANA mark or to register any domain name incorporating it, and that no relationship exists between the Parties. There is no evidence in the record suggesting that the Respondent has been commonly known by the disputed domain name or that the Respondent holds any trademark or other rights corresponding to it. The Registrar-disclosed information identifies the registrant as “Rajesh Parekh”, operating under the organization name “Carvanacanada”, a name that directly mirrors the disputed domain name and the Complainant’s mark, and which itself suggests an attempt to create a false impression of affiliation with the Complainant. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 2.3.

The record further shows that the disputed domain name currently resolves to a website displaying a “Launching Soon” notice and a contact form soliciting the name and email address of visitors. The website bears no disclaimer clarifying its lack of affiliation with the Complainant. The use of a domain name that incorporates the Complainant’s mark in its entirety, in connection with a website that collects personal data from Internet users without disclosing its true identity, does not constitute a bona fide offering of goods or services within the meaning of paragraph 4(c)(i) of the Policy, nor a legitimate noncommercial or fair use under paragraph 4(c)(iii). [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 2.2. The Panel further notes that the CARVANA mark is a coined term with no recognized meaning in the English language independent of the Complainant’s brand, and the composition of the disputed domain name combining that trademark with a geographic term “canada” could falsely suggest to Internet users the mistaken belief that they may find a Canada-based operator of the Complainant’s services.

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, the record shows that the Complainant’s CARVANA trademark has been registered in the United States since April 30, 2013, and that the Complainant has continuously used the CARVANA mark in connection with its e-commerce platform for the purchase and sale of used automobiles since that date. The Complainant’s trademark rights therefore substantially predate the registration of the disputed domain name on January 30, 2026, by a period of more than a decade. Given the long-standing and extensive use of the CARVANA mark, its recognition as a coined term, and its well-established reputation in connection with the Complainant’s online automotive services, the Panel considers it unlikely that the Respondent was unaware of the Complainant and its trademark at the time of registration of the disputed domain name. This conclusion is further supported by the fact that the Respondent registered the disputed domain name under

the organization name “Carvanacanada”, which directly references the Complainant, leaving no plausible inference other than that the Respondent had the Complainant specifically in mind at the time of registration.

As of the date of the Complaint and this Decision, the disputed domain name resolves to a website displaying a “Launching Soon” notice and a contact form soliciting the name and email address of visitors. The website bears no disclaimer clarifying its lack of affiliation with the Complainant. By registering a domain name incorporating the Complainant’s well-known mark in its entirety, in connection with a website that collects personal data from Internet users who may reasonably believe they are interacting with the Complainant or an authorized affiliate, it is more likely than not that the Respondent intended to ride on the reputation of the Complainant’s mark.

Panels have found that the non-use of a domain name, including a blank or “coming soon” page, would not by itself prevent a finding of bad faith under the doctrine of passive holding. To the contrary, in looking at the totality of circumstances in each case, panels have found that the registration and non-use of a domain name can still constitute bad faith for purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 3.3. Having reviewed the available record, the Panel notes the distinctiveness and well-known character of the Complainant’s CARVANA trademark, the Respondent’s adoption of that mark in its entirety together with a geographic term that could suggest an extension of the Complainant’s business into Canada, the Respondent’s use of the Complainant’s mark and company name as its registrant organization name, the absence of any Response or credible explanation for the registration of the disputed domain name, and the presence of a contact form designed to collect personal data from Internet users, and finds that in the circumstances of this case the passive holding of the disputed domain name does not prevent a finding of bad faith under the Policy.

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 <carvanacanada.com> be transferred to the Complainant.

*/Gustavo Patricio Giay/*

**Gustavo Patricio Giay**

Sole Panelist

Date: June 25, 2026