

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

Canva Pty Ltd v. Host Master, 1337 Services LLC, Daniel Riccardo,
Canva, Roco Vitello, Canva
Case No. D2026-2533

1. The Parties

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

The Respondents are Host Master, 1337 Services LLC, Saint Kitts and Nevis, Daniel Riccardo, Canva, Switzerland, and Roco Vitello, Canva, United States of America ("United States").

2. The Domain Name and Registrars

The disputed domain names <canvalicense.com> and <canvaltd.com> are registered with NameCheap, Inc., and the disputed domain name <mediacanva.com> is registered with Tucows Domains Inc. (the "Registrar").

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the "Center") on June 11, 2026. On June 11, 2026, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrars a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain names. On June 11, 2026, and June 12, 2026, the Registrars transmitted by email to the Center its verification response disclosing registrant and contact information for the disputed domain names which differed from the named Respondents (Privacy service provided by Withheld for Privacy ehf, N/A) and contact information in the Complaint.

The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on June 15, 2026, with the registrant and contact information of nominally multiple underlying registrants revealed by the Registrars, requesting the Complainant to either file separate complaints 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 on June 17, 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 June 22, 2026. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was July 12, 2026. The Respondent owning the disputed domain name <canvalicense.com> sent two email communications to the Complainant and to Center respectively on June 22, 2026, and June 24, 2026.

The Center appointed Edoardo Fano as the sole panelist in this matter on July 17, 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.

The Panel has not received any requests from the Complainant or the Respondents 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, 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 formal Response from the Respondents.

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

4. Factual Background

The Complainant is an Australian company providing an online design platform and owning several trademark registrations for CANVA, including the following:

- United States Trademark Registration No. 4316655 for CANVA, registered on April 9, 2013;
- Australian Trademark Registration No. 1483138 for CANVA, registered on September 9, 2013;
- International Trademark Registration No. 1204604 for CANVA, registered on October 1, 2013;
- European Union Trade Mark Registration No. 017056656 for CANVA, registered on December 15 2017.

The Complainant also operates on the Internet, its official website being "www.canva.com".

The Complainant provided evidence in support of the above.

The disputed domain names were registered on the following dates: <canvalicense.com> on May 13, 2026, <canvaltd.com> on May 2, 2026, and <mediacanva.com> on January 4, 2024, and are currently inactive, although when the Complaint was filed, the disputed domain names <mediacanva.com> and <canvaltd.com>, with the use of email addresses purporting to be Complainant's representatives, were used for fraudulent activities, namely to remove Etsy CANVA-related shop offerings under the guise of IP enforcement, and to carry out phishing activities, <mediacanva.com> also to redirect to the Complainant's official website, until they were both blocked one after the other by Etsy following the Complainant's removal request, while the disputed domain name <canvalicense.com> was used to redirect to a parked webpage displaying pay-per-click (PPC) links, some of which directly competing with the Complainant's trademark, and had activated MX records.

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.

Notably, the Complainant states that the disputed domain names are confusingly similar to its trademark CANVA, as the disputed domain names incorporate the Complainant's trademark in its entirety.

Further to section 6.1 below, the Complainant argues that the disputed domain names are under common control and thus addresses the Respondents in the singular. The Complainant asserts that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the disputed domain names since it has not been authorized by the Complainant to register the disputed domain names or to use its trademark within the disputed domain names, it is not commonly known by the disputed domain names 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 names. The disputed domain names <mediacanva.com> and <canvaltd.com>, with the use of email addresses purporting to be Complainant's representatives, were used for fraudulent activities, namely to remove Etsy CANVA-related shop offerings under the guise of IP enforcement, and to carry out phishing activities, <mediacanva.com> also to redirect to the Complainant's official website, until they were both blocked one after the other by Etsy following the Complainant's removal request, while the disputed domain name <canvalicense.com> was used to redirect to a parked webpage displaying PPC links, some of which directly competing with the Complainant's trademark, and had activated MX records.

The Complainant submits that the Respondent has registered the disputed domain names in bad faith, since the Complainant's trademark CANVA is known as an online design platform. Therefore, the Respondent targeted the Complainant's trademark at the time of registration of the disputed domain names, and the Complainant contends that the fraudulent use of the disputed domain names <mediacanva.com> and <canvaltd.com> as well as the use of the disputed domain name <canvalicense.com> with the purpose to attract, for commercial gain, Internet users by creating a likelihood of confusion with the Complainant's trademark as to an affiliation between the Respondent and the Complainant, qualifies as bad faith registration and use.

B. Respondents

The Respondents have made no formal reply to the Complainant's contentions.

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 – if adequately supported by evidence – 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 Select UDRP Questions (["WIPO Overview 3.1"](#)), section 4.3.

In this case, the Respondent owning the disputed domain name <canvalicense.com> sent the following two email communications to the Complainant and to the Center respectively on June 22, 2026, and June 24, 2026:

"Dear Canva Legal Team, I am writing to you regarding the ongoing UDRP proceeding (Case No. D2026-2533) and the recent notification from WIPO concerning the existence of multiple different registrants. To save you time and avoid unnecessary legal costs associated with amending the complaint or initiating separate proceedings for each domain, I would like to propose an out-of-court resolution. As the owner of these domains, I am prepared to sign the standard WIPO settlement agreement today and transfer all three domains (<canvalicense.com>, <canvaltd.com>, and <mediacanva.com>) to Canva. In exchange for this prompt transfer and my full cooperation, I request

modest compensation to cover my registration, renewal, and administrative costs. I also agree not to attempt to reclaim the domains in any way. If this practical solution is acceptable to you, please let me know, and we can proceed immediately to formalize the standard settlement agreement. Sincerely,” (June 22, 2026);

“Wait, let me decide what to do.” (June 24, 2026).

6. Discussion and Findings

6.1 Consolidation of Multiple Respondents

The Complainant has requested consolidation of multiple respondents and stated that the disputed domain names belong to the same person or organization. No objection to this request was made by the Respondents.

Pursuant to the [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 4.11.2, “[w]here a complaint is filed against multiple respondents, panels look at whether (i) the domain names or corresponding websites are subject to common control, and (ii) the consolidation would be fair and equitable to all parties. Procedural efficiency would also underpin panel consideration of such a consolidation scenario”. The Panel may consider a range of factors to determine whether consolidation is appropriate, such as examining relevant registrant contact information, and any naming patterns in the disputed domain names, or other evidence of respondent affiliation that indicate common control of the disputed domain names.

The Panel notes the following factors:

- the registration data for <canvaltd.com> and <canvalicense.com> both list the registrant organization as “Canva” (i.e. the Complainant);
- the disputed domain name <canvaltd.com> registration data uses the fictional street address associated with the television cartoon series The Simpsons and it identifies the registrant’s city as New York while using Switzerland as the registrant’s country;
- the disputed domain name <canvalicense.com> has copied the address of one of the offices of the Complainant;
- the disputed domain name <mediacanva.com> uses the details of hosting provider 1337 Services LLC to mask the true underlying identity of the registrant;
- the disputed domain name <mediacanva.com> was used to send fraudulent Etsy delisting requests under the guise of the Complainant’s IP enforcement team, and once Etsy were made aware of this fraudulent activity and ceased accepting such delisting requests from the disputed domain name <mediacanva.com>, one day later, the disputed domain name <canvaltd.com> was registered, and used to send fraudulent delisting requests to Etsy in the same manner as the disputed domain name <mediacanva.com>, while one week later, the disputed domain name <canvalicense.com> was registered, using similar registrant data as the disputed domain name <canvaltd.com>;
- all three disputed domain names have used the same MX servers, and they all follow the same naming pattern, namely containing the Complainant’s CANVA trademark in addition to a term (i.e. “It’d”, “media”, “license”);
- in its first email communication to the Center on June 22, 2026, the Respondent owning the disputed domain name <canvalicense.com> states to be the owner of all three disputed domain names.

The Panel finds that there is evidence that the disputed domain names are subject to common control, and that it would be procedurally efficient, fair, and equitable to all Parties to accept the Complainant's consolidation request. The Panel further notes that the Respondents did not object to the consolidation request. The Panel therefore accepts the Complainant's consolidation request. Hereinafter, the Panel will refer to the Respondents in the singular, i.e., "the Respondent".

6.2 Substantive Issues

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

- (i) the disputed domain names are 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 names; and
- (iii) the disputed domain names have been registered and are 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 names.

[WIPO Overview 3.1](#), 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 3.1](#), section 1.2.1.

The Panel finds the mark CANVA is recognizable within the disputed domain names. Accordingly, the disputed domain names are confusingly similar to the marks for the purposes of the Policy.

[WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.7.

While the addition of other terms, here "ltd" (shorthand for 'limited', a common company identifier), "license" and "media", may bear on assessment of the second and third elements, the Panel finds the addition of such terms does not prevent a finding of confusing similarity between the disputed domain names and the Complainant's trademark for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.8.

It is also well accepted that a generic Top-Level Domain ("gTLD"), in this case ".com", is typically ignored when assessing the similarity between a trademark and a domain name. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.11.1.

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, UDRP 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 names. 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 present record, the Panel finds the Complainant has established a prima facie case that the Respondent lacks rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain names. 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 names such as those enumerated in the Policy or otherwise.

The disputed domain names <mediacanva.com> and <canvaltd.com>, with the use of email addresses purporting to be Complainant's representatives, were used for fraudulent activities, namely to remove Etsy CANVA-related shop offerings under the guise of IP enforcement, and to carry out phishing activities, <mediacanva.com> also to redirect to the Complainant's official website, until they were both blocked one after the other by Etsy following the Complainant's removal request, while the disputed domain name <canvalicense.com> was used to redirect to a parked webpage displaying PPC links, some of which directly competing with the Complainant's trademark, and had activated MX records.

As regards the disputed domain names <mediacanva.com> and <canvaltd.com>, panels have held that the use of a domain name for illegal activity, here passing off, and phishing, can never confer rights or legitimate interests on a respondent. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 2.13.1.

The Panel therefore concludes that the disputed domain names are not being used in connection with a bona fide offering of goods or 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.

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.

In the present case, regarding the registration in bad faith of the disputed domain names, the reputation of the Complainant's trademark CANVA as an online design platform is clearly established and the Panel finds that the Respondent more likely than not knew of the Complainant and deliberately registered the disputed domain names due to the likelihood of confusion with the Complainant's trademark, especially because the disputed domain names <mediacanva.com> and <canvaltd.com>, with the use of email addresses purporting to be Complainant's representatives, were used for fraudulent activities, namely to remove Etsy CANVA-related shop offerings under the guise of IP enforcement, and to carry out phishing activities, the disputed domain name <mediacanva.com> also to redirect to the Complainant's official website, until they were both blocked one after the other by Etsy following the Complainant's removal request, while the disputed domain name <canvalicense.com> was used to redirect to a parked webpage displaying PPC links, some of which directly competing with the Complainant's trademark, and had activated MX records.

As regards the disputed domain names <mediacanva.com> and <canvaltd.com>, panels have held that the use of a domain name for illegal activity, here passing off, and phishing, constitutes bad faith. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 3.4.

As far as the use in bad faith of the disputed domain name <canvalicense.com>, used to host PPC links, some of which directly competing with the Complainant's trademark, the Panel notes that the Respondent was trying to attract Internet users to its website by creating likelihood of confusion with the Complainant's trademark as to the website's source, sponsorship, affiliation or endorsement, an activity clearly detrimental to the Complainant's business.

The above suggests to the Panel that the Respondent intentionally registered and was using the disputed domain names in order both to disrupt the Complainant's business, in accordance with paragraph 4(b)(iii) of the Policy, and to attract, for commercial gain, Internet users to its website in accordance with paragraph 4(b)(iv) of the Policy.

Furthermore, the Panel considers that the nature of the disputed domain names, which incorporates the Complainant's trademark in its entirety with the mere addition of the terms "ltd" (shorthand for 'limited', a common company identifier), "license" and "media", further supports a finding of bad faith. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 3.2.1.

Having reviewed the record, the Panel finds the Respondent's registration and use of the disputed domain names 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 names <canvalicense.com>, <canvaltd.com>, and <mediacanva.com> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Edoardo Fano/

Edoardo Fano

Sole Panelist

Date: July 28, 2026