

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

Openlane, Inc. v. harpreet Gill
Case No. D2026-2885

1. The Parties

The Complainant is Openlane, Inc., United States of America ("United States"), represented by CSC Digital Brand Services Group AB, Sweden.

The Respondent is harpreet Gill, Canada.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <openlaneautotransport.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 July 1, 2026. On July 2, 2026, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On July 6, 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 (Registration Private, Domains By Proxy, LLC, DomainsByProxy.com) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on July 7, 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 July 9, 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 July 15, 2026. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was August 4, 2026. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent's default on August 5, 2026.

The Center appointed Iris Quadrio as the sole panelist in this matter on August 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, Openlane, Inc., is a corporation organized under the laws of Delaware, United States, and headquartered in Carmel, Indiana, United States. The Complainant provides digital automotive marketplaces and technology platforms through which original equipment manufacturers, dealers, fleet operators, rental companies, and financial institutions buy and sell used vehicles. It also provides solutions relating to vehicle transportation, delivery, recovery, and tracking.

The Complainant operates under the OPENLANE brand in North America and Europe and maintains an online presence through, inter alia, the domain names <openlane.com> and <openlane.eu>. The latter was registered on March 16, 2016. Through its websites, the Complainant offers online marketplaces for used vehicles and related services, including transportation and delivery solutions.

The Complainant is the owner of trademark registrations for OPENLANE in several jurisdictions. For the purposes of this proceeding, the Panel notes in particular the following registrations: (i) Canada: Reg. No. TMA757102, registered on January 15, 2010, for classes 35, 36, 37, 39, and 42; (ii) United States: Reg. No. 4268846, registered on January 1, 2013, for class 35; (iii) United Kingdom: Reg. No. UK00003906284, registered on July 21, 2023, for classes 35 and 39; and (iv) European Union: Reg. No. 018868545, registered on September 12, 2023, for classes 35 and 39. These registrations cover, inter alia, online automotive marketplaces, supply chain management services facilitating the locating, selling, recovering, transporting, and tracking of vehicles, and vehicle transportation services. All of these registrations predate the registration of the disputed domain name.

The disputed domain name <openlaneautotransport.com> was registered on November 11, 2025. At the time of the filing of the Complaint, the publicly available registration information identified a privacy service as the registrant. Following the Registrar's verification, the underlying registrant was disclosed as Harpreet Gill, located in Calgary, Alberta, Canada. The Complainant filed an amended Complaint on July 9, 2026, reflecting the Registrar-disclosed registrant information.

According to the evidence submitted with the Complaint, the disputed domain name resolved to an active commercial website operating under the name "Open Lane Auto Transport" and offering vehicle shipping and auto transportation services across Canada. The website invited Internet users to request quotations, provided information about terminal-to-terminal and door-to-door transportation, and displayed a toll-free telephone number and the email address [...]@openlaneautotransport.com.

At the time of this Decision, the disputed domain name continues to resolve to an active website offering vehicle transport services across Canada under the name "Open Lane Auto Transport". The website includes pages identified as "SERVICE OPTIONS", "FREE ESTIMATES", "TRACKING", and "TERMS & CONDITIONS", and provides a quotation form, telephone number, and email address through which prospective customers may contact the operator. The website does not expressly identify the Complainant, state that it is operated by or affiliated with the Complainant, or disclose the nature of any relationship between the Respondent and the Complainant.

The record does not indicate any relationship between the Parties or that the Complainant has authorized the Respondent to use the OPENLANE mark or to register any domain name incorporating it.

The evidence submitted with the Complaint also indicates that the Respondent registered the domain name <openlaneautotransport.ca>, which redirected Internet users to the disputed domain name. The Complainant further submits that the Respondent registered <adesautotransport.ca>, which was the subject

of a separate proceeding under the Canadian Internet Registration Authority Domain Name Dispute Resolution Policy.

On March 18, 2026, the Complainant's representative sent a cease-and-desist notice concerning the disputed domain name and <openlaneautotransport.ca> through the registrant contact mechanisms provided by the respective registries or registrars. The notice requested that the recipient cease trading under the OPENLANE name and transfer the domain names to the Complainant. It also requested a response within ten days.

The Complainant's representative subsequently sent further notices through the available domain-holder contact mechanisms, including a second notice on April 3, 2026, and a third and final notice dated April 10, 2026. The record does not indicate that the Respondent replied to those communications.

The Respondent did not submit a Response in this proceeding and was notified of its default on August 5, 2026.

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 OPENLANE trademark, as it reproduces the mark in its entirety together with the terms "auto" and "transport". According to the Complainant, those terms directly relate to the automotive transportation services offered by the company and covered by its trademark registrations. The Complainant further claims that the generic Top-Level Domain ("gTLD") ".com" should be disregarded for comparison purposes.

The Complainant further contends that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the disputed domain name. The Respondent is neither affiliated with nor authorized by the Complainant, is not commonly known by the disputed domain name, and holds no trademark or other relevant rights in the terms comprising the disputed domain name. According to the Complainant, the Respondent's use of the disputed domain name in connection with a commercial website offering vehicle transportation services under the name "Open Lane Auto Transport" does not constitute a bona fide offering of goods or services or a legitimate noncommercial or fair use. In particular, the website fails to disclose the absence of any relationship between the Respondent and the Complainant and instead creates a misleading impression of affiliation with, or endorsement by, the Complainant.

Moreover, the Complainant contends that the disputed domain name was registered and is being used in bad faith. The Complainant sustains that its OPENLANE trademark registrations substantially predate the registration of the disputed domain name and that the Respondent was aware of and targeted the Complainant and its mark. In particular, the disputed domain name combines the OPENLANE mark with terms describing services covered by the Complainant's trademark registrations, and the associated website offers vehicle transportation services in Canada, where the Complainant owns a longstanding trademark registration for OPENLANE.

According to the Complainant, the Respondent has intentionally used the disputed domain name to attract Internet users for commercial gain by creating a likelihood of confusion as to the source, sponsorship, affiliation, or endorsement of the website and the services offered therein.

The Complainant further highlights the Respondent's registration of the domain name <openlaneautotransport.ca>, which redirects to the disputed domain name, and the alleged registration of <adesaaautotransport.ca>, involving another automotive brand associated with the Complainant, as evidence of a pattern of conduct. The Complainant also relies on the Respondent's failure to reply to the cease-and-desist notices sent through the available domain-holder contact mechanisms.

The Complainant requests that the disputed domain name be transferred 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 OPENLANE mark in several jurisdictions, including Canada, where the Respondent is located, as set out in the Factual Background above. These registrations predate the registration of the disputed domain name.

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 gTLD ".com", the disputed domain name consists of the Complainant's OPENLANE mark in its entirety together with the terms "auto" and "transport".

Although the addition of the terms "auto" and "transport" 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 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 OPENLANE mark or to register any domain name incorporating it, and that no relationship exists between the Parties. There is no evidence in the record that the Respondent owns any trademark or other rights corresponding to the disputed domain name. The Registrar-disclosed information identifies the Respondent as Harpreet Gill, a name that does not correspond to the disputed domain name.

The Panel notes that the disputed domain name resolves to an active commercial website operating under the name “Open Lane Auto Transport” and offering vehicle shipping and transportation services across Canada. The website invites Internet users to request quotations and provides a telephone number, an email address, and information concerning transportation and tracking services.

The Panel finds that such use does not constitute a bona fide offering of goods or services within the meaning of paragraph 4(c)(i) of the Policy. The disputed domain name reproduces the Complainant’s OPENLANE mark in its entirety together with the terms “auto” and “transport”, which directly relate to services covered by the Complainant’s trademark registrations. The associated website uses the corresponding name “Open Lane Auto Transport” to offer those same types of services. It does not identify the Complainant or disclose that the Respondent is independent of and unaffiliated with the Complainant. In these circumstances, the disputed domain name and the associated website are apt to create the misleading impression that the Respondent’s services are operated by, affiliated with, or authorized by the Complainant.

The Panel further notes that the composition of the disputed domain name carries a risk of implied affiliation with the Complainant. A domain name consisting of the Complainant’s mark together with terms describing services covered by that mark is inherently apt to suggest sponsorship or endorsement by the trademark owner. Such use does not support a finding of fair use. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 2.5.1.

Furthermore, the website is commercial in nature, and there is no evidence that the Respondent is making a legitimate noncommercial or fair use of the disputed domain name within the meaning of paragraph 4(c)(iii) of the Policy.

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.

The Complainant's trademark registrations for the OPENLANE mark substantially predate the registration of the disputed domain name. The Panel finds that the Respondent was aware of the Complainant and its OPENLANE mark when registering the disputed domain name.

In particular, the Complainant has owned a Canadian trademark registration for OPENLANE since January 15, 2010, covering, among other things, vehicle transportation and tracking services. The Respondent, who is located in Canada, registered the disputed domain name incorporating the OPENLANE mark in its entirety with the descriptive terms "auto" and "transport" and used it to offer similar services. These circumstances support a finding that the Respondent targeted the Complainant and its mark when registering the disputed domain name.

The Respondent's use of the disputed domain name further demonstrates that it was registered and is being used in bad faith. The associated website operates under the name "Open Lane Auto Transport" and offers vehicle shipping and auto transportation services across Canada. It invites Internet users to request quotations and provides service information and commercial contact details. The website does not identify the Complainant or disclose that the Respondent is independent of and unaffiliated with the Complainant.

The Panel finds that the disputed domain name and the associated website are apt to create the impression that the Respondent's vehicle transportation services are operated by, affiliated with, sponsored by, or endorsed by the Complainant. The Respondent's commercial use of a domain name combining the Complainant's mark with terms that directly describe services covered by that mark supports the inference that the Respondent intended to take advantage of the association with the Complainant and its OPENLANE mark.

Accordingly, the Panel finds that the Respondent has intentionally attempted to attract, for commercial gain, Internet users to the associated website by creating a likelihood of confusion with the Complainant's OPENLANE mark as to the source, sponsorship, affiliation, or endorsement of the website and the services offered therein, within the meaning of paragraph 4(b)(iv) of the Policy.

The Panel further notes that the evidence submitted with the Complaint indicates that the Respondent registered the domain name <openlaneautotransport.ca>, which redirected Internet users to the disputed domain name. The record also indicates that the Respondent registered <adesautotransport.ca>, incorporating the ADESA mark associated with the Complainant's automotive business, and that the latter domain name was transferred following a proceeding under the Canadian Internet Registration Authority Domain Name Dispute Resolution Policy. Taken together, these circumstances support a finding that the Respondent has engaged in a pattern of registering domain names incorporating trademarks associated with the Complainant for use in connection with vehicle transportation services, within the meaning of paragraph 4(b)(ii) of the Policy.

The Panel further notes that the Respondent continued to use the disputed domain name after receiving cease-and-desist notices from the Complainant's representative dated March 18, April 3, and April 10, 2026. The record contains no evidence that the Respondent replied to those notices or otherwise sought to explain its registration and use of the disputed domain name. While the Respondent's failure to respond is not, by itself, conclusive of bad faith, it provides further support for the Panel's finding in light of the circumstances of the case.

The Respondent has not submitted a Response in this proceeding. Although the Respondent's default does not by itself establish bad faith, the absence of any explanation leaves unrebutted the evidence indicating that the Respondent specifically targeted the Complainant and its OPENLANE mark.

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 <openlaneautotransport.com> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Iris Quadrio/

Iris Quadrio

Sole Panelist

Date: August 25, 2026