



CANADIAN INTERNATIONAL INTERNET DISPUTE RESOLUTION CENTRE

DOMAIN NAME DISPUTE

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL

DECISION

CIIDRC case number:	27703-UDRP	September 4, 2026
Disputed Domain Name:	appnovation.dev	
Registrar:	Spaceship, Inc.	
Panel:	Adam Samuel	
Complainant:	Appnovation Technologies Inc.	
Respondent:	Appnovation LLC	

1. PROCEDURAL HISTORY

On July 23, 2026, the Complainant filed a Complaint pursuant to the UDRP and the UDRP Rules via online platform. The required fee was paid on July 24, 2026. On July 27, 2026, CIIDRC transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name, and on July 28, 2026, the Registrar responded advising of the identity of the Respondent and providing the above contact details. In addition, the Registrar confirmed that the disputed domain name was placed in a Registrar LOCK. 3. On July 29, 2026, CIIDRC confirmed compliance of the Complaint and commencement of the dispute resolution process.

On July 29, 2026, pursuant to UDRP Rule 4 and Supplemental Rule 5, CIIDRC notified the Respondent of this administrative proceeding and forwarded a Notice of Complaint to the Respondent. In accordance with the UDRP Rules, the deadline for the submission of a Response was August 18, 2026. As of the date of this Decision, the Registrant has not submitted a Response. The Complainant in this administrative proceeding elected for a Panel consisting of a single member. The required Panel fee deposit was received on August 28, 2026. In accordance with Rule 5 (d), CIIDRC appointed Adam Samuel, as a single-member Panel in the above-referenced matter. Adam Samuel completed and returned to CIIDRC the statement of acceptance and declaration of impartiality and independence.

The Domain Name was registered on June 14, 2025.

This matter has been conducted pursuant to the Uniform Domain Name Dispute Resolution Policy (the Policy) and the Rules for Uniform Domain Name Dispute Resolution Policy (the Rules) of the Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers (ICANN).

2. FACTS ALLEGED BY THE PARTIES

The Complainant is a global digital consultancy headquartered in Vancouver, British Columbia, Canada, providing digital strategy, engineering, and experience design services. Founded in 2007, the Complainant operates internationally across North America, Europe, and the Asia-Pacific region, including in the United States through its wholly owned subsidiary, Appnovation USA, Inc.. The Complainant owns a number of trademark registrations for APPNOVATION Trademark in multiple jurisdictions, including Canada Trademark Registration No. TMA862886 registered Oct. 18, 2013 and U.S. Trademark Registration No. 4,558,328 registered July 1, 2014. The Complainant also owns the domain name <appnovation.com> through which it promotes its services.

The Respondent was formed on May 23, 2025, with a principal office located in Missouri, USA.

3. CONTENTIONS OF THE PARTIES

- **Complainant**

The Complainant submits that the disputed domain name consists entirely of the Complainant's distinctive APPNOVATION Trademark, with the addition only of the generic top-level domain ("gTLD") ".dev,". It is a well-established principle that gTLDs may be excluded from consideration as being merely functional components of a domain name.

The Respondent is not affiliated with, authorized by, or otherwise connected to the Complainant in any way. Nor has the Complainant licensed or permitted the Respondent to use its registered APPNOVATION Trademark or to register any domain name incorporating the APPNOVATION Trademark.

While the Respondent has adopted the name "Appnovation LLC," the evidence shows that this entity was formed on May 23, 2025, only shortly before the registration of the Disputed Domain Name on June 14, 2025, and after the Complainant had already established longstanding trademark rights in the APPNOVATION Trademark. The adoption of a corporate name identical to the Complainant's APPNOVATION trademark does not give rise to a legitimate interest where it is clearly intended to capitalize on the Complainant's goodwill.

The Respondent's use of the Disputed Domain Name is not a bona fide offering of goods or services. Rather, the Respondent has used the Disputed Domain Name in a manner that falsely suggests an association with the Complainant. In particular, the Respondent has used the Disputed Domain Name to:

- impersonate the Complainant by using a domain name identical to the Complainant's registered APPNOVATION Trademark;
- falsely suggest an affiliation with the Complainant by identifying itself as "Appnovation LLC"; and
- operate a website that closely imitates the Complainant's Website.

Such conduct is inherently misleading and cannot constitute a legitimate or fair use of the disputed domain name.

Given the distinctiveness of the APPNOVATION Trademark and the Respondent's use of the APPNOVATION Trademark in its entirety, it is inconceivable that the Respondent registered the Disputed Domain Name without knowledge of the Complainant and its rights. The Respondent formed an entity named "Appnovation LLC" on May 23, 2025, and registered the Disputed Domain Name shortly thereafter on June 14, 2025, long after the Complainant had established its trademark rights. This sequence of events demonstrates deliberate targeting of the Complainant and its APPNOVATION Trademark.

The Respondent continues to operate a website that closely imitates the Complainant's website in appearance and design. A side-by-side comparison of the respective landing pages reveals that the Respondent's Website closely mirrors the overall look and feel of the Complainant's Website. The Respondent's Website duplicates the Complainant's trade dress and messaging, by utilizing a dark background across the landing page, displaying the Complainant's "APPNOVATION" Trademark in the same top-left corner of the landing page, and adopting the same marketing tone, structure, and positioning strategy as the Complainant. In particular, the Respondent's landing page adopts design elements and messaging that are substantially similar to those used by the Complainant, creating a misleading impression that the Respondent's Website is affiliated with, endorsed by, or otherwise connected to the Complainant. These similarities are unlikely to be coincidental and instead support a finding of intentional imitation and bad faith.

The Respondent has further sought to conceal its identity through the use of a privacy service, which in the circumstances supports an inference of bad faith. This conduct is likely to confuse and divert Internet users seeking the Complainant, including potential clients, partners, and vendors. The Respondent's actions therefore disrupt the Complainant's business and trade on its reputation for the Respondent's own benefit,

Respondent

The Respondent has not filed a Response.

- **Remedy Sought**

The Complainant requests the Domain Name be transferred to it.

DISCUSSION AND FINDINGS

3.1 Requirements

In accordance with Paragraph 4 of the Policy, the onus is on the Complainant to prove that:

1. the Domain Name is Identical or Confusingly Similar to a trademark or service mark in which the Complainant has rights;
2. the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the Domain Name; and
3. the Domain Name has been registered and is being used in bad faith.

The Panel will consider each of these requirements in turn.

3.2 Analysis

3.2.1 The Domain Name is Identical or Confusingly Similar to a Mark in which the Complainant has Rights

The disputed domain name consists of the Complainant's distinctive trademark and the gTLD ".dev". Since all domain names need to have a gTLD, the addition of ".dev" is irrelevant here. The disputed domain name is at least confusingly similar to the Complainant's trademark.

3.2.2 Rights or Legitimate Interests in respect of the Domain Name

The Respondent created a company and registered the disputed domain name in the same month. The landing page of the website to which the disputed domain name resolved has a similar color scheme as the Complainant's website and used the Complainant's distinctive trademark. There is no evidence that the Complainant is or has in anyway been connected to the Respondent or has authorized the Respondent to use the Complainant's trademarks generally or in the creation of the disputed domain name. The Respondent's entire business seems to be geared towards using the Complainant's trademark without permission and confusing Internet users into thinking that its website is that of the Complainant. The Respondent does not have rights or legitimate interests in respect of the disputed domain name.

3.2.2. Registration and Use of the Domain Name in Bad Faith

Registering a company and domain name with the express purpose of impersonating another business and using its trademark in the process constitutes registration and use of the disputed domain name in bad faith.

Without a response, it is impossible to know exactly why the Respondent registered the disputed domain name. It could have done so for any number of reasons listed in Paragraph 4(b)(i) (iii) and (iv) of the Policy: selling the domain name to the Complainant for valuable consideration, disrupting the Complainant's business or more likely to attract for commercial gain Internet users to the Respondent's website by "creating a likelihood of confusion with the complainant's mark as to the source, sponsorship, affiliation, or endorsement of [the] web site or location or of a product or service".

For all these reasons, the Panel concludes that the Respondent registered and has used the disputed domain name in bad faith.

4. DECISION and ORDER

For the above reasons, in accordance with Paragraph 4 of the Policy, Paragraph 15 of the Rules, and Rule 10 of the Supplemental Rules, the Panel orders that <appnovation.dev> be transferred to the Complainant.

Made as of September 4, 2026

XXXXXXXXXXXX
XXXXXXXXXXXX
XXXXXXXXXXXX
XXXXXXXXXXXX

SIGNATURE OF PANEL

