



CANADIAN INTERNATIONAL INTERNET DISPUTE RESOLUTION CENTRE
DOMAIN NAME DISPUTE
ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL
DECISION

CIIDRC case number:	25717-CDRP	Decision date: November 12, 2025
Domain Name:	framar.ca	
Panel:	Hon. Neil Brown, KC	
Complainant:	Framar International Inc.	
Registrant:	Frank Vanelli Organization: Framar Investments Inc.	

1. OVERVIEW

This matter concerns a registered domain name (the “domain name”).

This matter is a proceeding under the Canadian Dispute Resolution Policy (“CDRP”) and the Canadian Dispute Resolution Rules (“Rules”) of the Canadian Internet Registry Authority (“CIRA”). The Canadian International Internet Dispute Resolution Centre (“CIIDRC”) is a recognized service provider to the CIRA Domain Name Dispute Resolution Policy (the “Policy”) of the Canadian Internet Registration Authority (“CIRA”).

2. PROCEDURAL HISTORY

The procedural history of this case was set out in a letter from CIIDRC to the Panel dated November 10, 2025.

1. On September 25, 2025, the Complainant filed a Complaint pursuant to the CDRP and the Resolution Rules. The required commencement fee was paid on September 26, 2025. The Complaint was filed via the online platform.
2. On September 30, 2025, CIRA was notified of this proceeding, and on October 8, 2025, CIRA transmitted by email to CIIDRC its verification response informing that the registrant of the Disputed Domain Name is Frank Vanelli (the “Registrant”), Organization Framar Investments Inc. CIRA also confirmed that the disputed

domain name was placed on a Registrar LOCK and that the Disputed Domain Name has a Registration Date of April 27, 2018 (the “Registration Date”).

3. Pursuant to Resolution Rule 4.4, CIIDRC notified the Registrant of this administrative proceeding and forwarded a Notice of Complaint along with the Complaint to the Registrant on October 9, 2025.
4. The Respondent, as the Registrant of the domain name, failed to file a Response to date.
5. As permitted, given the absence of a Response, the Complainant has elected under Rule 6.5 to convert from a panel of three to a single-member Panel.
6. The Complainant deposited the required Panel fee on November 6, 2025.
7. On November 10, 2025, CIIDRC appointed The Honorable Neil Anthony Brown KC as a single-member Panel in this proceeding. The Panel accordingly confirmed acceptance of its appointment and submitted to CIIDRC the statement of impartiality and independence as required under Paragraph 7 of the Rules. The Panel determines that it has been properly appointed and constituted as the single-member Panel to decide the Complaint in accordance with the Policy and the Rules.
8. Absent exceptional circumstances, and pursuant to Resolution Rule 12.2, the decision is due by December 1, 2025.
9. The disputed domain name was registered on April 27, 2018.

3. FACTS

The relevant facts are included in the contentions of the parties below.

4. CONTENTIONS OF THE PARTIES

The Complainant makes the following contentions:

1. The Complainant is a Canadian company engaged in the provision of professional hair tools, accessories and related goods and services and has been so engaged since 1986. It has developed a prestigious reputation and its goods and services are provided in over 70 countries. In particular, it has become established and recognized as an industry innovator with numerous trademarks, including the trademark for FRAMAR, and patents to protect its unique products and brand identity which are closely tied to the FRAMAR name. It will be shown that the Complainant has used the FRAMAR trademark continuously for nearly 40 years to offer its goods and services.
2. The Complainant satisfies the Canadian Presence Requirements of the Policy as it is the owner of the registered Canadian trademark for FRAMAR, registration number TMA 1101050, registered on May 31, 2021, (“the FRAMAR trademark” or the “Trademark”).
3. The Complainant uses the FRAMAR trademark in association with the provision of its goods and services (“the FRAMAR products”).
4. The FRAMAR trademark is “a Mark in which the Complainant had Rights prior to the date of registration of the domain name and continues to have such Rights;...” and is “a trade-mark...or a trade name that has been used in Canada by a person, or the person’s predecessor in title, for the purpose of distinguishing the

wares, services or business of that person from the wares, services or business of another person” within the meaning of 3.1 and 3.2 of the Policy.

5. As well as its aforesaid trademarks, the Complainant has registered the domain name <framar.com> which it uses in its business and in particular for its website at www.framar.com where it promotes its goods and services.
6. The Registrant registered the <framar.ca> domain name on April 27, 2018 (“the disputed domain name”).
7. The disputed domain name includes in its entirety the FRAMAR trademark to which the Registrant has added the Top-Level Country Code “.ca” for Canada.
8. The disputed domain name is confusingly similar to the FRAMAR trademark as the domain name includes the FRAMAR trademark and, hence so clearly resembles it in appearance, sound or the ideas suggested by the trademark as to be likely to be mistaken for it, within the meaning of paragraph 3.3 of the Policy and is a Mark in which the Complainant had rights prior to the date of registration of the domain name and continues to have such rights.
9. The Registrant has caused the disputed domain name to resolve to a website at www.framar.ca (the “Registrant’s Website”) which offers goods and services under the FRAMAR trademark and the Registrant has also purported to offer to sell the domain name including, as it does, the FRAMAR trademark.
10. The Registrant has no legitimate interest in the disputed domain name. That is so because:
 - (a) the Complainant has not licensed, authorized or permitted the Registrant to make any use of the FRAMAR trademark in a domain name or by any other means;
 - (b) the Registrant has never conducted a legitimate business under the FRAMAR trademark;
 - (c) the Registrant is not commonly known by the disputed domain name;
 - (d) the Registrant has never made any use of the disputed domain name such that it could give rise to a legitimate interest in the domain name on the part of the Registrant;
 - (e) the use by the Complainant of its FRAMAR trademark for nearly 40 years has been such that no other person or entity could have acquired any legitimate interest in the domain name;
 - (f) as the disputed domain name is not a Mark within the meaning of paragraph 3.2 (1) of the Policy, the Registrant cannot have used any such mark in good faith and could not have had rights in any such mark within the meaning of paragraph 3.4(1) of the Policy; in using the disputed domain name, the Registrant has not used a clearly descriptive or generic name within the meaning of paragraphs 3.4,(2) and (3) of the Policy as FRAMAR is a registered trademark; the Registrant is not using the disputed domain name for a non-commercial activity within the meaning of paragraph 3.4(4) of the Policy; (d) the disputed domain name is not the legal name of the Registrant within the meaning of paragraph 3.4(5) of the Policy; and (e) the disputed domain name is not a geographical location within the meaning of paragraph 3.4 (6) of the Policy.
11. The Complainant submits that it will therefore have provided evidence that the Registrant has no legitimate interest in the disputed domain name.

12. The Registrant has registered the disputed domain name in bad faith. That is so for the following reasons:

(a) the Registrant registered the domain name, or acquired the registration, primarily for the purpose of selling, renting, licensing or otherwise transferring the Registration to the Complainant, or the Complainant's licensor or licensee of the Mark, or to a competitor of the Complainant or the licensee or licensor for valuable consideration in excess of the Registrant's actual costs in registering the domain name, or acquiring the Registration within the meaning of paragraph 3.5(1) of the Policy;

(b) the Registrant registered the domain name or acquired the Registration in order to prevent the Complainant from registering the Mark as a domain name, provided that the Registrant, alone or in concert with one or more additional persons has engaged in a pattern of registering domain names in order to prevent persons who have rights in Marks from registering the Marks as domain names, within the meaning of paragraph 3.5(2) of the Policy;

(c) the Registrant registered the domain name primarily for the purpose of disrupting the business of the Complainant, or the Complainant's licensor or licensee of the Mark, who is a competitor of the Registrant within the meaning of paragraph 3.5(3) of the Policy;

(d) the Registrant has intentionally attempted to attract, for commercial gain, internet users to the Registrant's website or other on-line location, by creating a likelihood of confusion with the Complainant's Mark as to the source, sponsorship, affiliation, or endorsement of the Registrant's website or location or of a product or service on the Registrant's website or location within the meaning of paragraph 3.5(4) of the Policy; and

(e) the evidence will show that the Registrant had actual knowledge of the Complainant, its business and its aforesaid trademark at the time it, the Registrant, registered the disputed domain name.

13. The Complainant submits that finding for the Complainant and ordering that the registration of the disputed domain name should be transferred to the Complainant is consistent with the Trademarks Act (Canada).

14. The Complainant requests that for the aforesaid reasons the disputed domain name be transferred to it.

5. DISCUSSION AND FINDINGS

5.1 Eligibility

As this proceeding is brought under the CIRA Policy, Paragraph 1.4 of the Policy applies, and it provides as follows:

"1.4 Eligible Complainants. The person initiating a Proceeding (the "Complainant") must, at the time of submitting a complaint (the "**Complaint**"), satisfy the Canadian Presence Requirements for Registrants (**the "CPR"**) in respect of the domain name that is the subject of the Proceeding unless the Complaint relates to a trade-mark registered in the Canadian Intellectual Property Office ("**CIPO**") and the Complainant is the owner of the trade-mark."

In the present case, the Complaint relates to a trademark registered in the Canadian Intellectual Property Office. That trademark is the trademark that the Complainant relies on, namely the registered Canadian trademark for FRAMAR, registration number TMA 1101050, registered on May 31, 2021, (“the FRAMAR trademark” or the “Trademark”) and to which it maintains that the disputed domain name is confusingly similar. Moreover, the evidence is that the Complainant is the owner of that trademark. Accordingly, the Complainant has met the Canadian Presence Requirements for Registrants.

The Complainant can also bring itself within those specific provisions. That is because the Requirements provide that an entity satisfies these requirements if it is a

“(d) Corporation. A corporation under the laws of Canada or any province or territory of Canada; (or)

(q) Trade-mark registered in Canada. A Person which does not meet any of the foregoing conditions, but which is the owner of a trade-mark which is the subject of a registration under the Trade-marks Act (Canada) R.S.C. 1985, c.T-13 as amended from time to time, but in this case such permission is limited to an application to register a .ca domain name consisting of or including the exact word component of that registered trade-mark; ...”.

The evidence adduced by the Complainant shows that it is a corporation under the laws of the Province of Ontario, it being registered as a company in that Province and the Panel having verified that fact by its own enquiries. Moreover, the evidence is that the Complainant is the owner of a Canadian registered trademark, namely the aforesaid trademark for FRAMAR and any application the Complainant makes as the consequence of an order for the transfer of the disputed domain name to itself will be an application to register “a .ca domain name consisting of or including the exact word component of that registered trade-mark; ...”.

Thus, on both tests, the Complainant has established that it is an eligible complainant for the purposes of the Canadian Presence Requirements for Registrants.

5.2 Requirements of the Complaint.

In accordance with Paragraph 4.1 of the CDRP, the onus is on the Complainant to prove that:

(a) the Disputed Domain Name is Confusingly Similar to a trademark or service mark in which the Complainant had rights prior to the date of registration of the Disputed Domain Name and continues to have such Rights: and

(b) the Registrant has no legitimate interest in the Disputed Domain Name, of which the Complainant must produce some evidence; and

(c) the Registrant registered the Disputed Domain Name in bad faith.

The Panel will consider each of these requirements in turn.

5.3 Whether the Domain Name is Confusingly Similar to a Mark in which the Complainant has Rights.

The first question that arises is therefore whether the Complainant has a trademark on which it may rely in this proceeding. That requirement comes from paragraph 3.1.1 of the Policy which provides in effect that the Complainant must establish that the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to a Mark in which the Complainant had Rights prior to the date of registration of the domain name and continues to have such rights. Thus, it must first be established that the Complainant has a “mark”, defined in paragraph 3.2.3 of the Policy to include “a trade-mark, including the word elements of a design mark, that is registered in CIPO...”.

The Complainant has relied, in part, on 4 trademarks, which are:

- (a) the registered Canadian trademark for FRAMAR, registered with the Canadian Intellectual Property Office, registration number TMA 1101050, registered on May 31, 2021;
- (b) the United States trademark for FRAMAR, registered with the United States Patent and Trademark Office, Registration Number 5685800, registered on February 26, 2019;
- (c) the WIPO trademark for FRAMAR, registration number 1557328, registered on September 10, 2020; and
- (d) the WIPO trademark for FRAMAR, registered number 1591665, registered on March 3, 2021.

The disputed domain name <framar.ca> was registered by the Registrant on April 27, 2018. Thus, the Complainant did not, in the words of paragraph 3.1.1 of the Policy, have Rights in any of those trademarks prior to the date of registration of the domain name.

However, the Complainant does not rely solely on the registered trademarks set out above. Its case is that it also relies on what it refers throughout the Complaint as the FRAMAR trademark, brand and name. Its evidence is that the FRAMAR brand was founded in 1986, that it has been used continuously since then, that it is a global brand with over 1 million Instagram followers, a vast array of Tik Tok users, a presence in over 70 countries around the globe, that it has during the intervening years used the FRAMAR name as a trademark and that it has been used in trade shows, beauty publications and stylist communities, giving it a strong reputation. The Panel has also sought to verify the Complainant’s contentions itself by looking at the Wayback Machine at www.archive.org to see how the Complainant has used its own domain name, <framar.com> on the internet. That examination shows statements from the Complainant that the business actually started in 1978 and was functioning under the FRAMAR brand from 1986 and that it has continuously done so since 1986.

On that basis, the Panel finds that the Complainant had established FRAMAR as its common law trademark since 1986 and that it was in full use as a trademark at least since that year. Thus, the Complainant had rights in the trademark, as required by paragraph 3.1.1 of the Policy, well prior to the date when the disputed domain name was registered, being April 27, 2018. Clearly, the Complainant also continues to have those rights.

It has been established that a complainant in CDRP proceedings may rely on common law trademark rights; see, for example the decision in *Synchronized Agency Inc. v. Zeehan Mir/ Inssurance Lead Master*, 25606-CDRP (although in that case the proposition was not made out on the evidence) and see also the observations of three panellist including the present panellist in *Jackpine Dynamic Branding Inc.v. Asadallah Kassam*, 24696-CDRP, (the" Canada is Not for Sale Hat case"), that "(f)or a trademark to acquire protection under common law, it must serve as a source identifier, not merely as a political or decorative statement. This principle is supported by the decision *Guitar Center, Inc. v. Piperni*, DCA-1570-CIRA and is reflected in the definition of a "trademark" under Section 2 of the Canadian Trademarks Act (RSC 1985, c T-13)."

The Panel is satisfied that the evidence in the present case has established that the Complainant has currently, and has had since 1986, a common law trademark for FRAMAR which is a prominent and well-known source identifier of the Complainant's goods and that it has been so since that date, which was many years prior to the registration of the disputed domain name.

The same result is reached from a further consideration of the definition of "mark" in paragraph 3.2 of the Policy. In that provision, a mark is defined to include "... a trade name that has been used in Canada by a person... for the purpose of distinguishing the wares, services or business of that person from the wares, services or business of another person...". For the reasons already given and which it is not necessary to repeat, it is clear from the evidence that the Complainant has used FRAMAR as a trade name coming within that definition and that it has done so since at least 1986, thus qualifying it for the purposes of this proceeding, as it had and used that trademark for decades before the Registrant registered the disputed domain name.

The next question that arises is whether the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to the trademark. The formular to be used to answer that question is that set out in paragraph 3.3 of the Policy which is as follows:

3.3 "Confusingly Similar". In determining whether a domain name is "**Confusingly Similar**" to a Mark, the Panel shall only consider whether the domain name so nearly resembles the Mark in appearance, sound or the ideas suggested by the Mark as to be likely to be mistaken for the Mark."

It is self-evident that the domain name so clearly resembles the trademark in its appearance that it is more than likely to be mistaken for the trademark. It is also clear that the domain name so resembles the trademark in the ideas suggested by the trademark, namely the renown and prestige of the long-established business of the Complainant, that it is likely to be mistaken for the trademark.

It is clear that the domain name consists solely of the FRAMAR trademark and the Canadian country code ".ca". In making the comparison between the domain name and the trademark, the country code is ignored, as all domain names must have such an extension. Thus, the domain name is confusingly similar to the trademark, as internet users would undoubtedly see it as invoking the FRAMAR trademark and the goods and services being offered under it.

The Complainant has therefore satisfied the requirements of paragraph 3.3 of the Policy.

5.4 Whether the Registrant has No Legitimate Interest in the Domain Name.

In analyzing this issue, there are two important provisions of the Policy that must be borne in mind. The first provision is that contained in paragraph 3.4 of the Policy, which is as follows:

”3.4 Legitimate Interests. For the purposes of paragraphs 3.1(b) and 4.1(c), any of the following circumstances, in particular but without limitation, if found by the Panel to be proved based on its evaluation of all evidence presented, shall demonstrate that the Registrant has a legitimate interest in a domain name...”

That paragraph then goes on to state the circumstances that will give the Registrant a legitimate interest in the domain name. The Complainant’s case is that the Registrant does not meet any of those tests and therefore it would not be able to show that it has a legitimate interest in the domain name. The Panel will therefore first examine the grounds relied on by the Complainant to show that it does not have a legitimate interest in the domain name. It will then examine the specific grounds under paragraph 3.4 to show that the Registrant could not itself make out a case for a legitimate interest in the domain name.

The second important provision that should be borne in mind is paragraph 4(c) of the Policy which provides:

4.1 Onus. To succeed in the Proceeding, the Complainant must prove, on a balance of probabilities, that:

“(a)...

(b)...

(c) the Registrant has no legitimate interest in the domain name as described in paragraph 3.4.

Even if the Complainant proves (a) and (b) and provides some evidence of (c), the Registrant will succeed in the Proceeding if the Registrant proves, on a balance of probabilities, that the Registrant has a legitimate interest in the domain name as described in paragraph 3.4.”

Thus, the Complainant must provide “some evidence” that the Registrant has no legitimate interest in the domain name. As will be seen, and as the Panel now finds, the Complainant has shown the “some evidence” required and has in fact gone that and has shown substantial evidence that that the Registrant has no legitimate interest in the domain name.

The Complainant has made out each of the grounds that it relies on to show that the Registrant has no legitimate interest in the disputed domain name. Those grounds are:

- (a) the evidence shows that the Complainant has not licensed, authorized or permitted the Registrant to make any use of the FRAMAR trademark in a domain name or by any other means; thus, it could not be suggested that the domain name was registered with anything like the consent of the

- Complainant; the Registrant has thus registered a domain name consisting solely of the Complainant's trademark and without the permission of the Complainant as the trademark owner;
- (b) the Registrant has never conducted a legitimate business under the FRAMAR trademark; this seems to be so for the reason that the Respondent has not used the domain name for a legitimate business and the evidence shows that it has put the domain name up for sale, indicating that it had no legitimate use for it;
 - (c) the Registrant is not commonly known by the disputed domain name; there is no evidence that the Registrant is commonly known by the domain name and there is no evidence that it is known by any name other than its own which is Frank Venelli;
 - (d) on the evidence, the Registrant has never made any use of the disputed domain name such that it could give rise to a legitimate interest in the domain name on the part of the Registrant; the Registrant has had the opportunity to bring forward any evidence it has that it has used the domain name for a legitimate purpose, but has not filed a Response;
 - (e) the use by the Complainant of its FRAMAR trademark for nearly 40 years has been such that no other person or entity could have acquired any legitimate interest in the domain name; clearly, the Complainant's use of the domain name for over 40 years has entrenched its association with the domain name. So far as the Registrant is concerned, it has had ample opportunity to give any explanation it may be advised to give to the effect that it has a legitimate association with the domain name, but has not taken up that opportunity; in particular, the fact that it has put the domain name up for sale raises the inference that it has no legitimate interest in it; and,

turning to the criteria under paragraph 3.4 of the Policy that could show on adequate evidence that the Registrant has a legitimate interest in the domain name, Registrant has not adduced any evidence that might bring it within any of those criteria,

- (f) as the evidence is that the domain name is not a Mark within the meaning of paragraph 3.2(a) of the Policy, the Registrant cannot have used any such mark in good faith and could not have had rights in any such mark within the meaning of paragraph 3.4(1) of the Policy; in using the domain name, the Registrant has not used a clearly descriptive or generic name within the meaning of paragraphs 3.4(2) and (3) of the Policy as FRAMAR is a registered trademark; the Registrant is not using the domain name for a non-commercial activity within the meaning of paragraph 3.4(4) of the Policy; (d) the domain name is not the legal name of the Registrant within the meaning of paragraph 3.4(5) of the Policy; and (e) the domain name is not a geographical location within the meaning of paragraph 3.4(6) of the Policy.

Accordingly, the Panel finds that the Registrant has no legitimate interest in the disputed domain name and the Complainant has provided not only some but considerable evidence of that fact.

5.5 Whether the Registrant registered the disputed domain name in bad faith.

The Complainant has submitted that the Registrant registered the disputed domain name in bad faith on several grounds. In assessing whether the Complainant has made out those grounds, the Panel will apply the balance of probabilities, that being the standard of proof in civil proceedings such as the present. The Panel finds on the balance of probabilities that the Complainant has made out each of the grounds of bad faith that it relies on, which are:

(a) the Registrant registered the domain name primarily for the purpose of selling, renting, licensing or otherwise transferring the Registration to the Complainant, or the Complainant's licensor or licensee of the Mark, or to a competitor of the Complainant or the licensee or licensor for valuable consideration in excess of the Registrant's actual costs in registering the domain name, or acquiring the Registration within the meaning of paragraph 3.5 (1) of the Policy; the evidence shows that the Registrant has put the domain name up for sale and the Panel has seen that at least one Registrar currently has the domain name in its inventory of domain names that it has for sale; that being so, it must be accepted on the balance of probabilities that the intention of the Registrant was to register a domain name including the Complainant's trademark and to make the Complainant a likely buyer of it, and for the highest price it could obtain, no doubt in excess of its registration costs, thus bringing the Registrant squarely within this provision;

(b) the evidence shows that the Registrant registered the domain name or acquired the Registration in order to prevent the Complainant from registering the Mark as a domain name, provided that the Registrant, alone or in concert with one or more additional persons has engaged in a pattern of registering domain names in order to prevent persons who have rights in Marks from registering the Marks as domain names, within the meaning of paragraph 3.5(2) of the Policy; the conduct of the Registrant in this regard suggests that this not an isolated occurrence but that it was part of a plan or pattern of the Registrant; the Registrant must have known that the result of its registering the domain name would be that the Complainant, being the trademark owner, would be prevented from registering the disputed domain name including the FRAMAR trademark;

(c) the evidence shows that the Registrant registered the domain name primarily for the purpose of disrupting the business of the Complainant, or the Complainant's licensor or licensee of the Mark, who is a competitor of the Registrant within the meaning of paragraph 3.5(3) of the Policy; clearly, the Registrant must have known that if it registered this domain name it would disrupt the business of the Complainant, as internet users would probably be misled and confused about its authenticity, with the potential that customers would use it to try to obtain the Complainant's goods and services; indeed there is validity in the Complainant's point that because of the Complainant's fame in Canada, internet users would probably think that the domain name, being in the ".ca" space, was connected to the Complainant's official website in Canada, which itself would be disruptive to the Complainant;

(d) the evidence shows that the Registrant has intentionally attempted to attract, for commercial gain, Internet users to the Registrant's website or other on-line location, by creating a likelihood of confusion with the Complainant's Mark as to the source, sponsorship, affiliation, or endorsement of the Registrant's website or location or of a product or service on the Registrant's website or location within the meaning of paragraph 3.5(4) of the Policy; again, the Registrant must have known that registering the domain name would run the risk that internet users and particularly the customers and potential customers of the Complainant in Canada would likely think that it was a genuine and official domain name of the Complainant, including as it did, the Complainant's well-known trademark, and that if it were used to offer goods and services similar to those of the Complainant, potential customers would be confused as to whether they were genuine goods and services of the Complainant; indeed, the evidence of the Complainant is that it has "had so many people write to us asking why framar.ca wasn't working" shows that internet users are in fact confused by the domain name and believe that it is owned by the Complainant and that the Complainant may not be operating in Canada;

(e) the evidence shows that the Registrant had actual knowledge of the Complainant, its business and its aforesaid trademark at the time it, the Registrant, registered the disputed domain name; the domain name <framar.ca> obviously did not appear from nowhere and it must have been conceived by the Registrant; thus the Registrant must have had actual knowledge of the Complainant and its trademark at the time it registered the domain name to enable it to carry out its subterfuge.

Thus, the Complainant has established that the Registrant registered the disputed domain name in bad faith.

6. DECISION and ORDER

The Complainant has made out all of the elements that it must establish under the Policy and is entitled to the relief that it seeks, namely transfer of the disputed domain name.

For the above reasons, in accordance with Paragraph 4 of the CDRP and Paragraph 12 of the Resolution Rules, the Panel orders that: the <framar.ca> domain name be transferred to the Complainant.

Made as of 12 November 2025

SIGNATURE OF PANEL

The Honorable Neil Anthony Brown KC



The