



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

CIIDRC case number:	25981-UDRP	Decision date: November 28, 2025
Domain Name:	<b>lawsonlundeil.com</b>	
Panel:	<b>Bart Van Besien</b>	
Complainant:	<b>Lawson Lundell LLP</b>	
Respondent:	<b>Donn MacDougall</b>	

## 1. PROCEDURAL HISTORY

The procedural history of this case is as follows:

1. On October 27, 2025, the Complainant filed a Complaint pursuant to the Uniform Domain Name Dispute Resolution Policy (the "Policy") and the Rules for Uniform Domain Name Dispute Resolution Policy (the "Rules").
2. On October 28, 2025, CIIDRC notified the Respondent of this administrative proceeding and forwarded a Notice of Complaint to the Respondent.
3. The Respondent filed his response on November 3, 2025.
4. Both Parties elected for a Panel consisting of a single-member.
5. CIIDRC appointed Bart Van Besien, as a single-member Panel in this matter. He accepted the appointment.
6. The Panel finds that it is properly constituted and has submitted the Statement of Acceptance and Declaration of Impartiality and Independence.

CIIDRC will communicate the full text of the decision to the parties and the concerned Registrar.

**Domain Names: lawsonlundeil.com**  
25981-UDRP

The Disputed Domain Name <lawsonlundeil.com> was registered on May 6, 2025.

This matter is 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**

### **Facts alleged by the Complainant:**

The Complainant, Lawson Lundell LLP, is a well-established Canadian business law firm founded in 1886, with offices in Vancouver, Calgary, Yellowknife, and Kelowna, and more than 210 lawyers. The firm owns multiple Canadian trademark registrations for LAWSON LUNDELL and related design marks used in connection with legal services and publications, and it has operated its principal domain name <lawsonlundell.com> continuously since 1995.

The Respondent, Donn MacDougall, registered the Disputed Domain Name <lawsonlundeil.com> on May 6, 2025. The domain differs from the Complainant’s domain name and its trademarks only by replacing the final “ll” with “il”—a visually similar combination, especially when the Respondent renders the “i” as a capital “I”. The Respondent created a website at the disputed domain displaying marked-up documents relating to his disputes with the Northwest Territories Legislative Assembly (“NTLA”) and its counsel, the Complainant. The Respondent also configured the domain to operate as a catch-all email server, redirecting messages sent to “<anyname>@lawsonlundeil.com” to his personal Gmail account. The Complainant has evidence that at least one such misaddressed email was actually intercepted by the Respondent.

The Complaint asserts that the Disputed Domain Name is part of a broader pattern of conduct by the Respondent. The Respondent has a long-running campaign against NTLA relating to grievances arising from his former employment with the Government of the Northwest Territories. This includes the publication of the “Infobreach” book series, multiple websites (such as infobreach.ca and nwtassembly.ca), and social media accounts mimicking NTLA identifiers. NTLA is currently represented by the Complainant in litigation and in a CDRP proceeding concerning “nwtassembly.ca.” The Complainant states that the Respondent’s registration of the Disputed Domain Name is retaliatory and deliberately targets the Complainant in its role as NTLA’s counsel

### **Facts alleged by the Respondent:**

The Respondent filed a Response but did not provide any supporting facts and did not address the factual assertions made in the Complaint.

### 3. CONTENTIONS OF THE PARTIES

- **Complainant**

The Complainant owns various LAWSON LUNDELL trademarks, registered in Canada. The Complainant submitted evidence that it is the registered owner of the following trademarks (the “LAWSON LUNDELL Trademark(s)”):

- Word trademark “LAWSON LUNDELL”: Canadian Registration No. TMA918142, filed on June 12, 2013, registered on October 23, 2015, in association with the following goods and services: Printed publications in the field of legal matters, namely, newsletters, brochures and articles; Electronic publications in the field of legal matters, namely, newsletters, brochures and articles transmitted via email or posted on an internet website; and Legal services; providing information in the field of legal matters; arranging, hosting and presenting seminars in the field of legal matters.
- Design trademark “LAWSON LUNDELL LLP L”: Canadian Registration No. TMA762856, filed on December 9, 2008, registered on March 29, 2010, in association with the following goods and services: Electronic publications related to legal matters, namely, newsletters, brochures and articles transmitted via email or posted on an internet website; Printed publications related to legal matters, namely, newsletters, brochures and articles; Arranging, hosting and presenting seminars relating to legal matters; Legal services; providing information relating to legal matters.;
- Design trademark “LAWSON LUNDELL LLP PENSION FRAMEWORK”: Canadian Registration No. TMA927763, filed on August 2, 2012, registered on January 29, 2016, in association with the following goods and services: Printed publications related to legal matters in the field of pensions and pension plans, namely, newsletters, brochures and articles; Electronic publications related to legal matters, namely, newsletters, brochures and articles transmitted via email or posted on an internet website; Legal services; providing information relating to legal matters in the field of pensions and pension funds; arranging, hosting and presenting seminars relating to legal matters; Designing and advising on turnkey monitoring and reporting on governance in the field of pensions and regulatory compliance requirements for pension funds; Providing secure electronic document storage in respect of pension funds.

First, the Complainant claims that the Disputed Domain Name is confusingly similar to its LAWSON LUNDELL Trademarks. The only difference—substitution of “il” for “ll”—constitutes typosquatting, especially where the Respondent uses a capital “i” as “l” thereby increasing the risk of confusion and creating the false impression of association.

Second, the Complainant claims that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the Disputed Domain Name. The Respondent is not affiliated with the Complainant, has not been authorized to use its trademarks, and does not use the Disputed Domain Name for a bona fide offering of goods or services. Instead, the Respondent uses the domain to publish marked-up legal documents relating to his disputes with NTLA, and to intercept misaddressed emails. The Respondent has engaged in a pattern of similar abusive

registrations targeting NTLA. To the extent the website criticizes the Complainant, such criticism cannot confer rights where the domain itself impersonates the Complainant's registered marks. The Complainant argues that the purported "criticism" is a pretext for cybersquatting, typosquatting, and commercial activity.

Third, the Complainant claims that the Respondent has registered and is using the Disputed Domain Name in bad faith. The Complainant asserts clear typosquatting; intentional interception of confidential email, especially problematic where the target is a law firm; retaliatory motive related to the Respondent's disputes with NTLA; commercial promotion of the Respondent's Infobreach books; a pattern of abusive domain registrations; lack of genuine criticism; and the inadequacy of disclaimers (if any) to cure confusion.

- **Respondent**

The Respondent's Response is brief. He does not address the issue of confusing similarity. He asserts—without evidence—that he is making legitimate noncommercial or fair use of the domain and states: "On this issue, the website speaks for itself." He denies bad faith for the same reason. Regarding reverse domain name hijacking, the Respondent writes merely: "Sure looks like it to me," without further explanation.

- **Remedy Sought**

The Complainant requests the Domain Name be transferred to it.

#### **4. DISCUSSION AND FINDINGS**

##### **4.1 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.

##### **4.2 Analysis**

###### **4.2.1 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 LAWSON LUNDELL Trademark with the substitution of the final "l" with an "i," plus the ".com" gTLD. Such a minor alteration—which results in characters that are visually almost identical—does not prevent a finding of confusing similarity. The gTLD ".com" is disregarded for

comparison purposes. The Panel therefore concludes that the Disputed Domain Name is confusingly similar to a trademark in which the Complainant has rights within the meaning of paragraph 4(a)(i) of the Policy.

#### **4.2.2 Rights or Legitimate Interests in respect of the Domain Name**

As regards paragraph 4(a)(ii) of the Policy, while the overall burden of proof rests with the Complainant, it is commonly accepted that this should not result in an often-impossible task of proving a negative. Therefore, numerous previous panels have found that the Complainant is required to make out a prima facie case that the Respondent lacks rights or legitimate interests. Once such prima facie case is made, the burden of production shifts to the Respondent to come forward with appropriate allegations or evidence demonstrating rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name. If the Respondent fails to come forward with such appropriate allegations or evidence, the Complainant is generally deemed to have satisfied paragraph 4(a)(ii) of the Policy. If the Respondent does come forward with some allegations or evidence of relevant rights or legitimate interests, the Panel then must weigh all the evidence, with the burden of proof always remaining on the Complainant.

The Complainant has made a prima facie showing that the Respondent lacks rights or legitimate interests. The burden of production therefore shifts to the Respondent, who has failed to produce any evidence of such rights.

The Panel finds that the Respondent does not have any rights or legitimate interests in respect of the Disputed Domain Name from a combination of the following facts:

- The Disputed Domain Name incorporates the LAWSON LUNDELL Trademark of the Complainant in its entirety, with the sole substitution of the final "l" with an "i". This is a minimal change that is indicative of typosquatting and does not create rights or legitimate interests in the Disputed Domain Name.
- There is no evidence that the Respondent is or has been commonly known by the Disputed Domain Name or by the terms "LAWSON LUNDELL" or "LAWSON LUNDEIL".
- The WHOIS information does not provide any information that might indicate any rights of the Respondent to use the Disputed Domain Name or the terms "LAWSON LUNDELL" or "LAWSON LUNDEIL".
- The Respondent does not seem to have any consent or authorization to use the LAWSON LUNDELL Trademarks or variations thereof and does not seem to be related to the Complainant.
- The Respondent did not show to have any trademark rights or other rights regarding the terms "LAWSON LUNDELL" or "LAWSON LUNDEIL" (or similar terms).
- The Complainant's LAWSON LUNDELL Trademarks predate the domain registration by many years.
- The Respondent's website reproduces legal documents bearing the Complainant's name and trademarks, with no credible explanation.

- There is no evidence to show that the Respondent is making a legitimate non-commercial or fair use of the Disputed Domain Name, without intent for commercial gain or to misleadingly divert consumers. On the contrary, it appears that the Respondent is taking advantage of the Complainant's name and registered LAWSON LUNDELL Trademarks to create a likelihood of confusion with the Complainant's LAWSON LUNDELL Trademarks.
- On May 7, 2025, the Respondent sent an email to the Complainant and several persons at the Government of Northwest Territories, stating that the Complainant "made a big mistake" and adding a link to a webpage available via the disputed domain name. The Panel's understanding is that the url is in fact linked to the disputed domain name <lawsonlundeil.com>, not the domain name of the Complainant (<lawsonlundell.com>), whereby the Respondent is using a capital "i" to make it look as an "l".
- It is clear to the Panel that the Respondent did not register and is not using the Disputed Domain Name for a genuine criticism or 'parody' purpose, but rather to impersonate the Complainant and to retaliate against the Complainant as legal representative of NTLA. The registration of the domain name and of email addresses using the domain name, goes far beyond any type of bona fide offering of services or goods. The overall circumstances strongly suggest retaliation, disruption, and misuse of the Complainant's identity, not genuine commentary.

In sum, the Panel finds that the Complainant has made a prima facie case that the Respondent lacks rights or legitimate interests in the Disputed Domain Name, and that the Respondent did not come forward with any appropriate evidence or arguments to counter the Complainant's evidence or arguments. The Panel concludes that the Respondent does not have rights or legitimate interests in the Disputed Domain Name.

#### **4.2.3 Registration and Use of the Domain Name in Bad Faith**

The Complainant has advanced several arguments that the Respondent registered and is using the Disputed Domain Name in bad faith. These arguments are summarized above under the Parties' Contentions. The Respondent provided only a brief response and did not meaningfully address the Complainant's allegations.

The Panel considers the evidence and arguments as follows:

First, as already noted, the Disputed Domain Name reproduces the Complainant's LAWSON LUNDELL Trademarks in their entirety, with only a minor alteration: the substitution of the third letter "l" with the letter "i." The evidence shows that the Respondent renders this "i" as a capital "I," causing it to appear visually identical to an "l." This alteration is designed to create confusion among Internet users and to impersonate the Complainant.

Second, the Respondent has used the Disputed Domain Name to generate email addresses that imitate the email addresses of individuals at the Complainant's law firm and at NTLA, the Complainant's client and the Respondent's adversary in multiple disputes. This demonstrates an intent to impersonate the Complainant and likely to intercept communications intended for it. Because the Complainant is a law firm, such communications

may contain confidential or privileged information. The Respondent should have understood that this conduct goes far beyond any form of legitimate criticism or parody. His May 7, 2025 email to the Complainant—asserting that the Complainant “made a big mistake” and including links to a pages hosted at the Disputed Domain Name—further illustrates a retaliatory motive.

Third, the Complainant’s LAWSON LUNDELL Trademarks predate the registration of the Disputed Domain Name by many years. Given the extensive background of litigation and disputes between the Respondent and NTLA—and the Complainant’s role as NTLA’s counsel—the Respondent was clearly aware of both the Complainant and its trademarks at the time he registered and used the Disputed Domain Name.

Fourth, the screenshots submitted by the Complainant show that the Respondent’s website displays legal documents relating to the Respondent’s disputes with NTLA. Several of these documents were drafted by the Complainant and contain the Complainant’s name, address, logo, and other identifying details. This presentation creates the misleading impression that the website is operated or endorsed by the Complainant. The small statement “Not Lawson Lundell LLP” at the top of certain pages is insufficient to dispel this false association when the domain name itself conveys an impersonating impression.

Fifth, there is no indication that the Respondent is using the Disputed Domain Name for any bona fide offering of goods or services, or for any legitimate noncommercial or fair use.

Sixth, the Respondent has not provided any explanation for his choice of the Disputed Domain Name. His only comment—asserting that the website was not registered or used in bad faith and that “the website speaks for itself”—does not rebut the Complainant’s detailed evidence. In the Panel’s view, the website does “speak for itself,” but it does so in demonstrating that the domain name was registered and is being used in bad faith.

In light of all of the above, the Panel finds that the Disputed Domain Name was not registered and is not being used for any bona fide purpose. Rather, it was registered and is being used to target the Complainant, to impersonate it, to create confusion and mislead Internet users, and to exert pressure on the Complainant in its role as counsel to NTLA. It is evident that the Respondent had knowledge of the Complainant, its activities, and its LAWSON LUNDELL Trademarks when he registered and used the Disputed Domain Name. The Respondent clearly had the Complainant and its marks in mind throughout.

For the foregoing reasons, the Panel concludes that the Disputed Domain Name was registered and is being used in bad faith within the meaning of Paragraph 4(a)(iii) of the Policy.

#### **4.2.4 No Reverse Domain Name Hijacking**

In light of the Panel’s findings on all three elements of Paragraph 4 of the Policy, the Panel concludes that the Complaint does not constitute reverse domain name hijacking.

**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: the Complaint is accepted and that the Disputed Domain Name <lawsonlundeil.com> is to be transferred to the Complainant, Lawson Lundell LLP.

Made as of November 28, 2025

SIGNATURE OF PANEL

*Bart Van Besien*

