



CANADIAN INTERNATIONAL INTERNET DISPUTE RESOLUTION CENTRE

DOMAIN NAME DISPUTE

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL

DECISION

CIIDRC case number:	25308-CDRP	Decision date: January 21, 2026
Domain Name:	circlek.ca	
Panel:	Adam Taylor	
Complainant:	Circle K Stores Inc.	
Registrant:	Mike Morgan	

1. OVERVIEW

This matter concerns a registered domain, <circlek.ca> (the “Domain Name”).

This 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 under the CDRP.

2. PROCEDURAL HISTORY

The procedural history of this case is as follows:

1. On December 11, 2025, Ozge Senturk Fowler filed a Complaint on behalf of Circle K Stores Inc. (“the Complainant”) pursuant to the CDRP and the Rules. The required commencement fee was paid on the same day. The Complaint was in administrative compliance with CIRA’s requirements under paragraph 3.2 of the Rules.

2. On December 11, 2025, CIRA was notified of this proceeding and, on the same day, CIRA transmitted by email to CIIDRC its verification response informing that the registrant of the Domain Name is Mike Morgan (“the Registrant”). CIRA also confirmed that the Domain Name was placed on a Registrar LOCK and that the Domain Name had a Registration Date of July 14, 2021.

Domain Name: circlek.ca
26308-CDRP

3. Pursuant to paragraph 4.4 of the Rules, CIIDRC notified the Registrant of this administrative proceeding and forwarded a Notice of Complaint along with the Complaint to the Registrant on December 12, 2025.

4. The deadline for submitting a Response was set for January 2, 2026.

5. The Registrant failed to file a Response to date.

6. The Complainant in this administrative proceeding has elected for a Panel consisting of a single member.

7. On January 14, 2026, CIIDRC appointed Adam Taylor as a single-member Panel in this matter. The Panel finds that it was properly constituted. The Panel has submitted a declaration of impartiality and independence in accordance with paragraph 7 of the Rules.

3. FACTS

The Complainant operates a chain of over 17,000 convenience stores and service stations under the mark CIRCLE K in some 30 countries, including Canada. The business dates back to the 1950s.

The Complainant owns a number of Canadian registered trademarks for CIRCLE K, including trademark No. TMA325710, registered on April 10, 1987, in classes 35 and 37.

The Complainant operates a website at www.circlek.com.

The Domain Name was registered on July 14, 2021.

As of June 5, 2025, the Domain Name resolved to a parking page with pay-per-click (“PPC”) links to “Circle K Jobs”, “Circle K App” and “Circle K Easy Pay”.

The Registrant did not reply to the Complainant’s cease and desist letters sent on August 6, 18 and 28, 2025.

As of October 27, 2025, the Domain Name resolved to a webpage offering the Domain Name for sale for USD 26,999.

4. CONTENTIONS OF THE PARTIES

- **Complainant**

In summary, the Complainant submits as follows:

- the Domain Name is identical to the Complainant’s mark;
- the Registrant lacks a legitimate interest in the Domain Name;

- to the best of the Complainant's knowledge, the Registrant does not own a registered trademark corresponding to the Domain Name;
- the Complainant has not authorized the Registrant to use its trademarks;
- there is no evidence that the Registrant is commonly known by the Domain Name;
- the Complainant's mark significantly predates the Domain Name;
- the Registrant's use of the Domain Name for PPC links connected to the Complainant and its products does not amount to a bona fide offering of goods or services;
- the Registrant's use of the Domain Name to offer the Domain Name for sale at a price which far exceeds the Registrant's out-of-pocket expenses in registering the Domain Name is further evidence of the Registrant's lack of a legitimate interest;
- the Registrant is not making a legitimate, noncommercial fair use of the Domain Name;
- the Registrant registered the Domain Name in bad faith;
- the Complainant's mark, which is well known internationally, long predates the Domain Name;
- Google searches for "circlek" return results exclusively related to the Complainant;
- the Registrant's registration of the Domain Name incorporating the Complainant's mark demonstrates familiarity with the Complainant's business;
- by using the Domain Name for a parking page with PPC links, the Registrant set out to create a likelihood of confusion with the Complainant's mark in order to increase traffic to the Registrant's website for the Registrant's financial gain;
- it is irrelevant whether the Registrant influenced the PPC links on the website or itself profited from such links;
- the fact that, after receiving the Complainant's notices, the Registrant offered the Domain Name for sale at a price which far exceeds the Registrant's out-of-pocket expenses shows that the Registrant registered the Domain Name primarily for sale to the Complainant or a competitor; and
- the Registrant's failure to respond to the Complainant's notices is further evidence of bad faith.

- **Registrant**

The Registrant did not respond to the Complainant's contentions.

- **Remedy Sought**

The Complainant requests that the Domain Name be transferred to it.

5. DISCUSSION AND FINDINGS

5.1 Eligibility

Under paragraph 1.4 of the CDRP, the Complainant must, at the time of submitting the Complaint, satisfy the Canadian Presence Requirements for Registrants ("CPR") unless the Complaint relates to a trademark registered in the Canadian Intellectual Property Office ("CIPO") and the Complainant is the owner of the trademark.

In this case, the Complaint does indeed relate to a Canadian trademark owned by the Complainant. In any case, the Complainant satisfies the CPR as it has provided evidence that it is the owner of that Canadian trademark and the Domain Name consists of the exact word component thereof.

Accordingly, the Complainant is an eligible complainant under paragraph 1.4 of the CDRP.

5.2 Requirements

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

- (a) the 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 Domain Name and continues to have such Rights: and
- (b) the Registrant registered the Domain Name in bad faith,

and the Complainant must provide some evidence that:

- (c) the Registrant has no legitimate interest in the Domain Name.

The Panel will consider each of these requirements in turn.

5.3 Analysis

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

The Complainant has established rights in a "Mark" as defined in paragraph 3.2(c) of the CDRP, namely a trademark that is registered with the CIPO. See section 3 above.

Furthermore, the Mark predates the Domain Name, and the Complainant continues to have rights in the Mark, as required under paragraph 3.1(a) of the CDRP

Under paragraph 3.3 of the CDRP, 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.

In this case, the Domain Name is identical to the Complainant's trademark, and so the Panel has little difficulty in concluding that the Domain Name so nearly resembles the Mark in appearance as to be likely to be mistaken for the Mark.

The Panel finds that paragraph 4.1(a) of the CDRP has been established.

5.3.2 Whether the Registrant registered the Domain Name in Bad Faith

The Registrant has used the Domain Name, which comprises the Complainant's highly distinctive Mark, in connection with a parking page with PPC links relating to the Complainant. For example, one of links is to "Circle K Easy Pay", which corresponds to the name of the Complainant's branded debit card. In the Panel's view, by using the Domain Name in this manner, the Registrant has intentionally created a likelihood of confusion with the Complainant's Mark in accordance with paragraph 3.5(d) of the CDRP. The Panel agrees with the Complainant that it is irrelevant whether the Registrant influenced the PPC links or itself profited from such links

Furthermore, following the Complainant's cease and desist correspondence, the Registrant resolved the Domain Name to a website offering the Domain Name for sale for USD 26,999. In these circumstances, the Panel considers that, on the balance of probabilities, the Registrant registered the Domain Name primarily for the purpose of selling the Domain Name to the Complainant for valuable consideration in excess of the Registrant's actual costs in accordance with paragraph 3.5(a) of the CDRP.

The Panel also notes that the Registrant has not come forward to explain or defend its behavior.

The Panel finds that paragraph 4.1(b) of the CDRP has been established.

5.3.3 Whether there is Some Evidence that the Registrant has No Legitimate Interest in the Domain Name

Paragraph 3.4 of the CDRP sets out six non-exhaustive examples of legitimate interests in a domain name.

As discussed in section 5.3.2 above, the Complainant's evidence indicates that, on the balance of probabilities, the Registrant registered the Domain Name for sale to the Complainant, and that the Registrant also intentionally used the Domain Name to create a likelihood of confusion with the Complainant's Mark. In the Panel's view, such evidence is indicative of a lack of a legitimate interest on the part of the Registrant; furthermore, such evidence negates paragraphs 3.4(a)-(d) of the CDRP, all of which require that the Registrant acted "in good faith".

There is also evidence to indicate that the Domain Name does not comprise the legal or other name of the Registrant per paragraph 3.4(e) of the CDRP.

Paragraph 3.4(f) of the CDRP does not apply as there is no indication that the Domain Name is a geographical name.

Accordingly, the Panel concludes that there is some evidence that the Registrant had no legitimate interest in the Domain Name.

The Panel finds that paragraph 4.1(c) of the CDRP has been established.

6. DECISION and ORDER

For the above reasons, in accordance with paragraph 4 of the CDRP and paragraph 12 of the Rules, the Panel orders that the domain name <circlek.ca> be transferred from the Registrant to the Complainant.

Made as of January 21, 2026

Adam Taylor

