



CANADIAN INTERNATIONAL INTERNET DISPUTE RESOLUTION CENTRE

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL

DECISION

CIIDRC case number:	23006-CDRP	Decision date: February 9, 2026
Domain Name:	<20to50.ca>	
Panel:	Douglas M. Isenberg	
Complainant:	The Capital Planning Region operating as the Winnipeg Metropolitan Region	
Registrant:	Elitsa Vasileva	

1. OVERVIEW

This matter concerns a registered domain, <20to50.ca> (the “Disputed 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:

1. On November 25, 2025, Deborah A. Yeboah filed a Complaint on behalf of The Capital Planning Region operating as the Winnipeg Metropolitan Region pursuant to the CDRP and the Resolution Rules. The required commencement fee was paid on November 28, 2025. The complaint was in administrative compliance with CIRA’s requirements under Rule 3.2.

2. On December 1, 2025, CIRA was notified of this proceeding. CIRA transmitted by email to CIIDRC its verification response informing that the registrant of the Disputed Domain Name is Elitsa Vasileva (the

“Registrant”). CIRA also confirmed that the disputed domain name was placed on a Registrar LOCK and that the Domain Name has a Registration Date of 2025-06-18 (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 December 10, 2026.

4. The deadline for submitting a Response was set for December 30, 2025.

5. The Registrant failed to file response to date.

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

7. The Complainant deposited the required Panel fee on January 15, 2026.

CIIDRC appointed Douglas M. Isenberg as panelist on January 20, 2026.

The Disputed Domain Name was registered on September 3, 2025.

3. FACTS

Complainant states that it is “a planning region in the Province of Manitoba, Canada, made up of the capital city of Winnipeg and 13 other surrounding municipalities”; that its “mandate is to enhance economic and social development by improving and coordinating sustainable land use and development in the region”; that it created a plan in 2019 called “Plan20-50” in response to a “report titled ‘For the Benefit of All’ . . . , in which [Dr. Robert Murray, one of North America’s leading authorities on public policy with extensive experience in the Edmonton Metropolitan Region] indicated that the first foundational step to enhance economic development and move towards regional coordination was to develop a long-term regional growth and servicing plan”; that it “was the previous registrant of the disputed domain name, which it used since at least as early as December 4, 2020” in connection with “a website that promoted Plan20-50 and provided information to the public regarding Plan20-50.”

Complainant further states that it is the owner of the trademark “20to50,” which it first used in November 2020 in connection with “development and implementation of a long-term regional plan to coordinate land use, infrastructure, and economic development across the Winnipeg Metropolitan region over the course of 30 years” (the “20TO50 Trademark”).

Complainant further states: “In December of 2024, several municipal leaders voted against forwarding Plan20-50 to the province of Manitoba, effectively ending the implementation of the plan. As Plan20-50 was no longer being implemented, the Complainant no longer needed the disputed domain name and therefore allowed the registration of the disputed domain name to lapse in or around January 2025.”

Complainant further states that Registrant registered the Disputed Domain Name on September 3, 2025, “and up until recently, the disputed domain name resolved to a website that is masquerading as the Complainant’s 20to50 Website” by “misappropriating content from the Complainant’s 20to50 Website and presenting it as its own.”

4. CONTENTIONS OF THE PARTIES

- **Complainant**

The Complainant submits 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 because Complainant used the 20TO50 Trademark in connection with “a series of public consultations with stakeholders, including representatives from municipalities, Indigenous groups, economic development, social services, industry, environmental interest groups, construction and associations”; a consultation report based on the foregoing was published under the title “WMR Growth Management and Servicing Plan – Plan 20-50: December 2019 – February 2020 Consultation Summary Report”; “Complainant created an early draft of Plan20-50”; and Complainant “promoted Plan20-50 and provided information to the public regarding Plan20-50” on a website using the Disputed Domain Name (of course, before Complainant allowed the Disputed Domain Name to lapse and it was registered by Registrant); “[a] domain name will be found to be confusingly similar with a mark if it so nearly resembles the mark in appearance, sound or in the ideas suggested as to be likely to be mistaken for the mark”; and the Disputed Domain Name is “s virtually identical to or at least confusingly similar to” the 20TO50 Trademark.

The Complainant submits that the Registrant has no legitimate interest in the Disputed Domain Name because, *inter alia*, none of the following circumstances set forth in paragraph 3.4 of the CDRP is applicable:

(a) the domain name was a Mark, the Registrant used the Mark in good faith and the Registrant had Rights in the Mark;

(b) the Registrant registered the domain name in Canada in good faith in association with any wares, services or business and the domain name was clearly descriptive in Canada in the English or French

language of: (i) the character or quality of the wares, services or business; (ii) the conditions of, or the persons employed in, production of the wares, performance of the services or operation of the business; or (iii) the place of origin of the wares, services or business;

(c) the Registrant registered the domain name in Canada in good faith in association with any wares, services or business and the domain name was understood in Canada to be the generic name thereof in any language;

(d) the Registrant used the domain name in Canada in good faith in association with a non-commercial activity including, without limitation, criticism, review or news reporting;

(e) the domain name comprised the legal name of the Registrant or was a name, surname or other reference by which the Registrant was commonly identified; or

(f) the domain name was the geographical name of the location of the Registrant's non-commercial activity or place of business.

The Complainant also submits that “[t]he Registrant has wrongfully taken old content from the Complainant’s 20to50 Website and reproduced the content on 20to50.ca”; the Disputed Domain Name “resolved to a website that was masquerading as the Complainant’s 20to50 Website, including several advertisements and links, and was misappropriating content from the Complainant’s 20to50”; and “[c]urrently, the disputed domain name redirects to the domain < ccst.in >, which hosts a webpage that purports to be associated with Fox News, an American news channel.”

The Complainant submits that the Registrant has registered the Disputed Domain Name in bad faith because, *inter alia*, “[t]he Registrant has registered the disputed domain name and has reproduced old text and content created by the Complainant and formally displayed on the Complainant’s 20to50 Website”; the Disputed Domain Name “resolved to a website that invited the user to subscribe to ‘Get the Latest Updates from 20to50’”; and the Registrant “intentionally engaged in ‘phishing’ of personal information of internet users, for commercial gain.”

- **Registrant**

The Registrant did not submit a response or any other communications in this proceeding.

- **Remedy Sought**

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

5. DISCUSSION AND FINDINGS

5.1 Eligibility

The Complainant states that it is an eligible complainant under paragraph 1.4 of the CDRP because it is “a statutory corporation, namely a capital planning region in the Province of Manitoba, created pursuant to The Planning Act, CCSM c P80.” Paragraph 2(d) of the Canadian Presence Requirements For Registrants provides that “[a] corporation under the laws of Canada or any province or territory of Canada” is eligible to hold maintain the registration of a .ca domain name. The Panel is satisfied that Complainant is an eligible complainant.

5.2 Requirements

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

Complainant does not claim to be the owner of any registered trademarks. However, paragraph 3.1(a) of the CDRP refers only to “Rights” and is not limited to registered trademarks. A number of previous panels under the CDRP have found common law trademark rights sufficient to satisfy the “Rights” requirement of the CDRP. See, e.g., *Vacuum Specialists (1985) Ltd. v. Hani Labidi and Terry Smith/ Superior Vacuums*, CIIDRC Case No. 20799-CDRP (finding trademark rights where complainant argued that it “has acquired common law trademark rights in the name VACUUM SPECIALISTS through its continuous 40 years of use”); and *Delta9 Bio-Tech Inc. v. DELTA NINE*, BCICAC Case No. DCA-1980-CIRA (finding common law trademark rights

where complainant submitted a “press release, magazine article and the evidence of the Complainant’s website as off” a date prior to the date on which the disputed domain name was registered). Here, Complainant’s evidence of common law rights in the 20TO50 Trademark is primarily limited to its previous registration and use of the Disputed Domain Name, and Complainant states without support that it has “developed significant goodwill” in the 20TO50 Trademark. Complainant has failed to provide most of the evidence typically required for establishing common law trademark rights, such as “(i) the duration and nature of use of the mark, (ii) the amount of sales under the mark, (iii) the nature and extent of advertising using the mark, (iv) the degree of actual public (e.g., consumer, industry, media) recognition, and (v) consumer survey.” WIPO Overview of WIPO Panel Views on Selected UDRP Questions, Third Edition (“WIPO Overview 3.0”),¹ section 1.3. However, Complainant’s lack of evidence and arguments about common law trademark rights is overcome by Registrant’s use of the Disputed Domain Name, as discussed above, given that “[t]he fact that a respondent is shown to have been targeting the complainant’s mark (e.g., based on the manner in which the related website is used) may support the complainant’s assertion that its mark has achieved significance as a source identifier.” WIPO Overview 3.0, section 1.3. Accordingly, while the Panel would have preferred to see more substantial evidence and legal arguments, it is satisfied that Complainant has established Rights for purposes of the CDRP.

Paragraph 3.3 of the CDRP states: “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 apparent that the Disputed Domain Name contains the 20TO50 Trademark in its entirety. “[I]n cases where a domain name incorporates the entirety of a trademark, or where at least a dominant feature of the relevant mark is recognizable in the domain name, the domain name will normally be considered confusingly similar to that mark.” WIPO Overview 3.0, section 1.7.

Accordingly, the Panel finds that Complainant has met its burden of proof with respect to paragraph 3.1(a) of the CDRP.

5.3.2 Whether the Registrant registered the Domain Name in Bad Faith

The Panel evaluates whether the Complainant has established that Registrant has registered the Disputed Domain Name in bad faith, as defined by the CDRP. Pursuant to paragraph 3.5 of the CDRP, the following “in particular but without limitation, if found by the Panel to be present, shall be evidence that a Registrant has registered a domain name in bad faith”:

¹ Although WIPO Overview 3.0 addresses the Uniform Domain Name Dispute Resolution Policy (“UDRP”), Paragraph 3.2(l) of the Resolution Rules expressly allows references to “dispute resolution proceedings which apply to domain names registered under any other top level domain which the Complainant considers persuasive.”

- (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;
- (b) the Registrant registered the domain name or acquired the Registration in order to prevent the Complainant, or the Complainant's licensor or licensee of the Mark, 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;
- (c) the Registrant registered the domain name or acquired the Registration 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; or
- (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.

The Panel is persuaded that bad faith exists pursuant to paragraph 3.5(d), given that Registrant has used the Domain Name to redirect to a website that appears to contain information about the services offered by Complainant in connection with the relevant trademarks. This usage creates a likelihood of confusion pursuant to paragraph 3.5(d). See, e.g., *Emerson Vulcan Holding LLC v. Dan Thompson*, BCICAC Case No. DCA-2060-CIRA ("the very definition of bad faith" exists where "Registrant is using a domain name comprising a third-party brand to attract web traffic for that brand... for his own commercial gain by creating a likelihood of confusion in the mind of the public as to source, sponsorship, affiliation or endorsement of the Registrant's website"); and *Birkenstock Sales GmbH v. Vytas Klimavicius/Litamber Media Corporation*, BCICAC Case No. 2246-CIRA ("[t]he Registrant has no business relationship with the Complainant and the Registrant's website is clearly aiming to profit from an implication that it is a website of the Complainant or an authorized dealer").

Bad faith is further established by Registrant's registration of a domain name that was previously registered and used by Complainant itself. See, e.g., *Sylvia Browne Corporation v. Younghee Kim / SYLVIABROWNE HYPNOSIS*, WIPO Case No. D2007-1715 ("the disputed domain name was previously owned and used by the Complainant immediately prior to being registered by the Respondent. This suggests to the Panel that the Respondent's registration was an opportunistic action resulting from an inadvertent lapse on the part of the Complainant, a circumstance that in and of itself smacks of bad faith"); *Moog Inc. v. Luo Jie Ming*, WIPO Case No. D2018-1101 ("Respondent clearly should have been aware of the Complainant's trademark when it registered the disputed domain name" after it lapsed, because a " cursory search of the name... would have revealed the

existence of the Complainant”); and *Robert Rolls & Co Limited v. Daning Future Control (Xu Daning)*, WIPO Case No. D2017-0185 (finding bad faith where “Respondent seized the opportunity to register the disputed domain name immediately after Complainant’s registration expired”).

In light of the above, the Panel finds that Complainant has met its burden of proof with respect to paragraph 3.1(c) of the CDRP.

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

With respect to paragraph 4.1(c) of the CDRP, regarding a lack of legitimate interests, the Panel notes that paragraph 3.4 of the CDRP sets out six specific circumstances which, “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.” The Panel also notes that these circumstances are stated to be “without limitation,” allowing a Panel to find a legitimate interest under other circumstances as well.

The Complainant submits evidence and arguments, which the Panel accepts, that the Registrant does not meet any of the criteria for legitimate interest set out in paragraph 3.4 of the CDRP, and, in the absence of a response from the Registrant, the record contains no evidence of legitimate interests. See, e.g., *General Motors LLC v. Tony Wilson*, CIRA Case No. 00182 (“the Complainant has provided some evidence that the Registrant has no legitimate interest in the Domain Name and this evidence has not been rebutted by the Registrant”).

Accordingly, the Panel finds that Complainant has met its burden of proof with respect to paragraph 4.1(c) of the CDRP and therefore finds in favor of the Complainant with respect to this element of the CDRP.

6 DECISION and ORDER

For the above reasons, in accordance with Paragraph 4 of the CDRP, Paragraph 12 of the Resolution Rules, the Panel orders that the Disputed Domain Name be transferred to Complainant.

Made as of February 11, 2026

SIGNATURE OF PANEL

