



**CANADIAN INTERNATIONAL INTERNET DISPUTE RESOLUTION CENTRE**

**DOMAIN NAME DISPUTE**

**ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL**

**DECISION**

CIIDRC case number:	<b>26132-CDRP</b>	Decision date: <b>March 9, 2026</b>
Domain Name:	<b>manulifesolutions.ca</b>	
Panel:	<b>Richard Levy</b>	
Complainant:	<b>The Manufacturer's Life Insurance Company (Manulife)</b>	
Registrant:	<b>Robbie Stewart Dakin</b>	

**1. OVERVIEW**

This matter concerns a registered domain, **manulifesolutions.ca** (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:

1. On November 11, 2026, Sean Cordani filed a Complaint on behalf of The Manufacturer's Life Insurance Company (Manulife) pursuant to the CDRP and the Resolution Rules. The

required commencement fee was paid on November 18, 2025. The complaint was in administrative compliance with CIRA's requirements under Rule 3.2.

2. On December 18, 2025, CIRA transmitted by email to CIIDRC its verification response informing that the registrant of the Disputed Domain Name is Robbie Stewart Dakin (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 2025-02-05 (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 18, 2025.
4. The Registrant failed to file a response by the deadline and the CIIDRC notified the parties of this default on January 9, 2026.
5. The Complainant in this administrative proceeding has elected for a Panel consisting of a single-member.
6. The Complaint deposited the required Panel fee on February 5, 2026.
7. The CIIDRC appointed the undersigned as a single-member Panel in this matter.

### **3. FACTS**

8. The Complainant in this proceeding is a Canadian multinational insurance company and financial services provider headquartered in Toronto, Ontario, named Manufacturer's Life Insurance Company ( "Manulife"). According to the Complainant's assertions, it has approximately 38,000 employees and \$1.4 trillion CAD in assets under management, operates worldwide, serves over 26 million customers, has been in operation for over a century to cultivate an internationally respected brand, and possesses multiple registered and well-known trademarks.
9. According to the submitted evidence, the Complainant owns the following trademark:  
  
Canadian Trademark for MANULIFE (word mark), Reg. No. TMA385240, in International Classes 9, 16, 35, 36, 37, 41, and 44, registered on May 31, 1991, and in force until May 31, 2031.

10. According to the Complainant, it also owns the domain name <manulife.com> registered in February 1994, and <manulife.ca> registered in October 2000.

11. According to the CIIDRC Registry Verification Response, the disclosed registrant is Robbie Stewart Dakin, a Canadian citizen, located in Toronto, Ontario.

12. The Disputed Domain Name was registered on February 5, 2025, and resolves to an inactive website with no content on it.

#### **4. CONTENTIONS OF THE PARTIES**

- **Complainant**

13. The Complainant submits that it has satisfied the three elements in accordance with Paragraph 4.1 of the CDRP and Complainant provides reasons supporting that submission.

- **Registrant**

14. The Registrant, as noted, did not file a Response.

- **Remedy Sought**

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

#### **5. DISCUSSION AND FINDINGS**

##### **Eligibility**

16. The Complainant contends it is headquartered in Toronto, Ontario. The Complainant is an eligible complainant under paragraph 1.4 of the CDRP. The Complainant has also provided satisfactory evidence that it owns Trademark Rights over the term MANULIFE under its Canadian registration No. TMA385240.

17. Therefore, the Complainant satisfies the Canadian Presence Requirements under section 1.4 of the CDRP

##### **Preliminary issue: refiled Complaint**

18. Complainant filed a Complaint with the CIIDRC against the same Registrant regarding the same Domain Name, [case number 25210-CDRP]. For simplicity, and in accordance

with common usage, I will refer to that complaint as the “original complaint.” The Panelist in that case, Maria Alejandra Lopez Garcia, dismissed the original complaint on September 5, 2025, on the grounds that:

- (1) although Complainant asserts that Manulife is a very large company, operating worldwide, which owns multiple registered trademarks and the domain names manulife.com and manulife.ca, Complainant did not produce evidence of these assertions before the Panel;
- (2) although Complainant asserts that that the domain in dispute hosts no content referencing the domain name in such a way as to justify legitimate use of the domain name, Complainant failed to provided a copy of the of the Registrant’s website by the time of the filing of the Complaint;
- (3) “The Complainant asserts that the Complainant’s trademark MANULIFE is well-known; however, and again, the Complainant didn’t provide a single piece of evidence regarding such relevant assertion in these types of cases”;
- (4) “The Complainant also asserts that *“the domain was at one point officially associated with the Complainant’s business, further establishing that the Respondent is aware of its prior ownership and registered the domain in an attempt to disrupt them. The immediate registration with a domain reseller shows that the most likely motive is to sell, rent, license or otherwise transfer the Registration to the Complainant.”* (Underline added). Mere assertions or arguments are not sufficient. None of these assertions has been supported by its proof before the Panel.”

19. The Panelist concluded: “Therefore, although this case may fall into a typical Passive Holding scenario, given the almost absolute lack of substantive evidence, including the very little one required by paragraphs 3.4 and 4.1. of the CDRP, the Panel, based on paragraph 9.1(a),(b),(c) and (d) of the Resolution Rules, finds that the Complainant has not proven its case, including under a balance of probabilities criterion as set out by paragraph 4.1 of the CDRP.

Therefore, the Complainant has not satisfied paragraph 4.1(b) of the CDRP requirement.”

20. The Panelist dismissed the Complaint “without prejudice to be submitted again.”

21. Complainant did not mention in its current Complaint [26132- CDRP] filed on November 11, 2025 (the “refiled Complaint” or “current Complaint”), that that it had filed a previous complaint, regarding the same domain name and the same registrant, and that such original complaint had been dismissed. The undersigned Panelist only became aware that a previous complaint had been filed and dismissed due to a mention of this made by a representative of the Registrant in an exhibit to the current Complaint that contained emails sent by that representative to the Complainant’s representative. This Panelist then discovered the previous decision by doing a search of the keyword “Manulife” in the CIIDRC database of decisions.

22. The current Complaint is identical or almost identical to the original complaint. Moreover, the date of filing of the current Complaint is stated as “June 15<sup>th</sup>, 2025” (which would have been the date of the original complaint), and its list of schedules only lists three schedules, although there are in fact ten schedules filed with the current Complaint. Furthermore, the current Complaint, in its text, makes no reference to any of these ten schedules, whereas, in this Panelist’s experience, it is standard to link an assertion in the text to the schedule that provides evidence of such assertion.

23. The CDRP Policy and Rules do not provide guidance on how a panelist should approach a refiled complaint. Since the CDRP is based in part upon the earlier Uniform Domain Name Dispute Resolution Policy (the “UDRP”) it is helpful to consider the WIPO Overview of WIPO Panel Views on Selected UDRP Questions, Third Edition (the “Overview”), Section 4.18 of which provides:

“Under what circumstances would a refiled case be accepted?”

A refiled case is one in which a newly-filed UDRP case concerns identical domain name(s) and parties to a previously-decided UDRP case in which the prior panel denied the complaint on the merits. (The previous case may or may not be from another UDRP provider.) As the UDRP itself contains no appeal mechanism, there is no express right to refile a complaint; refiled complaints are exceptional.

Panels have accepted refiled complaints only in highly limited circumstances such as (i) when the complainant establishes that legally relevant developments have

occurred since the original UDRP decision, (ii) a breach of natural justice or of due process has objectively occurred, (iii) where serious misconduct in the original case (such as perjured evidence) that influenced the outcome is subsequently identified, (iv) where new material evidence that was reasonably unavailable to the complainant during the original case is presented, or (v) where the case has previously been decided (including termination orders) expressly on a “without prejudice” basis.”

24. Section 4.18 of the Overview goes on to state that the highly limited circumstances listed must be explicitly indicated and argued, as follows:

“In the refiling itself, a complainant must clearly indicate the grounds it believes would justify acceptance of the refiled complaint. The WIPO Center would initially assess whether grounds have been pleaded which prima facie justify accepting the refiled complaint. It remains however for any appointed panel to ultimately determine whether such preliminarily-accepted refiled complaint should proceed to a decision on the merits.

In certain highly limited circumstances (such as where a panel found the evidence in a case to be finely balanced, and opined that it may be possible for future respondent behavior to cast a different light on a panel’s assessment of bad faith), a panel may record in its decision that in the event certain conditions would be met, acceptance of a refiled complaint may be justified. The extent to which any such conditions have been met would bear on determining whether a refiled complaint should be accepted prima facie by the provider, and subsequently by the panel.”

25. Limited circumstance, paragraph (v), does appear to apply here, namely “where the case has previously been decided (including termination orders) expressly on a “without prejudice” basis”. The Panelist in the original case dismissed the complaint, “...without prejudice to be submitted again.”

26. And in the current Complaint, Complainant did provide additional exhibits to support its affirmations in the Complaint. However, as stated above, Complainant did not link the assertions in the text to the corresponding exhibits. Instead, Complainant appears to have re-submitted the same or almost identical Complaint that it filed in

the previous case and simply added several new exhibits, without identifying these in the Complaint.

27. Moreover, returning to the text of section 4.18 of the Overview, Complainant, did not “clearly indicate the grounds it believes would justify acceptance of the refiled complaint.” This absence must be viewed within the context of the serious failure by the Complainant to state that the current Complaint is a Refiled Complaint.

28. For that reason, the Panel, exercising its discretion, rules that the Complaint should not proceed to a decision on the merits.

## **6. DECISION and ORDER**

For the above reasons, in accordance with Paragraph 4 of the CDRP, Paragraph 12 of the Resolution Rules, the Panel **DISMISSES** the Complaint.

Made on March 9, 2026

SIGNATURE OF PANEL

A large black rectangular redaction box covering the signature area.

---

Richard S. Levy