



CANADIAN INTERNATIONAL INTERNET DISPUTE RESOLUTION CENTRE

DOMAIN NAME DISPUTE

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL

DECISION

CIIDRC case number:	26531-CDRP	Decision date: March 23, 2026
Domain Name:	<olg-casino.ca>	
Panel:	Zak Muscovitch	
Complainant:	Ontario Lottery and Gaming Corporation	
Registrant:	Adina Danila	

1. OVERVIEW

This matter concerns a registered domain, **<olg-casino.ca>** (the “Domain Name” or 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 dated March 6, 2026:

- a) On January 26, 2026, James Green of Gowlings WLG filed a Complaint on behalf of Ontario Lottery and Gaming Corporation pursuant to the CDRP and the Resolution Rules. The required commencement fee was paid on January 27, 2026. The complaint was in administrative compliance with CIRA’s requirements under Rule 3.2.

- b) On January 27, 2026, 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 Disputed Domain Name is Adina Danila (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 2025-09-05 (the “Registration Date”).
- c) 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 January 29, 2026.
- d) The deadline for submitting a Response was set for February 19, 2026.
- e) The Registrant failed to file response to date.
- f) The Complainant in this administrative proceeding has elected for a Panel consisting of a single-member.
- g) The Complaint deposited the required Panel fee on March 5, 2026.
- h) CIIDRC appointed the undersigned as a single-member Panel and the undersigned duly submitted his statement of impartiality and independence as required under Paragraph 7 of the Resolution Rules.

3. FACTS

The Complainant submitted an extraordinarily comprehensive Complaint which set out the material facts in detail. The Complainant is Ontario Lottery and Gaming Corporation (“OLG”), a Crown corporation owned by the Province of Ontario. OLG conducts and manages gaming activities in Ontario, including lotteries, casinos, and internet gaming, and operates an online casino through its website at www.olg.ca.

The Complainant owns a portfolio of Canadian trademarks and official marks incorporating “OLG”, including:

- OLG – Official Mark No. 919866;
- OLG – Registered Trademark No. TMA736387 (registered March 17, 2009);
- OLG (design) – Official Mark No. 919932;
- OLG (design) – Registered Trademark No. TMA736827 (registered March 24, 2009);
- OLG CASINO – Registered Trademark No. TMA737347 (registered April 2, 2009);
- OLG SLOTS – Registered Trademark No. TMA737800;
- PLAYOLG – Official Mark No. 922045; and
- PLAYOLG.CA – Official Mark No. 922046.

These marks have been used in Canada for many years in association with lottery and gaming services and are alleged by the Complainant to be well known. The Complainant registered the domain name <olg.ca> in 2005 and has used it continuously to promote and provide information about its services.

The disputed domain name <olg-casino.ca> was registered on September 5, 2025. The Complainant states that there is no relationship between the parties and that the Registrant has not been authorized to use the Complainant's marks.

According to the Complaint, the disputed domain name resolves to a website that reproduces the Complainant's OLG marks and logo and purports to offer online casino and gaming services. The website is alleged to impersonate the Complainant and present itself as an official OLG platform. The Complaint further alleges that the website invites users to create accounts and submit personal information and identification documents, and that certain links redirect users to a third-party online gaming website identified as "Flagman" at >>casinoflagman29.com<<.

The Complainant asserts that it has not authorized such use and that the Registrant is not licensed under the applicable Ontario regulatory regime governing online gaming. It further alleges that the use of the disputed domain name is misleading and may expose users to fraudulent or phishing activity.

4. CONTENTIONS OF THE PARTIES

The Complainant submits that the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to its OLG trademarks, including in particular its registered trademark OLG CASINO. It argues that the Domain Name wholly incorporates the distinctive element "OLG" and combines it with the term "casino", which directly relates to the Complainant's core business and increases the likelihood of confusion.

The Complainant contends that it has extensive rights in the OLG marks arising from long-standing registration and use in Canada, and that these marks are well known in association with lottery and gaming services. It submits that its rights predate the registration of the disputed domain name.

The Complainant further submits that the Registrant has no legitimate interest in the disputed domain name. It states that the Registrant is not affiliated with or authorized by the Complainant and has not been licensed to use the OLG marks. The Complainant argues that the domain name is not being used for any bona fide purpose, but rather to impersonate the Complainant through a website that reproduces its trademarks and logos.

The Complainant alleges that the website associated with the disputed domain name is a fraudulent or deceptive site that invites users to create accounts and submit personal information, and that it redirects users to a third-party online gaming website. The Complainant characterizes this conduct as phishing and misleading diversion of Internet users.

The Complainant submits that the disputed domain name was registered in bad faith. It argues that the Registrant must have been aware of the Complainant and its well-known marks at the time of registration and intentionally targeted them. The Complainant further contends that the domain name is being used to disrupt its business, to attract users for commercial gain by creating confusion, and to divert traffic to a competing online gaming site.

The Complainant also submits that the Registrant's activities raise consumer protection concerns, particularly given the regulated nature of online gaming in Ontario, and that the Registrant is not authorized under the applicable regulatory regime.

Accordingly, the Complainant requests that the disputed domain name be transferred to it.

The Registrant failed to respond to the Complaint. Although the Registrant did not file a Response, the burden remains on the Complainant to prove the required elements under Paragraph 4.1 of the Policy.

5. DISCUSSION AND FINDINGS

5.1 Eligibility

In order to satisfy Paragraph 1.4 of the Policy, the Complainant must at the time of submitting a Complaint, satisfy CIRA's Canadian Presence Requirements ("CPR") in respect of the Domain Name unless the Complaint relates to a trademark registered in the Canadian Intellectual Property Office ("CIPO") and the Complainant is the owner of the trademark. The Complainant has submitted evidence that it is both an Ontario crown corporation as well as the owner of Canadian registered trademarks. The Panel finds that in accordance with Paragraph 1.4 of the Policy, that; a) the Complainant satisfies the CPR as a result of being a corporation under the laws of Ontario; and b) that the Complaint relates to a trade-mark registered in the Canadian Intellectual Property Office and that the Domain Name consists of includes the exact word component of that registered trademark. As such, this is an eligible Complaint.

5.2 Requirements

Pursuant to Paragraph 4.1 of the Policy, to succeed in this proceeding, the Complainant must prove on a balance of probabilities that:

(a) the Registrant's dot-ca 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; and

(b) and the Registrant has registered the domain name in bad faith as described in paragraph 3.5; and the Complainant must provide some evidence that:

(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.

5.3 Analysis

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

The Complainant has alleged in accordance with Paragraph 4.1 of the Policy, 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.

Pursuant to Paragraph 3.1(a) of the Policy, a Complainant must have a “Mark”. A “Mark” is defined at Paragraph 3.2 of the Policy as inter alia, a trademark that is registered with CIPO. As set out above, the Complainant is the owner of CIPO registered trademarks which remain valid, including for OLG, TMA736387 (registered March 17, 2009) and for OLG CASINO, TMA737347 (registered April 2, 2009); and these therefore qualifies as Marks as understood by the Policy (the “Complainant’s Marks”).

The Disputed Domain Name was registered on September 5, 2025 according to CIRA’s verification statement, which is inter alia, long after the Complainant’s aforesaid 2009 trademark registration dates.

The Panel finds that the Disputed Domain Name is confusingly similar to the Complainant’s Marks. Pursuant to Paragraph 3.3 of the Policy, 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 likely to be mistaken for the Mark.

Paragraph 1.2 of the Policy states that a “domain name” means the domain name excluding the “dot-ca” suffix. Accordingly, for the purpose of comparing the Disputed Domain Name to the Mark, the .ca suffix is ignored. The Domain Name is virtually identical to the Complainant’s OLG CASINO mark. Although the Domain Name trademark differs from the Complainant’s OLG mark in that it additionally includes the descriptive term, “-casino”, it is nevertheless confusingly similar because it shares the identical dominant and distinctive portion of the Mark, namely “OLG” and therefore so nearly resembles the Mark in appearance, as to likely to be mistaken for the Mark.

Whether the Registrant registered the Domain Name in Bad Faith

The Complainant relies on Paragraph 3.5(c) and 3.5(d) of the Policy, namely that;

(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;” and

(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 Registrant erected a website which unlawfully reproduced the Complainant’s extraordinarily well known OLG mark and logo in an intentional effort to disrupt the Complainant’s business and to deceitfully misdirect Internet traffic to the Respondents competing business. There is also evidence of a likelihood of harvesting personal information from unsuspecting visitors who are deceived into believing that the Registrant’s website is associate with the Complainant. Under the circumstances, there can be no doubt that the Registrant registered the Domain Name in bad faith as understood by the Policy. Indeed, it is difficult to imagine a more egregious example of bad faith registration under the Policy.

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

None of the possible indicia of “legitimate interest” as set out at Paragraph 3.4(a) through 3.4(f) of the Policy appear to apply to the Registrant’s registration and use of the Domain Name. The Registrant appears to have registered a Domain Name specifically selected because of the Complainant’s Marks and then used it to pass his website off as the Complainant’s in order to deceive consumers. The Registrant has not responded to the Complaint and therefore has not come forward with any explanation of his registration

and use of the Domain Name other than in order to misdirect consumers and trade off of the Complainant’s trademarks. Accordingly, the Panel finds that there is no evidence that the Registrant has a legitimate interest in the Domain Name.

6. DECISION and ORDER

The Panel concludes that all three elements of Paragraph 4.1 have been established. For the above reasons, in accordance with Paragraph 4 of the CDRP, Paragraph 12 of the Resolution Rules, the Panel orders that the Domain Name be transferred to the Complainant.

Made as of March 23, 2026

SIGNATURE OF PANEL

“Zak Muscovitch”

