



CANADIAN INTERNATIONAL INTERNET DISPUTE RESOLUTION CENTRE

DOMAIN NAME DISPUTE

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL

DECISION

CIIDRC case number:	26663-UDRP	Decision date: March 25, 2026
Domain Name:	shopifywebbuilders.com	
Registrar:	Enom, Inc.	
Panel:	Reyes Campello Estebanz	
Complainant:	Shopify, Inc.	
Respondent:	Asterisk Seven	

1. PROCEDURAL HISTORY

This administrative proceeding is conducted pursuant to the Uniform Domain Name Dispute Resolution Policy (the “UDRP Policy” of the “Policy”); the Rules for Uniform Domain Name Dispute Resolution Policy (the “UDRP Rules” or the “Rules”) both of which issued under the auspices of the Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Number (“ICANN”); and the Canadian International Internet Dispute Resolution Centre (the “Centre”, or the “CIIDRC”) Supplemental Rules for Uniform Domain Name Dispute Resolution Policy (the “Supplemental Rules”).

The procedural history of this case was set out in a letter from the CIIDRC to the Panel as follows:

- On February 9, 2026, the Complainant filed a Complaint pursuant to the UDRP and the UDRP Rules via online platform. The required fee was paid on February 18, 2026.
- On February 18, 2026, CIIDRC transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name, and on February 19, 2026, the Registrar responded advising of the identity of the Respondent and providing its contact details. In addition, the Registrar confirmed that the disputed domain name was placed in a Registrar LOCK.

Domain Names: shopifywebbuilders.com
26663-UDRP

- On February 19, 2026, CIIDRC confirmed compliance of the Complaint and commencement of the dispute resolution process.
- On February 19, 2026, pursuant to UDRP Rule 4 and Supplemental Rule 5, CIIDRC notified the Respondent of this administrative proceeding and forwarded a Notice of Complaint to the Respondent. The deadline for submitting a Response was set for March 11, 2026. The Respondent failed to file its response within the said deadline.
- The Complainant in this administrative proceeding elected for a Panel consisting of a single member.
- On March 18, 2026, in accordance with Rule 5 (d), CIIDRC appointed Reyes Campello Estebarez, as a single-member Panel in the above-referenced matter (the "Panel"). The Panel finds that it was properly constituted. The Panel has submitted its Statement of Acceptance and Declaration of Impartiality and Independence, as required by CIIDRC to ensure compliance with Rule 7 of the UDRP Rules.

2. FACTS ALLEGED BY THE PARTIES

The Complainant, established in 2004, is an internationally recognized cloud-based e-commerce platform provider headquartered in Ottawa, Canada. The Complainant's platform is primarily designed for small and medium-sized businesses, which use the platform to operate and manage their activities across multiple sales channels, including online storefronts (web, tablet, and mobile), social media storefronts, and brick-and-mortar pop-up shops. The same platform provides merchants with a unified view of business operations and customer data, allowing them to manage products and inventory, process orders and payments, develop customer relationships, and utilize analytics and reporting tools. The Complainant is among the five largest publicly traded companies in Canada by market capitalization and employs more than 10,000 people across the globe.

The Complainant offers its services under the brand SHOPIFY and is the owner of numerous trademark registrations for this mark, including, inter alia:

- Canadian Trademark Registration No. TMA787767, SHOPIFY (word), registered on January 18, 2011;
- United States Trademark Registration No. 3840412, SHOPIFY (word), registered on August 31, 2010;
- Canadian Trademark Registration No. TMA700694 S SHOPIFY (figurative), registered on November 13, 2007, with the following graphic representation:



- Canadian Trademark Registration No. TMA963059, S SHOPIFY (figurative), registered on February 16, 2017, with the following graphic representation:



- United States Trademark Registration No. 7770210, S SHOPIFY (figurative), registered on April 22, 2025, with the following graphic representation:



(the aforementioned trademarks are hereinafter collectively referred to as the “SHOPIFY Mark”).

The Complainant further owns several domain names corresponding to the SHOPIFY Mark, including <shopify.com> (registered on March 11, 2005), which resolves to its official website, and <shopify.ca> (registered on February 20, 2006), which redirects to the same website.

This administrative proceeding concerns the domain name <shopifywebbuilders.com> (the “disputed domain name”), which was registered on February 12, 2025.

According to the Registrar’s verification, the WHOIS record for the disputed domain name identifies “Asterisk Seven”, located in Houston, United States, as the Registrant (the “Respondent”).

The disputed domain name resolves to an English-language website that identifies its operator by reference to the terms incorporated in the disputed domain name (“Shopify Web Builders”). The website provides a United States telephone number and a Houston, United States, address as contact information. The copyright notice on the website states: “© Shopify Web Builders 2025. All rights reserved.” The website prominently displays the SHOPIFY Mark, together with a stylized version of the Complainant’s green “S” shopping bag logo, both in the header and throughout its content. It purports to offer “Expert Shopify E-Commerce Services”, including website development and related services intended to assist merchants and developers in building e-commerce stores on the SHOPIFY platform. The website further promotes its services with statements such as: “We’re an award-winning agency that has been recognized by the industry for its outstanding work. Shopify Web Builders has received various awards, including being listed among the Top 10 Best Shopify Development Partners in 2023 by Trustpilot.” The website offers six service “packages”, with discounted prices ranging from USD 399 to USD 4,999, all of which incorporate the SHOPIFY Mark in their respective names.

According to the evidence submitted by the Complainant, the Respondent’s website includes, at the bottom of the page and in small print, a disclaimer stating: “Shopify Web Builders provides design and development services for custom e-commerce solutions and Shopify. The name ‘Shopify’, as well as related names, marks, emblems, and images, are registered trademarks of their respective owners.” At the time of drafting this

Decision, the Panel has verified that a similar disclaimer appears in small font at the top of the Respondent's homepage when viewed at its uppermost section; however, it is not persistently visible and disappears as the user scrolls down or navigates to other sections of the website.

3. CONTENTIONS OF THE PARTIES

- **Complainant**

The Complainant submits that it has satisfied each of the elements required under the Policy for the transfer of the disputed domain name.

In particular, the Complainant contends that the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to its SHOPIFY Mark, as it wholly incorporates the mark together with the descriptive terms "web builders", which refer to the Respondent's purported activities. The term "shopify" is the dominant and distinctive element of the disputed domain name. The Complainant further submits that "shopify" is a coined term and, as such, is inherently distinctive and entitled to a high degree of protection. It is not a term that traders would legitimately adopt absent an intention to create an impression of association with the Complainant. The SHOPIFY Mark is clearly recognizable within the disputed domain name.

The Complainant further asserts that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the disputed domain name. The Respondent is not affiliated with the Complainant and has never been authorized to use the SHOPIFY Mark. There is no evidence that the Respondent has been commonly known by the disputed domain name. On the contrary, the content of the Respondent's website demonstrates that the inclusion of the term "shopify" in the disputed domain name is a direct reference to the Complainant and its trademark. The disputed domain name appears to have been registered in order to take unfair advantage of the reputation of the Complainant's trademark. Furthermore, the Respondent is not making a legitimate noncommercial or fair use of the disputed domain name, nor is it using the disputed domain name in connection with a bona fide offering of goods or services within the meaning of the Policy. Rather, the Respondent is making an illegitimate commercial use of the disputed domain name by exploiting the goodwill associated with the SHOPIFY Mark and by creating a false impression of affiliation. In particular, the Respondent's website uses branding and visual elements that reinforce this misleading impression, including the color green and a shopping bag logo that are confusingly similar to those used by the Complainant. The overall presentation of the website is designed to suggest an affiliation with the Complainant and therefore cannot constitute a bona fide offering of goods or services, nor confer rights or legitimate interests on the Respondent.

Finally, the Complainant contends that the disputed domain name was registered and is being used in bad faith. The Respondent has intentionally attempted to attract, for commercial gain, Internet users to its website by creating a likelihood of confusion with the Complainant and its SHOPIFY Mark as to the source, sponsorship, affiliation, or endorsement of the Respondent's website, within the meaning of paragraph 4(b)(iv) of the Policy.

In addition, the Complainant submits that various merchants have reported being defrauded after attempting to engage the Respondent's advertised services, alleging that payments were made but no services were provided. Given the well-known character of the SHOPIFY Mark, it is implausible that the Respondent was unaware of the Complainant's trademark at the time of registration. The Respondent's use of the disputed domain name further demonstrates clear targeting of the Complainant, as the website expressly offers SHOPIFY-related development services and describes itself as a "top Shopify eCommerce agency", while simultaneously adopting branding elements that suggest affiliation. The circumstances of this case are indicative of fraudulent conduct. However, in any event, even if the Respondent were a legitimate provider of website development services, it would not be entitled to use the Complainant's trademark in a manner that creates confusion in order to attract Internet users, which constitutes bad faith under the Policy.

The Complainant relies on prior decisions under the Policy in support of its position.

- **Respondent**

The Respondent failed to submit a Response in this proceeding.

- **Remedy Sought**

The Complainant requests the disputed domain name be transferred to it.

4. DISCUSSION AND FINDINGS

4.1 Requirements

The Complainant has submitted all relevant assertions under the Policy, and the present dispute properly falls within its scope.

When a respondent is in default, paragraph 14(a) of the Rules provides that the Panel shall proceed to a decision on the basis of the complaint in the absence of exceptional circumstances. Accordingly, paragraph 15(a) of the UDRP Rules provides that the Panel shall decide the dispute on the basis of the statements and documents submitted, as well as any applicable rules and principles of law.

The Panel is therefore empowered to determine whether the three elements set out in paragraph 4(a) of the Policy have been satisfied, taking into account all relevant evidence, annexes, and submissions, as well as any rules and principles of law deemed applicable. The Panel may also undertake limited independent factual research into matters of public record, where appropriate, where such information is deemed useful for assessing the merits of the case and reaching a decision, pursuant to its general powers under paragraph 10 of the Rules, as recognized in prior decisions under the Policy. See, inter alia, *The Coca-Cola Company v. Whois Privacy Protection Service, Inc. / Thien LeTrieu, Le Trieu Thien*, WIPO Case No. D2015-2078; *Wild PCS, Inc. and Tom Yang v. Perfect Privacy, LLC / Choi Lam*, WIPO Case No. D2016-0017; *Death Row Records LLC v.*

samih dhillon, WIPO Case No. D2025-1113; *General Electric Company v. HUB Team*, WIPO Case No. D2025-1216; and WIPO Overview of WIPO Panel Views on Select UDRP Questions (“WIPO Overview 3.1”), section 4.8.

In accordance with Paragraph 4 (a) 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

Under paragraph 4(a)(i) of the Policy, the Complainant must establish two elements: first, that it has rights in a trademark or service mark (whether registered or used); and second, that the disputed domain name is identical or confusingly similar to that trademark or service mark.

With respect to the first requirement, it is well established that where a complainant owns a registered trademark, this is generally sufficient to satisfy the threshold requirement of demonstrating trademark rights for the purposes of the Policy, and the submission of evidence of registration before a competent national, regional, or international trademark authority has been held sufficient in this regard. See, *inter alia*, *Horten Advokatpartnerselskab v. Domain ID Shield Service CO., Limited / Krutikov Valeriy Nikolaevich*, WIPO Case No. D2016-0205; *STRUC-TUBE LTD. v. Hierro Mela*, CIIDRC Decision No. 26484-UDRP; and WIPO Overview 3.1, section 1.2.1.

The Complainant has demonstrated rights in respect of a trademark or service mark for the purposes of the Policy, namely the SHOPIFY Mark.

With respect to the second requirement, UDRP panels have consistently held that the first element functions primarily as a standing requirement, and the standing (or threshold) test for confusing similarity involves a reasoned but relatively straightforward comparison between the complainant’s trademark and the disputed domain name. This test is narrower than, and distinct from, the assessment of “likelihood of confusion” under applicable trademark law. Accordingly, considerations such as the scope of the complainant’s trademark rights, the geographical location of the parties, or other factors relevant to a trademark infringement analysis are not pertinent at this stage and, if relevant, are more appropriately addressed under the remaining elements of the

Policy. See, *inter alia*, *DPDgroup International Services GmbH & Co. KG v. Rega Bilgisayar Ltd.Sti., Rega Bilgisayar*, WIPO Case No. D2022-4105; and WIPO Overview 3.1, section 1.7.

The disputed domain name incorporates the SHOPIFY Mark in its entirety, followed by the terms “web builders”. The Panel finds that the addition of these terms does not prevent a finding of confusing similarity, as the SHOPIFY Mark remains clearly recognizable within the disputed domain name. It is well established that where a complainant’s trademark is recognizable within a disputed domain name, the addition of other terms—whether descriptive, geographical, pejorative, or otherwise—does not prevent a finding of confusing similarity under the first element. See, e.g., *BMGate Ltd. (formerly known as Reinvent Ltd.) v. Denys Lobusov*, CIIDRC Decision No. 25931-UDRP; and WIPO Overview 3.1, section 1.8.

It is further well established that a generic Top-Level Domain (“gTLD”), such as “.com”, is generally disregarded for the purpose of assessing confusing similarity under the first element, as it constitutes a standard registration requirement. See, e.g., *First Transit Canada Inc. v. Mykhailo Muzyka*, CIIDRC Decision No. 26482-UDRP; and WIPO Overview 3.1, section 1.11.

Accordingly, the Panel concludes that the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to the SHOPIFY Mark within the meaning of paragraph 4(a)(i) of the Policy, and the first element of the Policy has been established.

4.2.2 Rights or Legitimate Interests in respect of the Domain Name

Paragraph 4(c) of the Policy provides a list of circumstances in which the Respondent may demonstrate rights or legitimate interests in a disputed domain name.

Although the overall burden of proof in UDRP proceedings is on the complainant, panels have recognized that proving that a respondent lacks rights or legitimate interests in a domain name may result in the difficult task of “proving a negative”, requiring information that is often primarily within the knowledge or control of the respondent. As such, where a complainant makes out a prima facie case that the respondent lacks rights or legitimate interests, the burden of production on this element shifts to the respondent to come forward with relevant evidence demonstrating rights or legitimate interests in the domain name (although the burden of proof always remains on the complainant). If the respondent fails to come forward with such relevant evidence, the complainant is deemed to have satisfied the second element. See WIPO Overview 3.1, section 2.1.

Having reviewed the available record, the Panel finds the Complainant has established a prima facie case that the Respondent lacks rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name.

The Respondent has not rebutted the Complainant’s prima facie showing and has not come forward with any relevant evidence demonstrating rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name such as those enumerated in the Policy or otherwise.

According to the Complainant's allegations, the Panel observes that the term "shopify" is a coined term without dictionary meaning.

The Panel further notes that the Respondent's name, "Asterisk Seven," as disclosed in the Registrar's verification process, bears no resemblance to the terms included in the disputed domain name ("shopify web builders" or "shopifywebbuilders"), nor to the term "shopify" alone, and a search of WIPO's Global Brand Database confirms that the Respondent does not hold any trademark rights in these terms.

The Panel further observes that the disputed domain name resolves to an English-language website that prominently displays the SHOPIFY Mark, as well as a confusingly similar version of the Complainant's green "S" shopping bag logo in the header and throughout the site, including as the site's favicon. The website reproduces a similar color scheme (green) and branding elements to those used by the Complainant, and incorporates images and content that create a false impression of affiliation with the Complainant. No clear information regarding the actual owner or registrant of the disputed domain name is provided, and the website also offers multiple service packages incorporating the SHOPIFY Mark in their names, further evidencing the commercial exploitation of the Complainant's trademark.

The Panel finds that this use is calculated to mislead Internet users into believing that the disputed domain name is legitimately connected to the Complainant, thereby disrupting the Complainant's business. Such use amplifies the implied affiliation created by the composition of the disputed domain name and constitutes impersonation or passing off, effectively presenting the website as one operated by the Complainant or its authorized affiliates or web designers. Panels have consistently held that such conduct cannot confer rights or legitimate interests under the Policy, as it generates confusion and constitutes illegitimate and potentially unlawful activity. The use of a domain name for deceptive or fraudulent purposes, including impersonation or passing off, can never give rise to rights or legitimate interests. See, *inter alia*, *Accenture Global Services Limited v. Hermila Layne*, WIPO Case No. D2025-3386; *SmithValeriot Law Firm LLP v. Adeyeye Samuel, sharpgist*, WIPO Case No. D2021-3804; and WIPO Overview 3.1, section 2.13.1.

The Panel further finds that the Respondent's use does not qualify as nominative fair use under the Policy. The Panel notes that the Complainant's website offers, among its services, a Shopify e-commerce website builder. Therefore, the Respondent offers services that compete with the Complainant, while misleading users through impersonation or passing off. See, e.g., *Dareos LTD., Dareos INC. v. Global Domain Privacy Services Inc, Denis Belov, Asocial Games Ltd., Global Domain Privacy Services Inc, Alexander Strunin, Maria Hanina, Natalya Pladzidina, Anastasia Voloshina, and Svetlana Sboychikova*, WIPO Case No. D2022-1023. As noted in that decision, where a website offers competing services and extensively displays a complainant's trademarks, the conduct demonstrates an attempt to impersonate the complainant and mislead users for commercial gain.

Under these circumstances, the Panel finds that the inclusion of a non-prominently displayed disclaimer, in small text, either at the very top of the homepage (which disappears when scrolling or navigating the site) or at the bottom of the page, is insufficient to establish rights or legitimate interests. Such disclaimers are unlikely to

be read by Internet users and cannot prevent confusion. See, e.g., *Instagram, LLC v. Vu Ha*, WIPO Case No. DIO2025-0010. Moreover, the disclaimer itself is internally contradictory and not sufficiently clear, as it acknowledges the SHOPIFY Mark while simultaneously using “Shopify Web Builders” as the site’s identifying name.

Consequently, in the absence of any Response or contrary evidence, the Panel concludes that none of the circumstances set out in paragraph 4(c) of the Policy, nor any other circumstances giving rise to rights or legitimate interests, are present. Accordingly, the second element under paragraph 4(a) of the Policy has been established.

4.2.3 Registration and Use of the Domain Name in Bad Faith

For the purposes of paragraph 4(a)(iii) of the Policy, paragraph 4(b) of the Policy establishes circumstances, in particular, but without limitation, that, if found by the Panel to be present, shall be evidence of the registration and use of a domain name in bad faith.

In the present case, the Panel notes that the SHOPIFY Mark is highly distinctive and enjoys an established international well-known character. Prior decisions under the Policy have expressly recognized the international fame or well-known character of the SHOPIFY Mark. See, inter alia, *Shopify Inc. v. Oldo Glory, Organization; Sutherland*, CIIDRC Decision No. 25608-UDRP; *Shopify Inc. v. Katy Rodriguez*, CIIDRC Decision No. 24334-UDRP; *Shopify Inc. v. Christoforos Aivazidis*, CIIDRC Decision No. 24336-UDRP; and *Shopify Inc. v. aafaq s*, CIIDRC Decision No. 23918-UDRP.

The Complainant’s extensive online presence further reinforces that the Respondent was, or ought to have been, aware of the Complainant’s rights at the time of registration. A simple Internet search for the term “shopify” yields results overwhelmingly associated with the Complainant and its trademark.

Furthermore, the Respondent’s use of the disputed domain name confirms that the Respondent specifically targeted the Complainant and its trademark. The Respondent’s website prominently displays the SHOPIFY Mark, a similar version of the Complainant’s green “S” shopping bag logo, and reproduces the Complainant’s branding and color scheme. It advertises services purportedly related to the Complainant’s platform and presents content designed to suggest affiliation or authorization, creating the false impression that the site is operated by the Complainant or an officially authorized designer or affiliated web development company. Such conduct constitutes illegitimate activity indicative of bad faith under the Policy. See WIPO Overview 3.1, section 3.4.

Panels have consistently held that attempts to pass off a website as an official site of a trademark owner—through the display of the relevant mark or logo—constitute strong evidence of bad faith and are likely to disrupt the complainant’s business. See, inter alia, *Decathlon v. Manlidy*, WIPO Case No. D2024-3550; and *Accenture Global Services Limited v. Hermila Layne, supra*.

Accordingly, having reviewed the record, the Panel finds that the Respondent's registration and use of the disputed domain name constitute bad faith under the Policy. The composition of the disputed domain name, which wholly incorporates the distinctive SHOPIFY Mark, together with the content and presentation of the Respondent's website, are designed and calculated to confuse Internet users for a commercial gain. This demonstrates an intention to confuse Internet users by creating a false impression of an authorized source for web design services related to the Complainant's platform, in order to exploit the goodwill associated with the SHOPIFY Mark.

Therefore, the Panel finds that the Respondent has intentionally attempted to attract, for commercial gain, Internet users to its website by creating a likelihood of confusion with the Complainant's trademark as to source, sponsorship, affiliation, or endorsement, and by passing off as, or impersonating, the Complainant or one of its authorized affiliates. Such conduct falls squarely within the circumstances of bad faith set out in paragraph 4(b)(iv) of the Policy.

Under these circumstances, the inclusion of a non-prominently displayed and unclear disclaimer, which may easily go unnoticed by Internet users, is insufficient to cure the Respondent's bad faith. See, e.g., *Bayerische Motoren Werke AG v. Ralfs Liepins, Birojs 2B SIA*, WIPO Case No. D2025-0067, where the panel found that a disclaimer "would go unnoticed by most Internet users, who will most likely believe that they are on a website operated by or affiliated with the Complainant."

Furthermore, where the overall circumstances indicate bad faith, the mere existence of a disclaimer cannot neutralize it. Panels have consistently treated disclaimers in such contexts as an admission that users may be confused, which is precisely the case here. See, e.g., *CBOCS Properties, Inc. v. Kas Is*, WIPO Case No. D2025-1419; and WIPO Overview 3.1, section 3.7.

The Complainant has further alleged that several merchants who attempted to engage the Respondent's services were defrauded, paying fees without receiving the promised services. This conduct further supports a finding of the Respondent's fraudulent intent and the illegitimate nature of its activities. However, even if the Respondent were a legitimate website development provider, its use of the disputed domain name would still constitute bad faith under paragraph 4(b)(iv) of the Policy. A respondent cannot exploit a complainant's trademark to attract Internet users in a manner likely to cause confusion. Any scenario in which a respondent seeks to take unfair advantage of, abuse, or otherwise engage in conduct detrimental to a complainant's trademark, with no rights or legitimate interests that justify such conduct, satisfies the complainant's burden with respect to the third element of the Policy. UDRP panels have consistently held that the registration and use of a domain name implying false affiliation with a well-known trademark for commercial gain, with no rights or legitimate interests, constitutes bad faith. See WIPO Overview 3.1, section 3.1.

Finally, the Respondent's failure to submit a response, and thereby to rebut the Complainant's allegations, further supports the finding of bad faith.

Accordingly, the Panel concludes that the Complainant has established the third element of paragraph 4(a) of the Policy.

5 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 disputed domain name <shopifywebbuilders.com> be TRANSFERRED to the Complainant.

Made as of March 25, 2026.

SIGNATURE OF PANEL



Reyes Campello Estebanz

Sole Panelist

