



CANADIAN INTERNATIONAL INTERNET DISPUTE RESOLUTION CENTRE
DOMAIN NAME DISPUTE
ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL
DECISION

CIIDRC case number:	26662-CDRP	Decision date: April 18, 2026
Domain Name:	kgsgroups.ca	
Panel:	Melvyn J. Simburg, FCI Arb.	
Complainant:	Kontzamanis Graumann Smith MacMillan Inc.	
Registrant:	Lauren Lökk	

1. OVERVIEW

This matter concerns a registered domain, <**kgsgroups.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:

2.1. On February 24, 2026, Matthew Peña filed a Complaint on behalf of Kontzamanis Graumann Smith MacMillan Inc., pursuant to the CDRP and the Resolution Rules. The complaint was in administrative compliance with CIRA’s requirements under Rule 3.2.

2.2. CIRA was notified of these proceedings and subsequently emailed its response to the verification request to CIIDRC, stating that the registrant of the disputed domain name is Lauren Lökk (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 2026-01-20 (the “Registration Date”).

Domain Name: **kgsgroups.ca**
26662-CDRP

2.3. 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 March 3, 2026.

2.4. The Registrant failed to file a response to date.

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

2.6. The Complaint deposited the required Panel fee on March 27, 2026.

2.7. On March 31, 2026, CIIDRC appointed Melvyn Simburg, FCI Arb, as a single-member Panel in the above-referenced matter, which appointment was accepted on April 2, 2026.

2.8 The Domain Name was registered on January 20, 2026.

3. FACTS ALLEGED BY THE PARTIES

3.1 The Complainant's owner Pallikaria Inc. owns the "KGS Group" trademark, which has been registered pursuant to Canada's *Trademarks Act* (R.S.C. 1985, c.T-13), and all related rights. These rights have been licensed by Pallikaria Inc. to the Complainant

3.2 The Complainant and its owner, or their predecessors, have had control over or owned the "KGS Group" trademark and brand for decades. As a result of their stewardship, the Complainant is now well known throughout Canada in the consulting sphere, as a reputable mid-sized engineering firm.

3.3. Demonstration of this reputation and the Complainant's legitimate and good faith purpose can be confirmed through a review of its LinkedIn profile and website. Screenshots of the Complainant's profile and website are attached at Schedule "C1-C2" to Annex 1 to the Complaint.

3.4. The Complainant has used the "kgsgroup.com" domain since 1996, when it was originally registered as confirmed in its "Whois" information. A copy of this information is attached at Schedule "D" to Annex 1 to the Complaint.

3.5. The Complainant has been operating long before then and is celebrating its 40th anniversary this year in 2026. This milestone is reflected in the Complainant's recent LinkedIn post, a copy of which is attached at Schedule "E" to Annex 1 to the Complaint.

3.6. The Disputed Domain Name "kgsgroups.ca" was registered January 20, 2026. The Registrant has had no online presence or connection to the Disputed Domain prior to its registration.

3.7. The Disputed Domain Name resolved to a duplicate of the Complainant's own website.

4. CONTENTIONS OF THE PARTIES

Domain Name: kgsgroups.ca
26662-CDRP

- **Complainant**

4.1. The Complainant submits that The Complainant satisfies the Canadian presence requirements.

- 4.1.1. Complainant is a corporation registered under Canadian Federal Laws as Kontzamanis Graumann Smith MacMillan Inc., as confirmed by the Manitoba Companies Office's corporate summary, a copy of which is attached at **Schedule "A"** to Annex 1; an
- 4.1.2. The Complainant (through its owner Pallikaria Inc.) owns the "KGS Group" trademark and brand.
- 4.1.3. This trademark and licencing arrangement are confirmed in the: (1) Approval Notice to Pallikaria Inc., when it applied to register the "KGS Group" trademark; (2) the resulting Certificate of Registration; and (3) the License Agreement entered in 2016 through which Pallikaria Inc. licensed the entire "KGS Group" brand, and related rights, to the Complainant. Copies of these documents are attached at **Schedules "B1-B3"** to Annex 1 to the Complaint.

4.2. The Domain Name is Similar to Complainant's Trademark.

- 4.2.1. Complainant owns rights over the "KGS Group" trademark (the "Complainant's Mark"), which has been registered with the Canadian Intellectual Property Office ("CIPO").
- 4.2.2. Complainant's Mark and related rights are confirmed in the Approval Notice, the resulting Certificate of Registration, and the current License Agreement (see Schedules "B1-B3" to the Annex to the Complaint).
- 4.2.3. The only difference is that the "ksgroups.ca" Disputed Domain has an added "s".
- 4.2.4. As set out in paragraph 3.3 of the Policy, when considering whether a domain is confusingly similar to a Mark, the only consideration is "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." Satisfying this consideration, the Disputed Domain is unmistakably confusingly similar to both the Complainant's Mark of "KGS Group" and its corresponding domain name of "ksgroup.com".

4.3. The Respondent Has No Legitimate Interest in the Domain Name.

- 4.3.1. The Registrant does not and cannot satisfy any of the possible purposes described under paragraph 3.4 of the Policy and therefore has no legitimate interest in the Disputed Domain.
- 4.3.2. More, specifically, the Disputed Domain is neither:
 - 4.3.2.1. A Mark of the Registrant;
 - 4.3.2.2. Registered in good faith in association with any wares or services, and clearly descriptive in Canada or English in any applicable manner;

- 4.3.2.3. Registered in good faith in association with any wares or services, and an applicable generic name in any language;
- 4.3.2.4. Used in good faith for noncommercial criticism or news;
- 4.3.2.5. Comprises the legal name of the Registrant; nor
- 4.3.2.6. A geographical name of the Registrant's noncommercial activity or place of business.

4.3.3. The Complainant has never provided the Registrant with any form of authorization to register the Disputed Domain, and there is no online or physical presence or indication that the Registrant is commonly known by the Disputed Domain, or anything similar.

4.3.4. There is no legitimate live website associated with the Disputed Domain, or any sort of related trademark registered with CIPO.

4.4. The Domain Name was Registered in Bad Faith

- 4.4.1. The actual and deceptive purpose of the Registrant is to scam and fraudulently obtain personal and financial information of job candidates who are misled to believe they are communicating with the Complainant.
- 4.4.2. The Registrant's conduct satisfies paragraph 3.5(d) of the Policy, as the Registrant has intentionally attracted these candidates as "Internet users" to the Registrant's website or other on-line location, by confusing them into wrongfully believing they were interacting with the Complainant, by creating a likelihood of confusion with the Complainant's Mark.
- 4.4.3. The Disputed Domain has been made and used for a sophisticated, unlawful, and bad faith scheme to intentionally mislead job applicants for the Registrant's personal gain and the candidates' corresponding loss.
- 4.4.4. Evidence of this bad faith purpose is contained in exchanges between the Registrant and several of these candidates, as well as communications between one of these candidates and the Complainant where this candidate explained the Registrant's scheme to the Complainant and agreed to share their information for the purposes of this Complaint. Copies of these exchanges are attached at Schedules "H1-H4" to Annex 1 to the Complaint.
- 4.4.5. Over thirty of these candidates have reached out the Complainant so far to report being scammed, or of failed attempts to do so; each wrongly believed they were applying to work for the Complainant as a reputable mid-sized Canadian Engineering Consulting firm.

- **Registrant**

The Registrant has not submitted a response.

- **Remedy Sought**

The Complainant requests the Domain Name be transferred to it.

5. DISCUSSION AND FINDINGS

5.1 Eligibility

The Complainant is an eligible complainant under paragraph 1.4 of the CDRP. The Complainant is a “corporation under the laws of Canada or any province or territory of Canada” in compliance with section 2.4 of the Canadian Presence requirements of CIRA Policies version 1.3.

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

5.3.1.1. Under paragraph 3.3 of the Policy, a domain name will be found to be confusingly similar to a complainant’s mark if it so nearly resembles it in appearance, sound, or ideas suggested so as to be likely to be mistaken for the trademark. This test is one of first impression, and imperfect recollection. Further, paragraph 1.2 of the Policy provides that a domain name for the purposes of this analysis excludes the “dot-ca” suffix.

5.3.1.2. The Disputed Domain Name contains the Complainant’s trade name and Mark content in their entirety. The only difference is that the “kgsgroups.ca” Disputed Domain has an added “s”. “[I]n cases where a domain name incorporates the entirety of a trademark... the domain name will normally be considered confusingly similar to that mark for purposes of UDRP standing.” WIPO Overview 3.0, section 1.7. See also, e.g., *PepsiCo, Inc. v. PEPSI, SRL (a/k/a P.E.P.S.I.) and EMS Computer Industry (a/k/a EMS)*, WIPO Case No. D2003-0696 (“incorporating a trademark in its entirety can be sufficient to establish that a domain name is identical or confusingly similar to a registered trademark”).

5.3.1.3. For the above reasons, the Panel concludes that the Disputed Domain Name is confusingly similar to a mark in which Complainant has rights.

5.3.2 Whether the Registrant registered the Domain Name in Bad Faith

5.3.2.1. The Registrant has, since registering the Disputed Domain Name, maintained a website that reproduced exactly the Complainant's original website.

5.3.2.2 Registrant has shown a flagrant disregard for the Complainant's rights by replicating the exact Mark, as well as the Complainant's original webpages, in association with services that are identical to the services provided by the Complainant. In fact, since Registrant has not shown that Registrant is in a similar business at all, it appears that Registrant is misleading users into believing that they are interacting with Complainant.

5.3.2.3 Bad faith registration may be demonstrated based on the grounds enumerated in paragraph 3.5 of the Policy as well as the surrounding circumstances. In making a finding of bad faith, reasonable inferences may be drawn from the available evidence. The Registrant's use of the Domain name in this case is objectively intended to trade off and disrupt the goodwill and reputation in and to the Complainant's Marks.

5.3.2.4. The Registrant's activities also demonstrate bad faith under paragraph 3.5(d). If a consumer or Internet user is attracted to a registrant's website using the complainant's trademark in the domain name, a visitor is likely to be confused and misled as to the source, sponsorship, affiliation or endorsement of that registrant's website and the products offered for sale therein. (Oakley, Inc v Zhou Yayang, Case No. DCA-1377-CIRA at para 30).

5.3.2.5. The panel concludes that the Registrant's use of the Claimant's website in connection with the Disputed Domain Name means that the Registrant has registered the domain name primarily for the purpose of disrupting the business of Complainant, or has intentionally attempted to attract, for commercial gain, Internet users to the Registrant's website, by creating a likelihood of confusion with Complainant's mark as to the source, sponsorship, affiliation, or endorsement of the Registrant's website or of a product or service on the Registrant's website or location, thereby registering the Domain Name in bad faith.

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

5.3.3.1. In cases where a domain name is an exact match for a brand owner's trademark, the initial assumption will be that a registrant does not have a legitimate interest in said domain absent an agreement to the contrary between the parties. Here, the Disputed Domain Name contains an exact match to Complainant's trademark (plus only the letter "s") and there is no written or other agreement between the parties.

5.3.3.2. The Registrant fails to meet any of the enumerated legitimate interests set out in section 3.4 of the Policy. First, with respect to paragraph 3.4(a), there is no indication that the Registrant has legitimately used the Domain Name as a mark the for the purpose of distinguishing the goods, services, or business of the Registrant from those of others. To the contrary, it appears Registrant has used the Domain Name to imitate the services of Complainant and confuse users as

to its relationship with Complainant. Nor does the Registrant otherwise have any rights arising through use of the Domain Name as a trademark. The Registrant, lacking "Rights in the Mark," cannot show a legitimate interest under paragraph 3.4(a) of the CDRP.

5.3.3.3. To the extent of the evidence presented, the Disputed Domain Name was not registered in good faith in association with any wares, services or business that is "clearly descriptive" 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. The registered domain name is not clearly descriptive in the manner required by paragraph 3.4(b), except with respect to Complainant's business.

5.3.3.4. The circumstances listed in Section 3.4 of the Policy are not exclusive. Nevertheless, the Registrant has not shown any other basis to conclude Registrant has a legitimate interest in the Disputed Domain Name. Therefore, the Panel concludes that the Registrant has no rights or legitimate interest in the Disputed Domain Name.

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 Complainant is entitled to transfer of the domain name "**kgsgroups.ca**" from the Registrant to the Complainant **Kontzamanis Graumann Smith MacMillan Inc.** Once Complainant provides CIRA with the contact information necessary for the transfer and at least 30 days have elapsed thereafter, CIRA is to transfer the domain name in accordance with Complainant's instructions, this Decision, and CIRA policies.

Made as of April 18, 2026

SIGNATURE OF PANEL
