



CANADIAN INTERNATIONAL INTERNET DISPUTE RESOLUTION CENTRE

DOMAIN NAME DISPUTE

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL

DECISION

CIIDRC case number:	26672--UDRP	Decision date: 27 April 2026
Domain Name:	relishideas.com	
Panel:	Stefanie G. Efstathiou	
Complainant:	Relish Ideas Inc.	
Respondent:	Matt Cohen	

1. PROCEDURAL HISTORY

The procedural history of this case was set out in a letter from the Canadian International Internet Dispute Resolution Centre to the Panel:

1. On February 17, 2026, the Complainant filed a Complaint pursuant to the UDRP and the UDRP Rules via online platform. The required fee was received on March 5, 2026.
2. On March 7, 2026, CIIDRC transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the Domain Name, and on March 9, 2026, the Registrar responded advising of the identity of the Respondent and providing the above contact details. In addition, the Registrar confirmed that the Domain Name was placed in a Registrar LOCK.
3. CIIDRC confirmed compliance of the Complaint and commencement of the dispute resolution process.
4. On March 27, 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.
5. The deadline for submitting a Response was set for April 16, 2026.
6. The Respondent has failed to file its response.

Domain Names: **relishideas.com**
2266672-UDRP

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

8. In accordance with Rule 5 (d), CIIDRC hereby appoints you, **Stefanie G. Efsthathiou**, as a single-member Panel in the above-referenced matter. The Panel conducted a diligent search of her records to confirm her impartiality and independence vis-à-vis the parties and counsel. The Panel finds that it is properly constituted, completed and submitted to the CIIDRC a duly completed Statement of Impartiality and Independence.

The Domain Name was registered on **March 21, 2023**.

This matter is conducted pursuant to the Uniform Domain Name Dispute Resolution Policy (the Policy) and the Rules for Uniform Domain Name Dispute Resolution Policy (the Rules) of the Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers (ICANN).

2. FACTS ALLEGED BY THE PARTIES

The Complainant is Relish Ideas Inc., a branding and advertising agency that has operated since 2012. On March 3, 2023, the Complainant registered <relishideas.ca> and has since used "RELISH IDEAS" as a trade name and brand in connection with its advertising and marketing services, including on its website and in client-facing materials.

The Complainant also maintains brand presence under the name "RELISH IDEAS" through invoices/proposals, business listings, social media, Google Business Profile, advertising campaigns, demonstrating goodwill and therefore relies on common-law trademark rights in the RELISH IDEAS name.

The Domain Name <relishideas.com> was registered by the Respondent on March 21, 2023. The Respondent has configured <relishideas.com> to automatically redirect users to Brandish (brandishagency.com), a direct competitor offering the same/similar services.

The Respondent did not submit any response.

3. CONTENTIONS OF THE PARTIES

- **Complainant**

The Complainant submits that it has unregistered (common-law) trademark rights on "RELISH IDEAS" and that the Domain Name is identical to the unregistered trademark.

Furthermore, the Complainant states that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in the Domain Name. In this regard, the Complainant argues that there is no evidence of any bona fide use/offering of goods or services of the Domain Name, as the Domain Name redirects to a competitor's side and does so without changing

the domain name appearing on the browser address, that Respondent is not making a legitimate, non-commercial or fair use of the Domain Name, that there is also no evidence that the Respondent has been known by the Domain Name and it has not licensed or otherwise permitted the Respondent to use its trademark, nor has it licensed or otherwise permitted Respondent to apply for or use any domain names incorporating any of this mark.

Finally, the Complainant states that the Domain Name was registered and is being used in bad faith, since there is a clear attempt to make it seem like the Domain Name is related to the Complainant and since the Respondent attempted to attract for commercial gain, Internet users to Respondent's website by creating a likelihood of confusion with Complainant's trademark and its website as to the source, sponsorship, affiliation, or endorsement of Respondent's website.

- **Respondent**

No administratively compliant Response has been filed.

- **Remedy Sought**

The Complainant requests the Domain Name be transferred to it.

4. DISCUSSION AND FINDINGS

4.1 Requirements

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

The Complainant claims unregistered trademark rights in the term "RELISH IDEAS".

It alleges *inter alia* the following:

- “On **March 3, 2023**, the Complainant registered the domain **relishideas.ca** and has since used **RELISH IDEAS** as a trade name and brand in connection with its advertising and marketing services, including on its website and in client-facing materials.”
- “On **March 03, 2023**, the Complainant registered the domain **relishideas.ca** and has continuously used it for marketing and providing information about its services. The Complainant also maintains brand presence under the name RELISH IDEAS through **invoices/proposals, business listings, social media, Google Business Profile, advertising campaigns**, demonstrating goodwill and common-law trademark rights in the RELISH IDEAS name prior to the Respondent’s registration of the disputed domain.”
- “The Complaint is based on the unregistered (common-law) service mark and trade name **RELISH IDEAS** (also used as **RELISHIDEAS** and in the domain name **RELISHIDEAS.CA**). The Complainant also operates under the legal business name **Relish Ideas Inc.**, which is registered with the **Manitoba Companies Office**, and uses **RELISH IDEAS** publicly to identify its services.”
- “The mark is used on the Complainant’s website at **relishideas.ca** and in client-facing materials such as proposals, invoices, and marketing collateral.”
- “The Complainant intends to continue and expand use of the **RELISH IDEAS** mark in connection with the services listed above and related marketing/advertising offerings, including additional service packages and online marketing channels under the same brand.”

Nevertheless, the Complainant did not submit any proof of the above whatsoever. Even Annex 1 to the Complaint that is meant to prove the Complainant’s rights as a registrant of the domain name <relishideas.ca> is not showing the Complainant as registrant, since the version of the Whois is a redacted version.

There is no question that the Domain Name is identical to RELISH IDEAS, in which the Complainant claims unregistered trademark rights. However, the issue is as to whether or not the Complainant has demonstrated the existence of those rights.

In order for a complainant to establish unregistered or common law trademark rights for purposes of the UDRP, the complainant must show that its mark has become a distinctive identifier which consumers associate with the complainant’s goods and/or services.

Relevant evidence demonstrating such acquired distinctiveness (also referred to as secondary meaning) includes a range of factors such as (i) the duration and nature of the use of the mark (which may include social media presence and engagement), (ii) the amount of sales under the mark and during which time period, (iii) the nature and extent of advertising using the mark – including evidence of expenditures over a relevant time period, (iv) the degree of actual public (e.g., consumer, industry such as trade and professional associations, media) recognition, and (v) consumer surveys.

The claimed mark must also be used as a source identifier of goods or services e.g., on a website or on products or packaging used in commerce, provided that the mark, as used, is linked to the goods or services that are being

branded with the mark; this may include use by the complainant on letterhead or invoices or email headers and signatures.

Some of the above have been argued by the Complainant, however, no material and substantive proof has been submitted for that.

Furthermore, even Complainant itself mentions that the use of "RELISH IDEAS" as a brand and trade name started only after the registration of its alleged domain name <relishideas.ca>, which was on March 3, 2023. The Domain Name in dispute was registered on March 21, 2023 – "approximately **18 days** after the Complainant registered relishideas.ca and began operating publicly under the RELISH IDEAS name", as Complainant submits. It is quite unlikely that the Complainant's trade name acquired the needed recognition and secondary meaning in order to satisfy the necessary threshold of a common law /unregistered trademark in only 18 days.

Consequently, the Complainant failed in demonstrating any relevant unregistered or common law trademark rights in the term "RELISH IDEAS", especially prior to the registration of the Domain Name. Whether the Complainant ever had any such rights, the Panel is simply unable to assess on the basis of the evidence before it. The Panel finds that the Complainant has failed to prove that the Domain Name is identical or confusingly similar to a trade mark or service mark in which the Complainant has rights, and for this reason the Complaint must fail.

4.2.2 Rights or Legitimate Interests in respect of the Domain Name

In light of the Panel's finding under 4.2.1 above, it is unnecessary for the Panel to address this requirement.

4.2.3 Registration and Use of the Domain Name in Bad Faith

In light of the Panel's finding under 4.2.1 above, it is unnecessary for the Panel to address this requirement.

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 denies the Complaint without prejudice.

Made as of 27 April 2026

SIGNATURE OF PANEL

Domain Names: relishideas.com
2266672-UDRP

