



## CANADIAN INTERNATIONAL INTERNET DISPUTE RESOLUTION CENTRE

### DOMAIN NAME DISPUTE

### ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL

### DECISION

CIIDRC case number:	<b>26987-CDRP</b>	Decision date: <b>June 14, 2026</b>
Domain Name:	<b>&lt;londonhydro.ca&gt;</b>	
Panel:	<b>Thomas Manson, KC</b>	
Complainant:	<b>London Hydro Inc.</b>	
Complainant's Representative	<b>Harrison Pensa LLP</b>	
Registrant:	<b>Antonia Ojo</b>	

#### 1. OVERVIEW

This matter is an administrative proceeding under the CIRA Domain Name Dispute Resolution Policy ("CDRP") and the CIRA Domain Name Dispute Resolution Rules ("Rules") of the Canadian Internet Registry Authority ("CIRA"). The Canadian International Internet Dispute Resolution Centre ("CIIDRC") is a recognized dispute resolution service provider under the CDRP.

This proceeding concerns a registered domain, <londonhydro.ca> (the "Domain Name").

#### 2. PROCEDURAL HISTORY

Based on a letter from CIIDRC to this Panel dated May 28, 2026, and the proceedings herein, the procedural history of this matter is that:

On April 14, 2026, David Canton of Harrison Pensa LLP filed a complaint on behalf of the Complainant, pursuant to the CDRP and the Rules, concerning the Domain Name, <londonhydro.ca>.

On April 20, 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 Domain Name was “Antonia Ojo” organization “0902066 BC Ltd” and confirmed that locks had been placed with respect to the Domain Name.

Pursuant to 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 April 21, 2026.

The Registrant failed to submit a response and the CIIDRC sent a Notification of Respondent’s Default” by email dated May 14, 2026. The Registrant did not participate in this administrative proceeding.

The Complainant elected a panel consisting of a single arbitrator.

By letter dated May 28, 2026, CIIDRC appointed me as a single-member panel in this matter. I have submitted the required Statement of Independence and Impartiality to CIIDRC.

The Panel determines that it has been properly appointed and constituted to determine the Complaint in accordance with the CDRP and Rules.

A request for further evidence or argument was made by the Panel by email dated June 4, 2026, with respect to certain allegations made by the Complainant. The Complainant’s representative responded by email dated June 8, 2026. No response or comment was given by the Registrant.

The Panel made a second request for further evidence or argument by email dated June 8, 2026, to clarify matters arising from the reply and also seeking further clarification of the Complaint. The Complainant’s representative responded by email dated June 9, 2026. No response or comment was given by the Registrant.

### **3. FACTS**

Prior to April 2000, London Hydro was a division of the City of London called the “Hydro Electric Commission of the City of London.” It was commonly known as and carried on business as “London Hydro”; that entity registered <londonhydro.com> in 1995.

The Complainant was incorporated under the Ontario Business Corporations Act in April 2000 pursuant to the Electricity Act, 1998, SO 1998, c 15, Sch A. It is an electrical utility wholly owned by the City of London, Ontario. The Complainant is an Local Distribution Company (LDC), that owns

and operates the infrastructure required to deliver electricity to end-users (residential, commercial, and industrial customers) within the geographical area of London, Ontario.

The City of London incorporated London Hydro Utilities Services Inc. on April 26, 2000 with the City of London as sole shareholder. The name was changed to London Hydro Inc. by articles of amendment dated May 15, 2001. The City remains the sole shareholder today. The incorporation was done pursuant to part XI of the Electricity Act, 1998, which allowed municipalities to incorporate electrical utilities under the Ontario Business Corporations Act. The assets of the Hydro Electric Commission of the City of London, including <londonhydro.com>, were transferred to the Complainant.

The Complainant has section 9 marks registered in the CIPO database for:

“London Hydro” filed in 2002 and registered July 16, 2003 (Annex 4)

“London Hydro & Design” filed in 2002 and registered July 16, 2003 (Annex 5)

The Domain Name was registered on <2012-10-01>.

The Complainant engaged a third party to perform a penetration test in 2025. That test brought the <londonhydro.ca> registration to the attention of its Cybersecurity Manager, and flagged it as a security risk that could damage London Hydro’s reputation and place customers or staff at risk.

By email dated April 1, 2026 (Annex 2), the identity of the Registrant was provided to the Complainant by CIRA through the Request for Disclosure of Registrant Information Process. This identified “Antonia Ojo” with an address in Richmond, British Columbia as the registrant associated with <londonhydro.ca>.

At least since 2025, the website at the Domain Name redirects any user to sites containing malware and spam. Exactly where <londonhydro.ca> redirects varies at any given moment, but it consistently redirects to malware and spam sites.

In response to the First Rule 11.1 Request, by email dated June 8, 2026, the Complainant provided an undated copy of a landing page of a sub-domain, <ww1.londonhydro.ca>. This copy displayed, in part:

**“londonhydro.ca”**

“Related Searches”

COSMETIC SAMPLES >
ECO-FRIENDLY POWER SERVICES >
HEAT SINK >

#### 4. CONTENTIONS OF THE PARTIES

- **Complainant**

The Complainant submits that the Domain Name is identical to the Complainant’s corporate name and Marks. The Domain Name incorporates the Complainant’s name in its entirety, simply adding “.ca” to it.

The Complainant next submits that the Registrant has no legitimate interest in the Domain Name. The website at <londonhydro.ca> exhibits none of the six criteria for legitimate interest listed in paragraph 3.4 of the CDRP.

The Complainant argues that the Registrant has a pattern of registering other people’s marks as domain names in order to prevent persons who have Rights in Marks from registering the marks as domain names. A search for CDRP decisions on the CIRA website for the name “Antonia Ojo” shows seven decisions where the Registrant had domain names transferred. Those domain names included well-known brands, or spelling variations on well-known brands. Annex 14 listed search results from the CIPO (presumably CIRA) database for seven decisions with the name “Antontia Ojo” where a domain name registered to the registrant<sup>1</sup> was transferred to a complainant:

- Wood Wyant Canada Inc v. Antonia Ojo*, CIRA Case No. 00494 (presumably 20092-CDRP), 2023 (transfer of <woodwyant.ca>, which had been registered anonymously in 2010);
- Equifax Inc and Equifax Canada Co. v Antonia Ojo/0902066 BC Ltd.*, CIRA Case No 00473 (presumably 16881-CDRP), 2022 (transfer of <eqifax.ca>, <eqifax.ca>, and <quifax>, which “Antonia Ojo” or an initial registrant had registered in 2002, 2003, and 2015, respectively);
- Liberty Procurement Co. Inc. v. Antonia Ojo*, CIRA Case No. 00420 (presumably DCA-2169-CIRA), 2020 (transfer of <bedbathbeyond.ca>, which Antonia Ojo had registered in 2007).

---

<sup>1</sup> Dates of registration associated with “Antonia Ojo” in items a – g are those provided in the CIRA decisions referred to.

- d. *ADESA, Inc. v. Antonia Ojo*, CIRA Case No. 00391, 2019 (transfer of <adesapublicauction.ca>, which Antonia Ojo had registered in 2011);
- e. *Stanley Black & Decker, Inc. v. Antonia Ojo*, CIRA Case No. 00386, 2019 (transfer of <craftsman.ca>, which Antonia Ojo had registered in 2007);
- f. *Payless ShoeSource Worldwide, Inc. v. Antonia Ojo*, CIRA Case No. 00364, 2018 (transfer of <paylessshoes.ca>, which Antonia Ojo had registered in 2004); and
- g. *Kijiji International Limited v. Antonia Ojo*, CIRA Case No. 00307, 2016 (transfer of <kijijj.ca>, <kijigi.ca>, <kijijiii.ca>, <kijijiji.ca>, <kilili.ca>, <kingstonkijiji.ca>, <kjiji.ca> and <wwwkijiji.ca>).

Last, the Complainant submits that the Registrant registered the Domain Name in bad faith and relies on paragraphs 3.5.1 (presumably 3.5(a)), 3.5.2 (presumably 3.5(b)), and 3.5.4 (presumably 3.5(d)) of the CDRP.

- **Registrant**

The Registrant filed no response to the Complaint and no submissions were made on their behalf.

- **Remedy Sought**

The Complainant requests that the registration of <londonhydro.ca> be transferred to it.

## **5. DISCUSSION AND FINDINGS**

### **5.1 Eligibility**

In order to initiate the Complaint, paragraph 1.4 of the CDRP requires that the Complainant at the time of the initiation of the Complaint must satisfy the Canadian Presence Requirements for Registrants (the “CPR”) unless the Complaint relates to a trademark registered in the Canadian Intellectual Property Office (“CIPO”) and the Complainant is the owner of the trademark.

Here, the Complainant is a corporation incorporated under the laws of Ontario. Further, the Complaint relates to a Mark, “LONDON HYDRO”, filed in 2002 and registered in CIPO, and the Complainant is the owner of the trademarks, TMA 0914650 (Annex 4, word mark) and 0914651 (Annex 5, the associated design mark).

As such, the Complainant is an eligible complainant under paragraph 1.4 of the CDRP.

## 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, further, the Complainant must provide some evidence that the Registrant has no legitimate interest in the Domain Name.

## 5.3 Analysis

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

The Complainant has shown evidence of its ownership of the registered mark “LONDON HYDRO” in Canada 10 years before registration of the Domain Name and that it continues to have rights to the Mark.

According to paragraph 3.3 of the CDRP, “in determining whether a domain name is “Confusingly Similar” to a Mark, the Panel must only consider whether a 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”. Further, according to paragraph 1.2 of the CDRP, the domain name for the purpose of the CDRP means the domain name excluding the country code top-level domain (ccTLD) “.ca”.

In this case, the relevant part of the Domain Name is “londonhydro”. The Domain Name is identical to the Complainant’s word mark “LONDON HYDRO”.

In *Anytime Fitness Franchisor v Witt*, 20091-CDRP (March 13, 2023) [use of the trademark ANYTIME FITNESS] in <anytimefitness.ca>, the Panel observed:

“Where a domain name is identical and wholly incorporates a Complainant’s registered Mark, this is sufficient to establish identity or confusing similarity for the purposes of the Policy: *Nikon Inc. v. Technilab, Inc.* Case D2000-1774 (WIPO) March 7, 2001. Identity or

near identity to the Complainant's mark will always be sufficient to find that a domain name is confusingly similar to a complainant's mark: *Sleep Country Canada Inc. v. Pilfold Ventures Inc.* Case 00027 (CIRA) March 14, 2005. Since the Disputed Domain Name contains the exact wording of the Complainant's Mark, namely the use of the words "Anytime Fitness", there could be no doubt that it is confusingly similar to the Complainant's Mark."

Identical domain names have been addressed in many cases including:

- *Panavision Int'l v Mullen*, 0378-CIRA (Nov. 22, 2018) [use of the trademark "PANAVISION" in <panavision.ca>]. "The Domain Name is comprised exclusively of the PANAVISION trademark, and as a result, the Registrant cannot escape a finding of confusing similarity.";
- *Birkenstock Sales GmbH v Klimavicius*, 2246-CIRA (Aug. 15, 2020) [use of the trademark "BIRKENSTOCK" in <birkenstock.ca>]. "... the Domain Name is confusingly similar to the Complainant's Mark. The relevant word "Birkenstock" in the Domain Name is the same word as in the Mark.";
- *Loxone Electronics GmbH v Kreutz*, 15909-CDRP (Sept. 18, 2021) [use of the trademark "LOXONE" in <loxone.ca>]. "In the instances where the domain name incorporates the distinguishing element of the Mark, confusion will be established. ... the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to "LOXONE" Mark.";
- *SW Soccer (DBA Inaria) v O'Connor* 26483-CDRP (Mar. 12, 2026) [use of the trademark "INARIA" in <inaria.ca>]. "[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" citing the WIPO Overview 3.1, sec 1.7 as a persuasive reference from proceedings from another top level domain<sup>2</sup>; and
- *Hostinger UAB v Privacy Guardian*, 26880-CDRP (May 9, 2026) [use of the trademark "HOSTINGER" in <hostinger.ca>]. "In the instances where the domain name incorporates the distinguishing element of the Mark, confusion will be established. ... the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to "LOXONE" Mark."

#### Overview of "Confusing Similarity"

This Panel finds that the Domain Name is confusingly similar to the LONDON HYDRO Mark being a Mark in which the Complainant had and continues to have Rights; the Complainant has satisfied paragraph 4.1(a) of CDRP.

---

<sup>2</sup> Such a reference is authorized by paragraph 3.2(l) of the Rules

### 5.3.2 Whether the Registrant registered the Domain Name in Bad Faith

To succeed in this proceeding, paragraph 4.1(b) of the CDRP requires the Complainant to demonstrate, on a balance of probabilities, that the Registrant registered the Domain Name in bad faith as described in paragraph 3.5. The CDRP provides a “non-exhaustive”<sup>3</sup> list of circumstances which constitute bad faith. In making a finding of bad faith, reasonable inferences may be drawn from the available evidence; *Workplace Safety and Insurance Board v Dickson*, 18847-CDRP <wsib-on.ca> (Jan. 25, 2023), at paragraph 4.3.3.3.

The focus of the Complainant here appears to be on paragraphs 3.5(a), (b), and (d) of the CDRP.

#### Paragraph 3.5(a)

The Complainant received no response to an offer (no date provided) to purchase the Domain Name for the Registrant’s costs in the amount of \$500 and argued that this showed bad faith under 3.5.1(presumably 3.5(a)). In its first Rule 11.1 request, the Panel asked whether the Complainant referred to any CDRP or other decision in support of the proposition that non-response to an offer is bad faith under the relevant provision. No response was provided by the Complainant to this part of the Rule 11.1 Request. Aside from the absence of any authority, this Panel does not accept that a registrant’s non-response to an offer in these circumstances constitutes bad faith under paragraph 3.5(a).

#### Paragraph 3.5(b)

With respect to 3.5.2 (presumably 3.5(b)), the Complainant relies on evidence of a pattern of registering other people’s marks as domains to prevent persons who have rights in marks from registering the marks as domain names. The Complainant refers here to *Stanley Black & Decker v Ojo* 00386-CDRP, (April 23, 2019) [finding that “Antonia Ojo” registered the <craftsman.ca> domain name in bad faith pursuant to paragraph 3.5(b)].

With respect to the first-part of the test under paragraph 3.5(b), the Registrant filed the Domain Name 17 years after the Complainant’s predecessor established <londonhydro.com>, 12 years after the Complainant was incorporated, and 10 years after the Complainant filed its “LONDON HYDRO” marks. The Complainant says that it is well-known that electrical LDCs

---

<sup>3</sup> See *Stanley Black & Decker v Ojo* 00386-CDRP, <craftsman.ca> (April 23, 2019) at para 26 and *Leidos, Inc. v Ken Smither* 24273-CDRP (Jan. 9, 2025) at para 28.

incorporate, and use as their brand, names that follow the pattern “[geographic area] Hydro” as part of the domain name, and the website displays the name “London Hydro”. This Panel accepts that the Registrant was familiar with the Complainant’s brand and name when the Domain Name was registered and that such registration would prevent the Complainant from registering its “LONDON HYDRO” Mark as a “.ca” domain name.

With respect to the second part of the test, the Complainant relies on a series of CDRP decisions from 2016 to 2023 (see Annex 14 and the decisions listed as (a) to (g) in part 4 above). As the Panel (majority decision) observed in *Panavision Int’l v Mullen* 00386-CDRP, <panavision.ca> (Nov. 22, 2018), “the Policy does not ... impose a temporal limitation on which unauthorized domain name registrations the Complainant may rely upon when establishing a “pattern” of registrations.” It appears from the CDRP decisions identified by the Complainant that at least five to seven or so were registered by “Antonia Ojo” prior to 2012 when the Domain Name was registered. Having as few as two domain name registrations is sufficient to establish that a registrant has engaged in a “pattern” of abusive registrations for the purpose of the CDRP; *Stanley Black & Decker, Inc. v. Antonia Ojo*, CIRA Case No. 00386, <craftsman.ca> (April 23, 2019), at paragraph 32. From the seven “Antonia Ojo” cases referred to (Annex 14), it appears that panels ordered the transfer of 16 domain name registrations; this establishes a “pattern” of abusive registrations. Thus, this Panel accepts that the Registrant registered the Domain Name in bad faith pursuant to paragraph 3.5(b).

Although it did not rely on paragraph 3.5(b) to find no “legitimate interest”, the panel in *Equifax Inc. and Equifax Canada Co. v Antonia Ojo/0902066 BC Ltd.* 16881-CDRP (April 25, 2022), found (at para 54) that the registrant’s (that is, “Antonia Ojo/0902066 BC Ltd.”) pattern of registering domain names adjudged to have offended the CDRP supports the inference that the Respondent lacks a legitimate interest in the Domain Names.” This same inference is supported here.

#### Paragraph 3.5(d)

With respect to paragraph 3.5.4 (presumably 3.5(d)), the Complainant says that the website at <londonhydro.ca> redirects to pages containing malware and spam, demonstrating that 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 Complainant refers to *Equifax Inc and Equifax Canada v Leigh* 24337-CDRP (Jan. 27, 2025) [finding (on page 9) that the registrant registered the <equifx.ca> domain name in bad faith pursuant to paragraph 3.5(d)]. In that case, the "monetized parking page" using the disputed domain name contained links to goods and services associated with the complainant's "EQUIFAX" trademark and hyperlinks that were "in competition with" the services of the complainant, but that is not the case here.

Although it was factually different from the present case, *Equifax Inc. and Equifax Canada* does address the general proposition, noting (at page 8):

"... the Disputed Domain Name is associated with malicious activities, which is also evidence of bad faith. See, e.g., WIPO Overview 3.0, section 3.1.4 ("the use of a domain name for *per se* illegitimate activity... is manifestly considered evidence of bad faith"); and WIPO Overview 3.0, section 3.4 ("use of a domain name for purposes other than to host a website may constitute bad faith," such as "sending email, phishing, identity theft, or malware distribution")."

The Complainant also referred to another case, *Leidos, Inc. v Ken Smither* 24273-CDRP (Jan. 9, 2025) [use of the trademark "LEIDOS" in <leidos.ca>]. There, the panel concluded (at para 30):

"The only reasonable inference to be drawn from the registration of a domain name that incorporates the whole of the Complainant's known, used and publicized Mark, in the absence of an explanation from the Registrant, is that it was done for the purpose of confusing the public into thinking that it is dealing with the Complainant when in fact the opposite is true. These facts are sufficient to demonstrate the Registrant's bad faith in registering the Domain Name."

and (at para 32):

The Panel concludes that the Registrant has intentionally created a likelihood of confusion with the Complainant's Mark as to the source, affiliation or endorsement of the Registrant's identity or of a product or service. Those circumstances are evidence that the Registrant has registered the Domain Name in bad faith.

The reasoning in *Leidos*, also an identicality case, applies here.

This Panel accepts that the Registrant created a likelihood of confusion with the Complainant's Mark to intentionally attract, for commercial gain, Internet users to the registrant's website or other on-line location for *per se* illegitimate or "malicious" activity connected with malware and spam. This is evidence of bad faith registration.

In this case, the Registrant had no permission to use the Complainant's "LONDON HYDRO" Mark in the Domain Name, let alone to establish a website there to direct users to malware and spam, especially where the Domain Name website resolves to sites reported to be "malicious".

#### Overview of "Bad Faith Registration"

In light of the foregoing, this Panel finds that the Complainant has established bad faith registration of the Domain Name on a balance of probabilities and thus has satisfied paragraph 4.1(b) of the CDRP.

### **5.3.3 Is there "Some Evidence" that the Registrant has No Legitimate Interest in the Domain Name**

To succeed in this proceeding, paragraph 4.1(c) of the CDRP requires the Complainant to provide "some evidence" that the Registrant has no legitimate interest in the Domain Name as described in paragraph 3.4 of the Policy. CDRP paragraph 3.4 sets out a non-exhaustive list of six "legitimate interests"; see *Equifax Inc. and Equifax Canada Co. v Antonia Ojo/0902066 BC Ltd.* 16881-CDRP (April 25, 2022), at para 48. The Complainant says that "the website at the domain name" does not meet any of the criteria for legitimate interests listed in paragraph 3.4 of the Policy.

With respect to paragraph 3.4(a), the Domain Name is identical to the Complainant's word mark "LONDON HYDRO" and the Registrant has no permission to use "LONDON HYDRO" in any way. As the Panel said in *Panavision Int'l v Mullen*, 0378-CIRA (Nov. 22, 2018) [use of the trademark "PANAVISION" in <panavision.ca>] cited also in *Indeed, Inc et anon v Sadeghi* 16919-CDRP (July 14, 2022) at para 4.3.2.1:

"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."

Paragraphs 3.4(b), (c) and (d) of the CDRP require "good faith" in registration of the domain name (3.4(b) and (c)), and in use of the domain name (3.4(d)). The initial assumption of identity referred to in *Panavision* and *Indeed* prevails in the absence of any evidence from which good-faith registration or use could be inferred. Although "hydro" may be a service or

business, there is no evidence that the Registrant has anything to do with “hydro” as a service or business.

With respect to paragraph 3.4(d), there is no evidence that the Registrant was using the Domain Name in good faith for a legitimate non-commercial activity. Indeed, at least as of 2025-26, the website <londonhydro.ca> redirects to pages that contain malware and spam.

With respect to paragraph 3.4(e), the Registrant is identified as “Antonia Ojo”. As such, the Domain Name does not comprise the name of the Registrant, nor a name, surname or other reference by which the Registrant is commonly identified. Therefore, the provisions of paragraph 3.4(e) do not apply.

Last, although the Domain Name incorporates the geographical name of a location - “London” – paragraph 3.4(f) refers to the Registrant’s location or place of business. The Registrant is associated with Richmond, British Columbia and a BC numbered company; and there is no evidence of any non-commercial activity or place of business associated with the Registrant in London. Therefore, the provisions of paragraph 3.4(f) do not apply.

Beyond the specific circumstances enumerated in paragraphs 3.4 (a) to (f), in *Equifax Inc. and Equifax Canada Co. v Antonia Ojo/0902066 BC Ltd.* 16881-CDRP (April 25, 2022), with respect to “Antonia Ojo/0902066 BC Ltd.”, the panel noted (at para 54):

“The Registrant’s pattern of registering domain names adjudged to have offended the CDRP supports the inference that the Respondent lacks a legitimate interest in the Domain Names.”

This same reasoning applies here also.

Last, in the absence of a response from the Registrant, the record contains no evidence of any legitimate interest in the Domain Name; see, e.g., *General Motors LLC v. Tony Wilson*, CIRA Case No. 00182 (“the Complainant has provided some evidence that the Registrant has no legitimate interest in the Domain Name and this evidence has not been rebutted by the Registrant”), also cited in *SW Soccer (DBA Inaria) v O’Connor* 26483-CDRP (Mar. 12, 2026) at page 8. The default by a registrant (“Antonia Ojo/0902066 BC Ltd.”) in a proceeding was also a factor strengthening a finding of no legitimate interest in domain names in *Equifax Inc. and Equifax Canada Co. v Antonia Ojo/0902066 BC Ltd.* 16881-CDRP (April 25, 2022) at para 54.

Overview of “Legitimate Interest”

In this “exact match” case, the Complainant has provided “some evidence” that the Registrant has no legitimate interest in the Domain Name. Accordingly, the Complainant has satisfied paragraph 4.1(c) of the CDRP.

**6. DECISION and ORDER**

For the above reasons, in accordance with paragraph 4 of the CDRP and paragraph 12 of the Rules, this Panel orders that registration of the Domain Name, <londonhydro.ca>, be transferred to the Complainant.

Made as of this 14<sup>th</sup> day of June, 2026

SIGNATURE OF PANEL



Thomas Manson, KC

