



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

CIIDRC case number:	26953-CDRP	Decision date: June 15, 2026
Domain Name:	<zadig-et-voltaire.ca>	
Panel:	Leslie E. Maerov, FCI Arb. Q. Arb., Carol L. Roberts, James Plotkin, Q. Arb.	
Complainant:	ZV Singapore Pte. Ltd.	
Complainant's representative:	Nameshield - Clémence Guillaume	
Registrant:	Dave Chandler	

**THE PARTIES:**

1. The Complainant is ZV Singapore Pte. Ltd., of Singapore, and is represented by Nameshield - Clémence Guillaume, of Angers, France. The Registrant is Dave Chandler of Halifax, Nova Scotia, Canada.

**REGISTRATION OF THE DISPUTED DOMAIN NAME:**

2. The Domain Name in issue is <zadig-et-voltaire.ca> ("Domain Name") which was registered by the Registrant on December 1, 2025, and expires December 1, 2026. The Registrar is Go Daddy Domains Canada, Inc. ("Registrar").

**PROCEDURAL HISTORY:**

3. This complaint ("Complaint") was filed with Canadian International Internet Dispute Resolution Centre (the "Provider") as recognized service provider pursuant to the CIRA Domain Name Dispute Resolution Policy ("Policy"), in accordance with the CIRA Dispute Resolution Rules ("Resolution Rules") on April 2, 2026.

4. Upon a review of the Complaint the Provider determined that the Complaint was in administrative compliance with the Resolution Rules and this proceeding was deemed commenced on April 10, 2026.

5. The Registrant's identity is not published in the public WHOIS database, and within the time limited by Rule 4.3 of the Resolution Rules, on April 7, 2026, the Provider sent a request for registrar verification to the Registrar to determine the identity, including the mailing address and contact email of the Registrant, together with a request that the Domain Name be put on a Registrar lock. On April 7, 2026, the Registrar confirmed the identity of the Registrant and his mailing address and contact email and confirmed that the Domain Name was placed on a Registrar lock.

6. Pursuant to Rule 4.4 of the Resolution Rules, on April 10, 2026, the Provider notified the Registrant at the email address for the administrative contact of record in the Registrant Information at [wd.chandler@gmail.com](mailto:wd.chandler@gmail.com) and also at [postmaster@zadig-et-voltaire.ca](mailto:postmaster@zadig-et-voltaire.ca) of the commencement of this proceeding and advised the parties of the name and contact details of the Provider. The Registrant's Response deadline was set for April 30, 2026, and upon request of the Registrant, the deadline was extended until May 20, 2026.

7. The Registrant filed its Response on May 20, 2026. The Complaint and the Response were filed in the English language which accordingly became the language of the proceeding, pursuant to par. 10.1 of the Rules.

8. In accordance with par. 6 of the Rules, the Provider was empowered to appoint a three-member panel, with consideration being given to the nominees of the parties and to appoint a Chair. The Provider appointed Leslie E. Maerov, FCI Arb., Carol L. Roberts, and James Plotkin, Q. Arb. as panellists and Leslie E. Maerov as Chair of the Panel. Each of the panellists has signed and submitted a Statement of Independence and Impartiality to the Provider, declaring that there are no circumstances that would give rise to justifiable doubts as to their independence and impartiality, as required by the Resolution Rules. On May 27, 2026, after clearing for any potential conflicts, the Provider appointed all of the Panel members.

#### **JURISDICTION:**

9. By obtaining registration of a domain name in the dot-ca country code top level domain name registry operated by CIRA, the Registrant agreed to the resolution of certain disputes pursuant to the Policy and Resolution Rules. This is an administrative proceeding pursuant to the Policy and Resolution Rules.

10. In order to bring a proceeding under the Policy, a complainant must satisfy the Canadian Presence Requirements for Registrants contained in CIRA Policies, Rules and Procedures,

which require that the applicant must meet at least one of the listed requirements. The Complainant satisfies one of those requirements by being the owner of a trademark which is the subject of a registration at the Canadian Intellectual Property Office (“CIPO”) under the *Trademarks Act* (Canada), R.S.C. 1985, c.T-3. Satisfaction of this requirement limits permission to register a dot-ca domain name consisting of or including the exact word component of that registered trademark. The Complainant is the owner of the following trademark (“Complainant’s Mark”):

Trademark	Registration No.	Registration Date	Expiry Date	Wares/Services
ZADIG & VOLTAIRE	TMA 894624	January 21, 2015	January 21, 2030	Jewellery, horological and chronometric instruments, namely clocks, chronometers and pendulums, watches, trunks and suitcases, umbrellas; school bags, briefcases, wallets, purses, backpacks, handbags, shopping bags, rolling bags, beach bags, travel bags, garment bags, travel trunks, clothing, footwear, headgear, specifically trousers, skirts, sweaters, dresses, jackets, shirts, shorts, belts, gloves, coats, raincoats, undergarments, toques, swimwear, dress shoes, casual shoes, evening shoes, hats, caps

#### FACTS ALLEGED BY THE PARTIES:

11. The Complainant, operating under the brand ZADIG & VOLTAIRE, is a French company in the fashion industry. Established in 1997, the brand ZADIG & VOLTAIRE stands for ready-to-wear fashion, accessories and perfumes. The Complainant has stores worldwide, including bricks and mortar stores in two of Canada’s major cities, Toronto and Montreal.

12. The Complainant is the owner of several trademarks including the term “ZADIG & VOLTAIRE”, such as the Canadian trademark registration ZADIG & VOLTAIRE registration no. TMA894624 which was registered on January 21, 2015. The Complainant also owns a domain names portfolio, including the domain name <zadig-et-voltaire.com> registered and used for its official website since May 16, 2002. The Domain Name <zadig-et-voltaire.ca> was registered on December 12, 2025, and is offered for sale for \$3,500 USD on the Domain Name URL.

**DISCUSSION & ANALYSIS:**

13. In accordance with par. 3.1 of the Policy, to succeed in this proceeding, the Complainant is required to prove two things on a balance of probabilities, which are that:

- (a) The Domain Name is confusingly similar to the Complainant's Mark in which the Complainant had rights prior to the date of registration of the Domain Name, and continues to have such rights ;
- (b) The Registrant has registered the Domain Name in bad faith, (par. 3.5 of the Policy).

14. In addition, the Registrant must provide some evidence that the Registrant has no legitimate interest in the Domain Name, (par. 3.4 of the Policy).

(a) **Is the Domain Name Confusingly Similar to the Complainant's Mark?**

15. The Complainant must have had rights in the Complainant's Mark prior to the date of registration of the Domain Name and continue to have such rights. The Complainant satisfies this requirement by way of its ownership rights to the Complainant's Mark and having used that Mark in Canada on its official website since May 16, 2002, for the purpose of distinguishing its wares from the wares of another person, prior to the date of registration of the Domain Name which was not registered until December 1, 2025. The Complainant's Mark continues to be valid and in effect.

16. The Complainant states that the disputed domain name <zadig-et-voltaire.ca> is confusingly similar to its trademark ZADIG & VOLTAIRE and its associated domain name because it incorporates the Complainant's trademark, though it replaces the ampersand ("&") by the French equivalent "et" (French for "and"). The Registrant claims that substitution of "et" for "&" and the addition of hyphens create meaningful differences in spelling, punctuation, and linguistic presentation – particularly in Canada's officially bilingual context, and that these are not trivial or insignificant variations.

17. The Complainant contends that replacing "&" with "et" and hyphens does not eliminate the likelihood of confusion with the Complainant's Mark and cites another decision with respect to the disputed domain name <zadig-etvoltaire.com> in *CAC Case No. UDRP-104347, Z&V v. Above.com Domain Privacy*. The Panel in that case stated noted that:

“the disputed domain name reproduces the two dominant textual elements of the Complainant's Trade Mark: "ZADIG" and "VOLTAIRE". The substitution of the ampersand by the term “et”,

meaning “and” in French, does not prevent the likelihood of confusion between the disputed domain name and the Complainant's Trade Mark. In addition, the hyphen is, in the present context, insufficient to distinguish the disputed domain name from the Complainant's Trade Mark.”

18. The Registrant also submits that despite owning and actively using the .com domain <[zadig-et-voltaire.com](http://zadig-et-voltaire.com)> since May 2002 and holding the Canadian trademark since 2015, and despite more than eleven years of awareness and the fact that the exact French-variant domain was freely available in the open .ca registry for over a decade, the Complainant never registered <[zadig-et-voltaire.ca](http://zadig-et-voltaire.ca)> (or any materially identical variant). The Registrant submits that this demonstrates that the Complainant itself did not view the linguistic differences as immaterial and that the domain possesses legitimate independent commercial value in the Canadian secondary market. As a result, the Registrant claims that the disputed Domain Name is not confusingly similar.

19. To be confusingly similar, the Domain Name must so nearly resemble the Mark in appearance, sound or the ideas suggested by the Mark as to be likely to be mistaken for the Mark. Pursuant to par. 3.3 of the Policy, a domain name will be found to be confusingly similar with a Mark if it so nearly resembles the same in appearance, sound or in the ideas suggested so as to be likely to be mistaken for the Mark.

20. 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 Domain Name contains the distinctive words “Zadig” and “Voltaire”, there could be no doubt that it is confusingly similar to the Complainant's Mark. The use of hyphens and “et” instead of “and” or “&” are insignificant alterations to the Claimant's Mark and would not be noted by the average person as being any different than the Claimant's Mark. The word “et” (“and” in English) is the only way to write the “ampersand” in letters. Since the ampersand cannot form part of a domain name under the IPv6 protocol, the use of the letters “et” do not materially deviate from the Complainant's trademark. In the context of confusing similarity, the concern is an actual comparison between the disputed Domain Name and the Claimant's Mark, not whether the Claimant may or may not have taken an opportunity to register a .ca domain name for <[zadigetvoltaire.ca](http://zadigetvoltaire.ca)> or a variant.

21. Given that the Complainant's main domain name is <[zadig-et-voltaire.com](http://zadig-et-voltaire.com)>, which uses “et” and hyphens, the use of “et” and hyphens by the Registrant is additional evidence that the Registrant intended that the Domain Name be confused with the brand of the Complainant. An

Internet user who has knowledge or recollection of the Mark might easily mistake the Domain Name as being somehow affiliated with or owned by the Complainant. Use of the Domain Name is likely to mislead the public into believing that the Registrant is affiliated with or authorized by the Complainant.

22. Further, the addition of a CCTLD like “.ca” does not serve to distinguish the Domain Name from Complainant’s Marks and domain names: *Dansko, LLC v. Robert Testa*, 23141-CDRP (June 14, 2024). Pursuant to par. 1.2 of the Policy, the Domain Name means the domain name excluding the dot-ca suffix.

23. In conclusion, the Panel concludes that the Domain Name is likely to lead persons who become aware of the Domain Name to conclude that it is associated with the Complainant, and it is therefore confusingly similar to the Complainant’s Mark.

**(b) Does the Registrant have a legitimate interest in the Domain Name?**

24. The Complainant states that it never assigned, licensed, sold, transferred or in any way authorized the Registrant to use the Complainant’s Mark. There is no evidence that the Registrant ever used the names “zadig” or “voltaire” (or both words in combination), or that it had any interest in the Complainant’s corporate entity, or that he has a registered trade mark containing the names “zadig” or “voltaire”, or that it is a name by which the Registrant is commonly identified.

25. The Complainant asserts that the Registrant is not identified in the WHOIS database as the owner of the disputed Domain Name. Past panels have held that a Registrant was not commonly known by a disputed domain name if the WHOIS information was not similar to the disputed domain name. Thus, the Registrant is not known as the disputed Domain Name: NAF Case No. FA 1781783, *Skechers U.S.A., Inc. and Skechers U.S.A., Inc. II v. Chad Moston / Elite Media Group <bobsfromsketchers.com>*.

26. The Complainant states that it has granted neither license nor authorization to the Registrant to make any use of the Complainant’s trademark ZADIG & VOLTAIRE or apply for registration of the disputed Domain Name.

27. As referred to above, the Registrant did not register the Domain Name in Canada in association with any wares, services or business, there is no evidence of any mark associated with the Domain Name and the Domain Name does not resolve to any active website.

28. The Registrant did not register the Domain Name with the consent or approval of the Complainant and the Registrant has not been licensed or otherwise permitted to use the Complainant's Mark within the Domain Name or the website to which it resolves. The Registrant has no business relationship with the Complainant and has made no effort to establish that it has any rights in or authority to use the Domain Name. There is no evidence that the Domain Name was used for any legitimate non-commercial or fair use.

29. The Registrant has demonstrated no legitimate purpose or possible legitimate uses of its registration of the Domain Name except to state that he has a legitimate business of buying and selling domain names. The Policy sets out six circumstances which would demonstrate that the Registrant has a legitimate interest in the Domain Name, and the Registrant meets none of those requirements, nor has he alleged a credible alternative basis to make such a claim.

30. Not only is there no evidence that the Registrant has a legitimate interest in the Domain Name, to the contrary, there is sufficient evidence that only the Complainant has a legitimate interest in the Domain Name.

31. Accordingly, the Panel finds that the Complainant has satisfied the requirement that the Registrant has no legitimate interest in the Domain Name.

**(c) Has the Registrant registered the Domain Name in bad faith?**

32. The Domain Name was shown for sale for \$3,500 USD at the URL of the Domain Name at the time of commencement of this proceeding. Since the commencement of this proceeding the URL has been changed to say that the site is under construction, and the offer to sell the Domain Name has been removed. It appears to the Panel that the Registrant has attempted to resile from an offer to sell the Domain Name to remove some evidence from consideration by the Panel. The failure to actively use a domain name is neither a *bona fide* offering of goods or services under par. 4(c)(i), nor a non-commercial or fair use pursuant to par. 4(c)(iii) of the Policy and is evidence of bad faith registration and use.

33. The Registrant states that he operates Silent Domains, as a legitimate, established domain name "brokerage" business based in Halifax, Nova Scotia. The core of this business is the acquisition, management, and resale of premium .ca domain names in the secondary market. The Registrant contends that this is a recognized and lawful commercial activity. Further, he states that the disputed Domain Name was registered and openly offered for sale as part of that ordinary and *bona fide* offering of services (par. 3.4(a) of the Policy). the Panel finds that this may have

been the case if the Registrant had rights and legitimate interests in the Domain Name, but has determined that he does not. It appears obvious that the Registrant intends that the legitimate owner of the Mark would pay the Registrant for the Domain Name, and it is obvious that the Registrant registered the Domain Name primarily for the purpose of selling the registration to the Complainant. No other purchaser would succeed in claiming a legitimate interest in the Domain Name because it was clearly an infringement of the Complainant's Mark rather than, for example, a generic dictionary term available for legitimate registration by a broker or speculator.

**34.** Whatever other conclusion that could be reached, selling a domain name that is clearly confusingly similar to another person's Mark without having a legitimate interest in the Mark is surely evidence of bad faith. The Registrant has demonstrated no legitimate purpose or possible legitimate uses of its registration of the Domain Name except to state that he has a legitimate business of buying and selling domain names. Because the Domain Name is so obviously connected with Complainant, Registrant's actions suggest opportunistic bad faith in violation of the Policy.

**35.** Given the distinctiveness of the Complainant's trademark and reputation, 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 a credible explanation from the Registrant, is that the Registrant has registered the Domain Name with full knowledge of the Complainant's trademark. This demonstrates bad faith in accordance with par. 4(a)(iii) of the Policy.

**36.** the Registrant did not allege or prove that the domain name was descriptive of any goods or services. That the Registrant has a business and domain names are assets of that business is altogether different than a particular domain name being used in connection with any goods and services.

**37.** The Panel finds that the intention of the Registrant was to register the Domain Name because it reflected the Complainant's established trademark and because it provided him with scope for selling it to the Complainant and generally to use it to further his own interests. That conduct constitutes bad faith registration of the Domain Name on any test and the Panel so finds.

**38.** 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.

39. The Panel finds that the use of the Complainant's Mark in the Registrant's Domain Name meets the circumstances outlined for bad faith.

**REMEDY SOUGHT:**

40. The Complainant requests that the ownership of the Domain Name be transferred to the Complainant.

**DECISION AND ORDER:**

41. For the reasons set out in this decision, the Panel has found that the Complainant has satisfied all the requirements under the Policy in order to be successful in this proceeding and to be entitled to the remedy sought. As previously indicated, the Complainant is in compliance with the Canadian Presence Requirements for Registrants contained in CIRA Policies, Rules and Procedures which would allow it to initiate this complaint and be the registrant of a dot-ca domain name.

42. The Panel orders that the Domain Name <zadig-et-voltaire.ca> be transferred to the Complainant.

This order is made as of June 15, 2026.

Panel:



LESLIE E. MAEROV, FCI Arb., Q. Arb.

CAROL L. ROBERTS

JAMES PLOTKIN, Q. Arb

