



CANADIAN INTERNATIONAL INTERNET DISPUTE RESOLUTION CENTRE

DOMAIN NAME DISPUTE

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL

DECISION

CIIDRC case number:	27058-CDRP	Decision date: June 16, 2026
Domain Name:	<lottosport.ca>	
Panel:	Brian Gray, FCI Arb	
Complainant:	LTWHP, LLC	
Registrant:	Aloisia Jennings	

1. OVERVIEW

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

The particulars of the case are as follows:

1. On April 23, 2026, Eric Perrott of Gerben Perrott, PLLC filed a Complaint on behalf of the Complainant pursuant to the CDRP and the Resolution Rules. The complaint was in administrative compliance with CIRA’s requirements under Rule 3.2.
2. CIRA was notified of this proceeding on April 23, 2026, and subsequently transmitted by email to CIIDRC its verification response informing that the registrant of the Disputed Domain Name is Aloisia Jennings (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 2023-11-18 (the “Registration Date”).

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 May 4, 2026.
4. The deadline for submitting a Response was set for May 25, 2026.
5. The Registrant has failed to file a Response to date.
6. The Complainant in this administrative proceeding has elected for a Panel consisting of a single-member.
7. The Complaint deposited the required Panel fee on May 27, 2026.
8. On May 29, 2026, CIIDRC appointed Brian Gray, FCI Arb., as the single-member Panel in the above-referenced matter. I confirmed acceptance of appointment, and further confirmed my impartiality and independence as required under Paragraph 7 of the Resolution Rules.
9. I determine that I have been properly appointed and constituted to determine the Complaint in accordance with the Rules.
10. Further, as set out below, the Complainant satisfies CIRA’s Canadian Presence Requirements for Registrants because Complainant is the owner of trademarks registered under the Trade-marks Act (Canada) R.S.C. 1985.

The Domain Name was registered on <2023-11-18>.

3. FACTS

The Complainant LTWHP, LLC is a Delaware limited liability corporation having an office in New York City, New York, United States of America.

Complainant is the owner of the following Canadian Trademark Registrations and the domain name www.lottosport.com

1. LOTTO Word Mark - Application Number 0490962 – used in connection with athletic shoes and apparel
2. LOTTO & Design – Application Number 0373011 – used in connection with sporting footwear
3. LOTTO Design – Application Number 0607368 – used in connection with bags, wallets, shoes, apparel, towels, and shoe accessories
4. LOTTO & Design – Application Number 0495689 – used in connection with athletic shoes and apparel
5. LOTTO & Design – Application Number 1063519 – used in connection with personal care items, bags, and eyewear
6. LOTTO & LOZENGE Design – Application Number 2206875 – used in connection with sunglasses and eyewear
7. LOTTO SPORT – www.lottosport.com - used in connection with online retail store services

Domain Name: <lottosport.ca>
27058-CDRP

(Collectively the “LOTTO Marks”)

The LOTTO Marks are used in connection with products sold in physical and online retail stores and on its website “lottosport.com” (the “LOTTO Website”). The LOTTO Marks are used and registered in connection with clothing, accessories, sporting foods and footwear. LTWHP, LLC, through its predecessor-in-interest, has used the well-known LOTTO Marks since as early as 1973.. Complainant’s LOTTO Mark was first registered in Canada in 1976. Further, the LOTTOSPORT.COM domain name has been registered since 1996 and has been in continuous use since that time.

The Registrant, Aloisia Jennings, is the owner of the domain name www.lottosport.ca registered on 2023-11-18.

6. PARTICULARS

4. CONTENTIONS OF THE PARTIES

- **Complainant**

Confusingly Similar

The Complainant submits that, the LOTTO brand has become well-known throughout the world. Complainant submits that the Infringing Domain Name is confusingly similar to the LOTTO Marks since it incorporates Complainant’s LOTTO Marks in its entirety. The Infringing Domain Name is comprised of Complainant’s LOTTO mark and adds the word SPORT, which is a generic modifier. Complainant also sells “Lotto Sport” products to Canadian consumers under the domain name www.lottosport.com and asserts common law rights in the Domain Name. lottosport.

. Registrant has no legitimate interest:

For the purposes of paragraphs 3.1(b) and 4.1(c) of the of the Policy, the Complainant asserts that asserts the following:

- Upon Complainant’s search of CIPO, Registrant has no rights in the term LOTTO or the complete term LOTTO SPORT. Additionally, Complainant did not give Registrant any license or permissions to use its LOTTO Marks.
- Registrant is not using the Infringing Domain Name in good faith in connection with goods or services because Registrant is using the Infringing Domain Name to host a parked sales website, offering the domain name for sale for \$9,500.

c) The Infringing Domain Name is not generic in any language for any goods or services as it is a unique source identifier for Complainant and Complainant's goods and services offered in Canada. Additionally, Registrant is not offering any goods or services.

d) Registrant is not offering a non-commercial activity under the Infringing Domain Name.

e) The Infringing Domain Name is not an identifier for Registrant, through legal name or otherwise, because the Infringing Domain Name is a unique identifier for Complainant's company.

f) The Infringing Domain Name is not a geographical location and cannot identify Registrant's non-commercial activity or business because Registrant is not offering a non-commercial activity or business.

Complainant further asserts that Registrant has registered the domain name in bad faith:

Resolution Rule 3.2(i)(3) & the relevant provisions of Paragraph 3.5 of the Policy: Complainant only need to prove one of the four factors that demonstrate a *prima facie* case of bad faith. Complainant believes that Registrant registered the Infringing Domain Name in bad faith because, pursuant to paragraph 3.5(a) of the Policy, the purchase or registration of the Infringing Domain Name to sell back to Complainant, Complainant's licensee, or a competitor of Complainant for valuable consideration in excess of actual cost of acquiring the domain is evidence of bad faith.

Complainant asserts that the Registrant's intent to sell the domain is evident as the Infringing Domain Name website immediately redirects to a page proclaiming "This domain lottosport.ca is for sale!" and advertises a purchase price of \$9500 USD. Complainant is unaware of how much Registrant spent on the Infringing Domain Name; however, third-party tools (such as DomainIQ, GoDaddy, and Dynadot) anticipate the value is less than \$500 USD.

Alternatively, if the Panel finds that there was no intent to sell the domain in excess of purchase cost, the lack of a noncommercial activity and use of Complainant's full mark is sufficient to find bad faith under 3.5(c). Complainant's registration of the Infringing Domain Name offers no alternative goods or services than to (1) be sold to Complainant or Complainant's competitors or (2) to sit parked and confuse Canadian consumers who are searching for Registrant's business, disrupting the usual flow of business. Registrant is relying upon the fact that Complainant wishes to avoid consumer confusion and will pay an amount in excess of the cost of the domain to acquire it.

- **Registrant**

The Registrant has filed no evidence and made no submissions, although duly notified of the Complaint and these proceedings.

- **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. As previously discussed the Complainant is owner of a number of Canadian Trademark Registrations.

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.

This is little point in repeating the contentions of the Complainant. As I have summarized them above, I agree with them completely. The Domain Name at issue, i.e. *lottosport.ca* is confusingly similar to the Complainant's LOTTO marks given that the difference is only the addition of the generic term "sport". In addition, here the Complainant is also able to rely on the use in Canada of the domain name *lottosport.com*.

The Registrant has not asserted any legitimate interest and no circumstances from the list of possible circumstances that might demonstrate a legitimate interest have been presented.

Finally, the parking of the domain name *lottosport.ca* which does not point to an active business and the offer to sell the domain name at a price higher than the actual registration costs suggests that the domain name was registered in bad faith as set out in Section 3.5 (a) of the Policy. This alone is determinative of this Complaint.

5.3 Analysis

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

The

5.3.2 Whether the Registrant registered the Domain Name in Bad Faith

The

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

The

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 Domain Name *lottosport.ca* be transferred to the Complainant.

Made as of

SIGNATURE OF PANEL

