



CANADIAN INTERNATIONAL INTERNET DISPUTE RESOLUTION CENTRE

DOMAIN NAME DISPUTE

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL

DECISION

CIIDRC case number:	26995-UDRP	Decision date: July 6, 2026
Domain Name:	greenlandturf.com	
Registrar:	HOSTINGER operations, UAB	
Panel:	Stefanie G. Efstathiou	
Complainant:	Greenland Irrigation	
Respondent:	Naeem Durrani	

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 April 27, 2026, the Complainant filed a Complaint pursuant to the UDRP and the UDRP Rules via online platform.
2. CIIDRC transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name, and the concerned Registrar responded advising of the identity of the Respondent and providing the above contact details. In addition, the Registrar confirmed that the disputed domain name was placed in a Registrar LOCK.
3. On May 20, 2026, CIIDRC confirmed compliance of the Complaint and commencement of the dispute resolution process.
4. On May 20, 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 June 9, 2026.

6. The Respondent has failed to file its response.

7. The Complainant in this administrative proceeding has elected for a Panel consisting of a single-member. The required Panel fee deposit was received on June 12, 2026.

8. In accordance with Rule 5 (d), CIIDRC hereby appoints you, Stefanie G. Efstathiou, 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-a-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 February 25, 2026.

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 a company called "Greenland Irrigation", which was incorporated in 1995 as an Ontario Limited Company. The Company provides various services including: synthetic turf, landscaping, snowplowing and outdoor lighting.

The Complainant does not own any trademark.

The Domain Name seems to have been registered by the Complainant in 2012 and according to the Complainant "In total, 6 domain names were transferred without my authorization on February 22nd, 2026.". The Domain Name is used in connection to a website that has displays only some Chinese characters, maybe sentences.

The Respondent did not submit any response.

3. CONTENTIONS OF THE PARTIES

- **Complainant**

The Complainant submits *inter alia* the following:

"I started my business in 1986 . Over the 40 years of business , we have continually evolved adding new services to grow our client base. These services including: synthetic turf, landscaping , snowplowing and outdoor lighting.

In 2012, I registered the domain name "greenlandturf.com" This domain has been renewed each and every year since inception. Over the years, I have registered over 22 domain names. Investing in building a number of websites to sell our brand and services. Social Media and Google search engines have been the main driving force for all of my marketing efforts to sell irrigation systems and synthetic turf. We have a current client base of over 2500 customers throughout southwestern Ontario.

All of our mail and communications used the site @greenlandturf.com serving as the main contact email for myself and my staff of over 20 employees. for example: barrysmith@greenlandturf.com, sales@greenlandturf.com, employee@greenlandturf.com. This is a major problem right now to communicate with clients and suppliers since the domain transfer has crashed all of our email. Customers are sending e-mails to book services and aren't getting any email reply. Our season is quickly approaching so this is a major problem for my business. To say the least, the impact of the "domain theft" has been devastating. A total disruption of day to day business activities.

In addition, we have a number of elderly clients who are not savvy with the internet and it's deception. I worry that my clients would be susceptible to fraud and could be sending money to these bad actors to a fraudulent website.

In total, 6 domain names were transferred without my authorization on February 22nd, 2026.

"My claim here is to recover my primary domain name which did have operating websites. (..)"

Simply a domain name purchase and renewal for "Greenlandturf.com". A website used to promote our online synthetic grass sales."

Further the Complainant mentions that some of the other domain names that they allegedly had in their portfolio are listed for sale, however, not the Domain Name.

Regarding the third UDRP element, the Complainant wrote:

"A theft of intellectual property.

I believe the intention is for financial gain."

- **Respondent**

No administratively compliant Response has been filed.

- **Remedy Sought**

The Complainant requests the Domain Name be transferred to it.

Domain Names: greenlandturf.com
26995-UDRP

4. DISCUSSION AND FINDINGS

4.1 Requirements

In accordance with Paragraph 4 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 does not own any relevant trademark or has not any relevant registered trademark rights.

Even though it has not been argued by the Complainant explicitly, the above arguments and some of the annexes attached to the Complaint may suggest that the Complainant could have unregistered trademark rights in the term “Greenland” or Greenland turf”.

Normally it is not in the obligations of the Panel to make the case for the parties, and this will not be the case here. However, in the present case, the Complainant is not represented by counsel and this, in the eyes of the Panel, as in some other instances (see WIPO Overview 3.1, Questions 4.2 and 4.16) should affect the standard of the panel's assessment, in the sense that the Complainant should be held to a lower standard. This is not meant to affect the three elements that the Complainant needs to prove.

For the above reasons, the Panel will indulge in the exercise of assessing whether the Complainant has gained unregistered or common law trademark 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.

The only suited proof for any of the above may have been the business card, where, however, only “Greenland” is stated and not Greenland Turf in combination. However, “Greenland” can be seen as a generic term or a geographical term describing the autonomous territory of the Kingdom of Denmark.

Given the lack of any other proof that “Greenland” has become a source identifier for the Complainant’s goods and services, lack of any other material evidence regarding the duration of the use of the mark, the amount of sales and the extent of its advertising, the Panel cannot confirm any acquired distinctiveness on any unregistered terms / marks, not on “Greenland” and neither on “Greenland turf”.

Consequently, the Complainant failed in demonstrating any relevant unregistered or common law trademark rights in the above mentioned term(s). 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 July 6, 2026

SIGNATURE OF PANEL



