



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

CIIDRC case number:	26952-CDRP	Decision date: August 3, 2026
Domain Name:	<instantpotcanada.ca>	
Panel:	Claude Freeman	
Complainants:	IB APPLIANCES US HOLDINGS, INC. and IB APPLIANCES CANADA HOLDINGS, INC.	
Registrant:	Josephine Thomas	

1. OVERVIEW

This matter concerns a registered domain, <instantpotcanada.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, which is as follows:

1. On May 26, 2026, Danijela Grubac filed a Complaint on behalf of IB APPLIANCES US HOLDINGS, INC. and IB APPLIANCES CANADA HOLDINGS, INC., pursuant to the CDRP and the Resolution Rules. The required commencement fee was paid on May 7, 2026. The Complaints were in administrative compliance with CIRA's requirements under Rule 3.2.
2. In response to CIIDRC's request, CIRA transmitted to CIIDRC, by email, its verification response identifying Josephine Thomas as the registrant of the disputed domain name (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 2025-11-06 (the "Registration Date").

3. Pursuant to Rule 4.4 of the Resolution Rules, CIIDRC formally notified the Registrant of this administrative proceeding on May 26, 2026, and transmitted to the Registrant a Notice of Complaint together with a copy of the Complaint.
4. In accordance with the Resolution Rules, the deadline for the submission of a Response was June 15, 2026.
5. As of the date of this Appointment Letter, the Registrant has not submitted a Response.
6. The Complainants elected to have the dispute determined by a single-member Panel.

The Complaint is submitted in English, and the correspondence is in English, which therefore includes this proceeding.

It should also be noted that there are two Complainants who are intertwined with each other by way of common corporate ownership, including their historical and ongoing business relationship. Accordingly, where in this Decision, the words Complainant or Complainants are used, either the plural or singular forms, they all refer to the Complainants making the joint Complaint herein.

3. FACTS

Complainants

The Complainants have submitted the following background to the INSTANT POT brand.

The INSTANT POT brand was founded in Canada and launched its first multicooker in 2008. The Complainant produces, advertises and sells various kitchen appliances under its INSTANT POT brand. The Complainants' products include but are not limited to multi-cookers, air fryer, toaster ovens, and related accessories.

Since launching, the brand has gained widespread acclaim and commercial success. For example, on 6 March 2017, the BBC reported on its UK website at <https://www.bbc.co.uk/news/business-39058736> that "the Instant Pot has become a veritable craze, a success built through social media word-of-mouth instead of traditional TV or print advertising".

In July 2016, on Amazon Day Prime, the Instant Pot multicooker sold 215,000 units in the US in one day.

The Complainant has an active online presence including owning the domain name <instantpot.com>, which is used to operate the INSTANT POT main website at (<https://instantpot.com/>) (the "Official Website"). The domain was registered on 2009-02-23 and the Official Website has been live continuously since as early as 22 May 2009.

Copies of historic screenshots of the Official Website from a Wayback Tool were provided as an Annex to this Complaint.

The Complainant holds a portfolio of domain names in support of its INSTANT POT brand, including ones with the ccTLD suffix ".ca":

- <instantpot.ca>
- <instant-pot.ca>
- <instantpotbrands.ca>

A copy of the Complainant's domain portfolio was also provided as an Annex.

The Complainants are also active on social media and has, through its social media efforts (and others), generated a significant level of endorsements.

The Complainants note that the Instant Pot Community on Facebook has 3.2M members, further demonstrating the popularity and reach of the INSTANT POT brand amongst consumers and Internet users, via the below Platform URL Followers.

Facebook <https://www.facebook.com/instantpot/> 809,000+
 Instagram <https://www.instagram.com/instantpotofficial/> 533,000+
 Twitter <https://twitter.com/instantpot> 22,000+

The Complainants submit that it is well-known and has established goodwill and a reputation globally, including in Canada, and they were headlined and featured in online articles from some of the most popular news outlets.

In Canada, for example, CBC news released an article in 2017 headlined "Cult-like worshippers' turn Canadian-invented Instant Pot into a phenomenon". In 2018, CBC released another article regarding INSTANT POT, saying that "The Instant Pot has been the runaway appliance hit of 2017".

In 2025, CTV News published an article on successful Canadian brands, commenting that INSTANT POT is "One of the most well-known kitchen appliances of the past 15 years". The Complainants have also featured in, for example, The New York Times, which wrote in 2017 that Instant Pot is "the Kitchen Gadget That Spawned a Religion". In 2021, the Daily Maverik (South Africa) wrote that Instant Pot "stirred the Air Fryer Revolution" (emphasis added). Additionally, "Malay Mail" (Malaysia) published an article with the headline "Falling in love with the instant pot". Copies of these new articles are provided as an Annex.

In some countries, such as Canada, the US and the UK, the Complainants sell directly to consumers via the Official Website as well as authorised retailers. Screenshots of the Official Website and the Complainants' websites in other regions are provided as an Annex.

Further, the Complainants' INSTANT POT-branded products available for purchase on marketplaces available globally. In Canada, the Complainants' products can be bought at, for example Amazon, Walmart, Best Buy, Canadian Tire and more.

Registrant

The Registrant has not filed any response.

4. CONTENTIONS OF THE PARTES

Complainant

The Complainants submit as follows and refer to a series of UDRP decisions (all successful), whereby panels have recognized that the Complainant has rights in the Trademarks and that those marks are well-known and distinctive (for example, see IB Appliances US Holdings, LLC v. Michael Bomar (Wise Eyes Ent), CACUDRP-107184; IB Appliances US Holdings, LLC v. Zhang Qiang, CAC-UDRP-106748; and IB Appliances US Holdings, LLC v. Richard Bergeron, CAC-UDRP-107112).

In IB Appliances US Holdings, LLC v. Richard Bergeron, CAC-UDRP-106825, the panel specifically stated that "INSTANT POT is not directly descriptive of multicooker products [...], it still carries distinctiveness as a trademark" and "the Panel accepts that INSTANT POT is a well-known trademark in relation to multicooker products".

(ii) Assessment of confusing similarity:

Domain Name: <instantpotcanada.ca>
 26952-CDRP

The Complainants submit that the Disputed Domain Name is confusingly similar to the Trademarks. The Disputed Domain Name incorporates the Trademarks in its entirety with the mere addition of the geographic term "canada" and the ccTLD ".ca".

- **Registrant**

The Registrant has not appeared or responded, and the Panel notes that no communication has been received from the Respondent. However, given that the Complaint and Written Notice were sent to the relevant address disclosed by the Registrar, the Panel considers that this satisfies the requirement in paragraph 2(a) of the Rules to "employ reasonably available means calculated to achieve actual notice".

- **Remedy Sought**

Resolution Rule 3.2(j) & Paragraph 4.3 of the Policy: The Complainant requests that the Panel issue a decision that the domain-name registration **be transferred to the Complainant.**

5. DISCUSSION AND FINDINGS

a. Eligibility

The Complainants are eligible complainants under paragraph 1.4 of the CDRP.

b. 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.

c. Analysis

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

Paragraph 3.3 provides that a domain name will be considered "confusingly similar" to a trademark if the domain name so nearly resembles the trademark in appearance, sound or ideas suggested by the trademark as to be likely to be mistaken for the trademark.

The test for confusing similarity is “whether the average Internet user, with an imperfect recollection of the Mark who wishes to access a website operated by the Complainant, either by entering a domain name including the Mark into the address bar of an Internet browser or by entering the key terms of the domain name into an Internet search engine, would likely be confused as a matter of first impression.”

The Complainants submit that the Disputed Domain Name is confusingly similar to the Trademarks.

The Disputed Domain Name incorporates the Trademarks in its entirety with the mere addition of the geographic term “canada” and the ccTLD “.ca”.

Under paragraph 3.3 of the Policy, a domain name will be found to be confusingly similar to a complainant’s mark if it so nearly resembles it in appearance, sound, or ideas suggested so as to be likely to be mistaken for the Trademarks.

This test is one of first impression and imperfect recollection. Further, paragraph 1.2 of the Policy provides that a domain name for the purposes of this analysis excludes the “dot-ca” suffix.

The Complainants submit that the fact that the Respondent incorporated the Trademarks, which is well-known and distinctive, is sufficient evidence of confusing similarity. “[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 for purposes of UDRP standing” (WIPO Overview 3.0, section 1.7).

See also, e.g., *Oki Data Americas, Inc. v. Asdinc.com*, WIPO Case No. D2001-0903, stating that “the fact that a domain name wholly incorporates a complainant’s registered mark is sufficient to establish identity or confusing similarity for purposes of the Policy”.

See also *PepsiCo, Inc. v. PEPSI, SRL (a/k/a P.E.P.S.I.) and EMS Computer Industry (a/k/a EMS)*, WIPO Case No. D2003-0696, which confirms “incorporating a trademark in its entirety can be sufficient to establish that a domain name is identical or confusingly similar to a registered trademark”.

Further, as far as “appearance” is concerned, the Disputed Domain Name and the Trademarks are identical in appearance, less the added geographic term “canada”.

The Complainants submit that the addition of the geographic term “canada” does not distinguish the Disputed Domain Name from the Trademarks nor prevent a finding of confusing similarity.

As set forth in section 1.8 of WIPO Overview 3.0: “Where the relevant trademark is recognizable within the disputed domain name, the addition of other terms (whether descriptive, geographical, pejorative, meaningless, or otherwise) would not prevent a finding of confusing similarity under the first element.”

The Trademarks are clearly recognisable within the Disputed Domain, as it is reproduced in its entirety (without any misspelling or modification) and features at the beginning of the string.

If anything, the added term “canada” reinforces the association with the Complainant and the Trademarks. This is because, not least, the INSTANT POT brand was founded in Canada, which remains a key territory for the Complainant’s business.

See the decision in *Guess? IP Holder L.P. v. Everett Aguilar*, CIIDRC Case Number 20099-CDRP, where the domain incorporated the complainant’s trademark plus the geographic term “Canada” and the Panel found that there was confusing similarity and that the geographic identifier indicated to the internet user that the domain relates to the activities of the complainant in Canada.

So far as “ideas” are concerned, the result is the same, as both the Trademarks and the Disputed Domain Name promote the idea of INSTANT POT products made or sold in Canada. The Trademarks are registered and used in Canada and so is the Disputed Domain Name.

Therefore, the Registrant’s domain (instantpotcanada.ca) is confusingly similar to the Complainants registered trademark in which it had rights prior to the registration of the Disputed Domain name, given that the Complainant’s Trademarks Registrations pre-date the registration of the Disputed Domain Name (2025-11-06).

5.3.2 Whether the Registrant registered the Domain Name in Bad Faith

Pursuant to subparagraph 4.1(b) of the Policy, the Complainant must prove on a balance of probabilities that the Registrant registered the domain name <instantpotcanada.ca> in bad faith, as described by paragraph 3.5 of the Policy.

Establishing any one of these circumstances is sufficient evidence that the Registrant registered the domain name in bad faith.

The Complainants submit that the Registrant registered the domain name in bad faith: Resolution Rule 3.2(i)(3) & the relevant provisions of Paragraph 3.5 of the Policy and relies on its earlier submissions in this complaint and the below in support of its position.

UDPR Panels have consistently found that registration of a domain name that is confusingly similar – particularly domain names incorporating the mark plus a descriptive term – to a widely-known trademark by an unaffiliated entity can by itself create a presumption of bad faith (WIPO Overview 3.0 at section 3.1.4).

As set out earlier in this complaint, the Trademarks are well-known and distinctive and the Complainants have a global reputation, including in Canada. The Disputed Domain Name is confusingly similar to the Trademarks in which the Complainant has prior rights.

The Respondent is not authorised or affiliated with the Complainant. As such, the Complainant submits that there is a presumption of bad faith on the part of the Respondent.

In addition, for the reasons below, it is inconceivable that the Respondent was not aware of the Complainant and its INSTANT POT brand when registering the Disputed Domain Name:

- The Complainants have been promoting and distributing its' INSTANT POT-branded products since the early-mid 2000s.
- The Complainants are well-known globally, including in Canada, headlining and featuring in some of the most popular newspapers globally and in Canada.
- A search on any of the most common search engines would have revealed the Complainant, the INSTANT POT brand and the Trademarks. A copy of a Google search for "INSTANT POT CANADA" using a Canadian VPN is provided as an Annex to the Complaint.
- The Disputed Domain Name was not registered until 2025, by which point in time the Complainant, the Trademarks and the INSTANT POT brand were well known globally, including in Canada.
- The Impersonation Website impersonates the INSTANT POT brand, features the Trademarks, and advertises, offers for sale and/or sells INSTANT POT-branded products.

Despite this knowledge, the Respondent deliberately registered the Disputed Domain Name: (i) to prevent the Complainant, or the Complainant's licensor or licensee of the Mark, from registering the Mark as a domain name (Policy, paragraph 3.5(b)); primarily for the purpose of disrupting the business of the Complainant (Policy, paragraph 3.5(c)); and/or to intentionally attempt to attract, for commercial gain, Internet users to the Impersonation Website or other on-line location, by creating a likelihood of confusion with the Trademark as to the source, sponsorship, affiliation, or endorsement of the Impersonation Website (Policy, paragraph 3.5(d)).

(i) the Registrant registered the domain name or acquired the Registration in order to prevent the Complainants, or the Complainants' licensor or licensee of the Mark, from registering the Mark as a domain name.

The Registrant, either alone or in concert with other persons, has engaged in a pattern of registering domain names in order to prevent the Complainants from registering the Trademarks as domain names. As well, the Registrant, either alone or in concert with other persons, has registered a series of domain names with the same naming convention as the Disputed Domain Name, all of which resolve to websites which are identical to the Impersonation Website.

These domain names include: Instantpotkuwait.com, instantpot-mexico.com, instantpotaustralia.com, instantpotcanada.com, instantpotchile.com, instantpotcolombia.com,

Domain Name: <instantpotcanada.ca>
26952-CDRP

instantpotdanmark.com, instantpotdeutschland.com, instantpotespana.com, instantpotindia.com, instantpotireland.com, instantpotitalia.com, instantpotmalaysia.com, instantpotnederland.com, instantpotnz.com, instantpotpolska.com, instantpotromania.com, instantpotsouthafrica.com, instantpotsverige.com.

The Complainant has filed a separate, consolidated UDRP complaint with the Czech Arbitration Court in relation to these other domain names.

Therefore, the Registrant (or connected persons) have a pattern of registering infringing domain names and clearly registered the Disputed Domain Name in order to prevent the Complainant, or the Complainant's licensor or licensee of the Mark, from registering the Mark as a domain name.

(ii) the Registrant registered the domain name or acquired the Registration primarily for the purpose of disrupting the business of the Complainant, or the Complainant's licensor or licensee of the Mark, who is a competitor of the Registrant.

As set out earlier in this complaint, the Registrant has used the Disputed Domain Name to host the Impersonation Website and has registered a large number of domains incorporating the Trademarks which also resolve to websites identical to the Impersonation Website.

The Complainant submits that this is evidence of intention of the Registrant to disrupt the business of the Complainant and/or its authorised distributors by diverting Internet users / the Complainant's consumers in Canada and worldwide away from the official websites of the Complainant and/or its authorised distributors to the Impersonation Website.

Given the widespread registration of infringing domains by the Respondent and/or persons connected to the Respondent, there will inevitably be some diversion of traffic and thereby lost sales for the Complainant and/or its authorised distributors.

(iii) 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.

In CIIDRC case number 20099-CDRP, a case analogous to the present dispute, the disputed domain incorporated the trademark plus the geographic identifier "canada" and resolved to a live impersonation website. In that case, the Panel found that Registrant has caused the disputed domain name to resolve to a website that suggests that it is a website of the Complainant or one that has been established with the knowledge and approval of the Complainant, which it is not, and registered the disputed domain in bad faith.

As set out earlier in this complaint, the Disputed Domain Name is confusingly similar to the Trademarks and falsely suggests / implies affiliation with the Complainant, not least by incorporating the Trademarks in its entirety plus the geographic term "canada", where the INSTANT POT brand was founded and is a key territory for the Complainant's business.

Further, it is reasonable to assume that Internet users in Canada who are searching for the Complainant will search for "INSTANT POT CANADA" and couple it with the ccTLD ".ca". Upon reaching the Impersonation Website, Internet users will undoubtedly be confused as to the source, sponsorship, affiliation, or endorsement of the Impersonation Website given it impersonates and attempts to pass off as the INSTANT POT brand. This confusion is compounded by the fact that there is no disclaimer at the Impersonation Website.

Therefore, the Complainant maintains that the Registrant has registered the Disputed Domain Name in bad faith.

Accordingly, any potential use of the Disputed Domain name by the Registrant would create a likelihood of confusion resulting in commercial gain, confirming the Registrant's bad faith registration.

**Domain Name: <instantpotcanada.ca>
26952-CDRP**

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

There are six enumerated circumstances by which the Registrant can establish legitimate interest. It is open to the Registrant to try and establish a non-enumerated circumstance, but this burden rests on the Registrant.

As to the enumerated circumstances, subparagraphs 3.4(a) to (d) require the Registrant to operate in good faith.

Paragraph 4.1 of the Policy requires that to succeed in the Complaint, the Complainant must provide some evidence that the Registrant has no legitimate interest in the Domain Name as the concept of "legitimate interest" is provided for in Paragraph 3.4 of the Policy.

Paragraph 3.4 of the Policy provides that the Registrant has a legitimate interest in a domain name if:

- a) the domain name was a Mark; the Registrant used the Mark in good faith, and the Registrant had Rights in the Mark;
- b) the Registrant used the domain name in Canada in good faith in association with any wares, services or business and the domain name was clearly descriptive in Canada in the English or French language of:
 - (i) the character or quality of the wares, services or business;
 - (ii) the conditions of, or the persons employed in, production of the wares, performance of the services or operation of the business; or
 - (iii) the place of origin of the wares, services or business;
- c) the Registrant used the domain name in Canada in good faith in association with any wares, services or business and the domain name was understood in Canada to be the generic name thereof in any language;
- d) the Registrant used the domain name in Canada in good faith in association with a non-commercial activity including, without limitation, criticism, review or news reporting;
- e) the domain name was the geographical name of the location of the Registrant's non-commercial activity or place of business.

In Paragraph 3.4(d) "use" by the Registrant includes, but is not limited to, use to identify a website.

It is to be noted that in Paragraphs 3.4(a), (b), (c), and (d), there is a requirement that the Registrants act "in good faith", which in part, has not been demonstrated or supported, by virtue of a non-response by the Registrant.

Furthermore, where the Registrant does not use the domain name as a mark, it cannot be considered to have rights in a mark to establish subparagraph 3.4(a).

Where the domain name is clearly not descriptive or a generic term of any wares, services or businesses with which the Registrant uses the domain, it cannot establish rights under subparagraphs 3.4(b) and (c).

Where the Disputed Domain Name is not used for non-commercial activity, such as by advertising or providing goods or services to consumers, the use cannot be considered "non-commercial" to establish rights under subparagraph 3.4(d).

Where the domain name clearly is not the name of the registrant or a geographical location, the Registrant cannot establish rights under subparagraphs (e) and (f).

Where the Complainant has provided sufficient evidence establish a lack of legitimate interests, the onus shifts to the Registrant to provide evidence that they have a legitimate interest in the domain.

If they fail to do so, they will fail to establish on a balance of probabilities that they have a legitimate interest in the domain.

Furthermore, where the Registrant does not use the domain name as a mark, it cannot be considered to have rights in a mark to establish subparagraph 3.4(a).

Where the domain name is clearly not descriptive or a generic term of any wares, services or businesses with which the Registrant uses the domain, it cannot establish rights under subparagraphs 3.4(b) and (c).

Where the Disputed Domain Name is not used for non-commercial activity, such as by advertising or providing goods or services to consumers, the use cannot be considered "non-commercial" to establish rights under subparagraph 3.4(d).

Where the domain name clearly is not the name of the registrant or a geographical location, the Registrant cannot establish rights under subparagraphs (e) and (f).

Where the Complainant has provided sufficient evidence establish a lack of legitimate interests, the onus shifts to the Registrant to provide evidence that they have a legitimate interest in the domain. If they fail to do so, they will fail to establish on a balance of probabilities that they have a legitimate interest in the domain.

The Complainant respectfully submits that the Respondents' illegal activity at the Disputed Domain Names and the Impersonation Websites does not and cannot amount to a bona fide offering of goods and services. Further, it precludes the Respondents from acquiring any rights or legitimate interests in the Disputed Domain Names.

- (ii) The Registrant has not used the Disputed Domain Name in good faith in association with a non-commercial activity including, without limitation, criticism, review or news reporting

As set out above, the Registrant has not used the Disputed Domain Name in good faith and has used the Disputed Domain Name for commercial activity i.e., to operate a website advertising, offering for sale and/or selling INSTANT POT-branded product. In addition, the Registrant has used the Disputed Domain Name for unlawful purposes – i.e., to impersonate the INSTANT POT brand and infringe upon the intellectual property rights (including trademark rights) of the Complainant.

Therefore, the Complainant maintains that the Registrant cannot be regarded as making use of the Disputed Domain Name in relation to bona fide non-commercial activity.

- (iii) The Disputed Domain Name is not the legal name or a name or reference by which the Registrant is commonly identified

Upon information and belief, the Registrant is not and has never been known as "INSTANT POT CANADA", "INSTANT POT" or any similar variation thereof.

- (iv) The Disputed Domain Name is not the geographical name of the location of the Registrant's non-commercial activity or place of business The Disputed Domain Name incorporates the Trademarks, which is not a geographic term. Further, the Registrant has used the Disputed Domain Name for commercial and unlawful activity, therefore, the Complainant submits that this circumstance does not apply in the present case.

It's also quite pertinent to add that though the Registrant has not provided any Response, there is no evidence to provide for or demonstrate any contractual right, licence or other form of authority by the Complainants to the Registrant, for the use of their name, tradename, copyright or any other form of intellectual property by the Registrant, and that the business activities, marks and other substantiating business evidence pre-date the Disputed Domain name registration.

Accordingly, the Complainants have met their burden under Paragraph 4.1 of the Policy, that the Registrant has no legitimate interest in the Disputed Domain name.

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 (intsantpotcanada.ca) be transferred to the Complainants.

Made as of August 3, 2026.

SIGNATURE OF PANEL

