



CANADIAN INTERNATIONAL INTERNET DISPUTE RESOLUTION CENTRE

DOMAIN NAME DISPUTE

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL

DECISION

CIIDRC case number:	27472-CDRP	Decision date: August 13, 2026
Disputed Domain Names:	<Geelyauto.ca> <Geelyautos.ca>	
Panel:	Brian Gray, FCI Arb. Q Arb.	
Complainant:	ZHEJIANG GEELY HOLDING GROUP CO., LTD.	
Registrant:	David Scherle	

1. OVERVIEW

This matter concerns two registered domains Geelyauto.ca and Geelyautos.ca (the “Domain Names”).

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 as follows:

- On July 2, 2026, Raphaëlle Nadon of Fasken Martineau DuMoulin LLP, filed a Complaint on behalf of ZHEJIANG GEELY HOLDING GROUP CO., LTD., pursuant to the CDRP and the Resolution Rules. The required commencement fee was paid on the same day. The complaint was in administrative compliance with CIRA’s requirements under Rule 3.2.
- On July 2, 2026, CIRA was notified of this proceeding and on July 3, 2026, CIRA transmitted by email to CIIDRC its verification response informing that the registrant of the Disputed Domain Names is David Scherle (the “Registrant”). CIRA also confirmed that the disputed domain names were placed on a Registrar LOCK and that the Domain Names have a Registration Date of 2025-03-17 (the “Registration Date”).

3. Pursuant to Rule 4.4 of the Resolution Rules, CIIDRC formally notified the Registrant of this administrative proceeding on July 7, 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 July 27, 2026.
5. As of the date of this Appointment Letter, the Registrant has not submitted a Response.
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 July 30, 2026.
8. On August 6, 2026, CIIDRIC appointed me as a single-member Panel in this matter. I confirmed my acceptance of this appointment and also confirmed my impartiality and independence as required under paragraph 7 of the Resolution Rules.
9. The Panel finds that it was properly constituted.
10. Both Domain Names were registered on 2025-03-17

3. FACTS

The facts are set out in the Complaint filed by Raphaëlle Nadon on behalf of the Complainant dated July 2 2026 and 23 Appendices attached thereto. The salient facts can be briefly summarized as follows.

1. The Complainant is an automobile manufacturer based in China which operates under the trademark and trade name GEELY. It commenced automobile manufacturing in 1998. It owns many subsisting and pending Canadian trademark registrations for the mark GEELY or GEELY formative, including registration TMA698,187 GEELY design, registered September 24, 2007 for, inter alia, automobiles.
2. The Complainant holds a number of GEELY domain names including the domain name geely.com registered 1997-07-12 and geely.auto registered 2016-01-29. The Complainant also holds numerous country code top level domain names for geely and geelyauto.
3. In 2026, the Complainant and "its corporate group" produced over 4 million cars per year. The Complainant has a number of other brands including GEELY, VOLVO, POLESTAR and LYNK. . The Complainant does not clearly identify how many cars were produced under the GEELY brand as opposed to others in the "corporate group" and does not identify any sales in Canada.
4. Geely is known throughout much of the world and operates in approximately 90 countries and has an extensive sales and distribution network in those countries but Complainant does not specifically mention sales in Canada.
5. The Complainant under the GEELY name has appeared in the Fortune 500 global rankings of companies since at least as early as 2012 and has appeared in established media in many countries, including Canada, under the GEELY corporate name .

6. The Complainant also owns and operates a website www.geely.com to promote its automotive Brand. This web site is accessible to Canadian users
7. The Complainant has received publicity in media circulated in Canada about its possible impending entry into Canada of its automobiles under the brand name GEELY.
8. The Respondent is a person who is in the owner of numerous domain names focusing in particular on automobile brands. Many of these have been “parked” and are not in use. There is no evidence that the Respondent is using the domain names Geelyauto.ca or Geelyautos.ca.

4. CONTENTIONS OF THE PARTIES

- **Complainant**

The Complainant submits that it is part of a famous global automotive group headquartered in Hangzhou, China and the parent and controlling entity of the GEELY automotive brand.

By 2002 the Complainant's group of companies was one of China's top 10 automakers. By 2005 the group was producing over 200,000 vehicles per day.

The Complainant and its group have appeared on the Fortune 500 global rankings of companies since at least as early as 2012. The Complainant and its affiliated entities operate in approximately 90 countries and have an extensive sales and distribution network.

The Complainant further submits that through extensive international use, the GEELY marks have become highly distinctive and uniquely associated with the Complainant and its automotive goods and services. The marks are inherently distinctive, have no descriptive meaning, and enjoy significant goodwill worldwide.

The Complainant owns valid and subsisting Canadian trademark registrations for marks incorporating the GEELY Mark either alone or with a design, all of which are registered for automobiles or automobile related products. The Complainant has invested substantial resources in the promotion and protection of its intellectual property rights.

The Complainant also owns and operates the website <https://www.geely.com/> to promote its automotive brand, which is accessible to Canadian users. The domain name was registered on 1997-07-12.

The Complainant is also the registered owner of numerous other domain names incorporating the GEELY Marks. The Complainant maintains a comprehensive list of “geely” domain name registrations, including “geelyauto”

The Complainant asserts that its rights in the GEELY Marks, as well as in domain names incorporating “geely” and “geelyauto,” are further confirmed by its consistent success in domain name arbitration proceedings worldwide.

.The Complainant submits that no business relationship exists between the Complainant (and its other subsidiaries) and the Respondent. The Respondent does not have, and has never had, permission to use the Complainant's protected Marks and brand. The Complainant has never authorized, licensed, or otherwise permitted the Respondent to use its GEELY marks in any manner.

The Respondent's domain names were registered on March 17, 2025, long after the Complainant had established rights in the GEELY marks in Canada and elsewhere.

Geelyauto.ca and Geelyautos.ca (the "Disputed Domain Names") resolves to an inactive webpage. There is no evidence that the Respondent has made any bona fide use of the Disputed Domain Names since its registration.

The Complainant submits that the Respondent has taken steps to conceal its identity and avoid contact,

The Complainant submits that the Disputed Domain Names, geelyauto.ca and geelyautos.ca, are confusingly similar to the GEELY Marks and to the Complainant's registered domain names because the Disputed Domain Names incorporates the entirety of the GEELY marks, which is the dominant and distinctive component of the Complainant's branding the only difference being the addition of the words "auto" or "autos," which further increases the likelihood of confusion since it refers to the goods and services related to the GEELY marks. And the Disputed Domain Names are identical to the Complainant's existing international domain name registrations "geelyauto."

The Complainant further submits that GEELY marks are inherently distinctive and have no descriptive meaning in English.

The Complainant submits that the Registrant lacks any legitimate interest in the domain name under the CDRP.

The Complainant submits that it is implausible that the Registrant independently adopted the Disputed Domain Names without targeting the Complainant.

Further, information provided by CIRA demonstrates that the Respondent engages in a broader pattern of registering domain names incorporating well-known third-party trademarks in the field of automobiles.

The Complainant submits that taken together the facts demonstrate that the domain name was registered primarily to exploit the Complainant's trademark rights, which constitutes bad faith under the CDRP.

- **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 Names be transferred to it.

DISCUSSION AND FINDINGS

4.1 Eligibility

The Complainant is an eligible complainant under paragraph 1.4 of the CDRP. The Complainant is the owner of numerous Canadian registered trade-marks incorporating the formative GEELY, for example TMA698,187 GEELY design, registered September 24,2007 for, inter alia, automobiles.

4.2 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.

4.3 Analysis

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

This element of the Policy requires that Complainant establish, first, that it has "Rights" in a "Mark", and second, that the disputed domain name is "confusingly similar" to its mark.

The definition of a "Mark" is set out in Paragraph 3.2 of the Policy. Sub-paragraph (a) states that a "Mark" can be: "a trade-mark, including the word elements of a design mark, or a trade name that has been used in Canada by a person, or the person's predecessor in title, for the purpose of distinguishing the wares, services or business of that person or predecessor ..."

Paragraph 3.1(a) of the Policy requires that the Complainant has “Rights” in its Mark. The term “Rights” is not defined in the Policy, but Canadian trademark law has recognized that trademark rights may be developed through use in commerce (i.e., at common law) and without the benefit of a trademark registration.

“Confusingly similar” for the purposes of the CIRA Domain Name Policy requires only that the Domain Name so nearly resembles the Mark in appearance and sound or the ideas suggested by the Mark as to be likely to be mistaken for the Mark.

Here the Complainant owns the mark GEELY which is the distinctive part of the Disputed Domain Names. The Disputed Domain Names incorporate the entirety of the Respondent’s Mark. The addition of the generic expression “auto” does not serve to avoid confusing similarity. In addition the domain name “geelyauto” is used extensively by the Complainant to promote the Complainant’s business. This trade name is a virtual identity to the Disputed Domain Names. For both the Complainant and the Respondents the top level domain names are disregarded for the purpose of the comparison.

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

5.3.2 Whether the Registrant registered the Domain Name in Bad Faith

Under Paragraph 4.1(b) of the Policy, the Complainant must demonstrate, on a balance of probabilities, that the Registrant registered the Domain Name in bad faith,

Paragraph 3.5 of the Policy sets out, without limitation, four frequently occurring examples of bad faith, any of which if found by the Panel shall be evidence that the Registrant has registered the domain names in bad faith.

Paragraphs 3.5 (a) and (b), respectively, state that evidence of bad faith registration may be found where the Registrant registered or acquired the Registration primarily for the purpose of selling, renting, licensing or transferring the Registration to the Complainant or a competitor of the Complainant for a consideration in excess of the Registrant’s actual costs or has registered the domain name to prevent the Complainant from registering its Mark as a domain name, provided that the Registrant has engaged in a pattern of registering domain names in order to prevent persons who have Rights in Marks from registering the Marks as domain names. .

Paragraphs 3.5(c) and (d) state, respectively, that evidence of bad faith registration may be found where:

“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;” or

“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."

Inherent to a finding of bad faith is some attribution of knowledge by a registrant of a complainant's trademark, whether actual or based upon a conclusion that a registrant should have known of the mark. Here, there is no evidence that GEELY has actually sold or marketed cars in Canada. However, the business press circulating in Canada has published news that the Complainant is considering marketing cars in Canada. There is no doubt that GEELY is well known in some parts of the world for its automobiles but not in Canada. On this basis I might have been tempted to give the Registrant the benefit of the doubt that it has never heard of the Complainant and did not intend to disrupt the Complainant's business or sell its registrations of the Disputed Domain Names to the Complainant.

However this cannot be accepted. The domain names geelyauto.ca and geelyautos.ca do not point to an active business and are "parked". More significantly the Registrant has shown a pattern of registering automobile names, including other famous Chinese, Japanese and American car companies. Many of these are also parked. Examples include:

cheryauto.ca; cheryautomobile.ca; fordmustang.ca; infiniti-parts.ca; nissanparts.ca; nissan-parts.ca
toyotadeal.ca; toyotaelectric.ca; toyotahybrid.ca; toyota-parts.ca.

It cannot be a coincidence that the Registrant has chosen to register names of automobile companies and park them, particularly companies such as GEELY and CHERRY which may be about to enter the Canadian market. The Registrant has engaged in a pattern of registering domain names in order to prevent persons who have Rights in Marks from registering the Marks as domain names.

I therefore find that the Registrant has registered the Disputed Domain Names in bad faith.

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

Paragraph 4.1(c) of the Policy states that the Complainant must provide "some evidence" that "the Registrant has no legitimate interest in the domain name as described in paragraph 3.4." Some evidence has been shown by the circumstances set forth above under the discussion about bad faith.

However, the Registrant will still succeed in the proceeding if he "proves, on a balance of probabilities, that [he] has a legitimate interest in the domain name as described in paragraph 3.4."

Paragraph 3.4 provides six particular, but non-limiting, examples, any one of which, if supported by evidence, shall demonstrate that Registrant has a legitimate interest in the Domain Name.

The Registrant has no business relationship with the Complainant and has not demonstrated any legitimate reason to register the Disputed Domain Names in connection with any business of the Registrant. The

Disputed Domain Names are not descriptive, and on the contrary contain the distinctive parts of the Complainant's trademarks and domain names. It appears from its registration of the Disputed Domain Names and of the automobile domain names of others that the Registrant is in the business of acquiring them to sell to the Complainant or to block the Complainant from registering its own Marks.

The Registrant has not demonstrated any legitimate interest in the Domain Name and no circumstances from the list of possible circumstances in Rule 3.4 have been presented that might demonstrate a legitimate interest.

5. 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 Disputed Domain Names be transferred to the Complainant.

Made as of 13th day of August 2026

SIGNATURE OF PANEL



