



CANADIAN INTERNATIONAL INTERNET DISPUTE RESOLUTION CENTRE

DOMAIN NAME DISPUTE

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL

DECISION

CIIDRC case number:	27498-UDRP	Decision date: August 27, 2026
Domain Name:	<lessonde.com>	
Registrar:	HOSTINGER operations, UAB	
Panel:	Peter Müller	
Complainant:	Lassonde Industries Inc.	
Respondent:	Sales Tropicanaoil	

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 July 14, 2026, Alexandre Ajami of Miller Thomson LLP on behalf of Lassonde Industries Inc., the Complainant, filed a Complaint pursuant to the UDRP and the UDRP Rules via email. The required fee was paid on July 15, 2026.
2. On July 15, 2026, CIIDRC transmitted by email to the concerned Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the Domain Name, and on July 16, 2026, the Registrar responded advising of the identity of the Respondent. In addition, the Registrar confirmed that the Domain Name was placed in a Registrar LOCK.
3. On July 20, 2026, CIIDRC confirmed compliance of the Complaint and commencement of the dispute resolution process.
4. On July 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. In accordance with the UDRP Rules, the deadline for the submission of a Response was August 10, 2026.

Domain Names: <lessonde.com>
27498-UDRP

6. The Registrant has not submitted a Response.

7. The Complainant in this administrative proceeding has elected for a Panel consisting of a single member.

8. In accordance with Rule 5 (d), CIIDRC appointed Peter Müller as a single-member panel in the above-referenced matter. He accepted the appointment.

9. The Panel finds that it is properly constituted and has submitted the Statement of Acceptance and Declaration of Impartiality and Independence, as required by CIIDRC to ensure compliance with the UDRP.

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 was incorporated on or about September 3, 1981. Its predecessor was an individual enterprise, „Lassonde“, founded in 1918 by Aristide Lassonde. Today, the Complainant is a leader in the food and beverage industry across North America, including Canada, *inter alia* developing, producing and marketing a wide range of private-label and national-brand products, including ready-to-drink beverages, fruit-based snacks and frozen juice concentrates. The Complainant's shares have been listed on the Toronto Stock Exchange since 1987. The Complainant's operating subsidiaries include Sun-Rype Concentrates, Inc. and Sun-Rype Products (USA), Inc., among others. Across the United States and Canada, the Complainant employs over 2,900 people and operates 19 plants through its subsidiaries. In 2025, the Complainant reported CAD 2,934 million in sales. The Complainant owns several trademarks for "Lassonde <fig.>", including US trademark registration no. 3,155,724, which was filed on April 7, 2005 and registered on October 17, 2006, in class 32 (hereinafter referred to as the „LASSONDE Mark“).

The Domain Name was registered on June 16, 2026 and is being used to send emails to the Complainant's customers, in which the Respondent posed as an employee of the Complainant's subsidiary Sun-Rype Concentrates, Inc. and sent invoices in which the bank details of the Complainant's subsidiary had been altered so that payment would be directed into the Respondent's account.

3. CONTENTIONS OF THE PARTIES

3.1 Complainant

The Complainant contends that the Domain Name is confusingly similar to the LASSONDE Mark, as it fully incorporates the mark's only word element, as the Domain Name constitutes a clear case of typosquatting, and as the LASSONDE Mark is clearly recognizable within the Domain Name.

The Complainant further argues that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in the Domain Name. In this regard, the Complainant states that it never authorized the Respondent to use the LASSONDE Mark in the Domain Name, that there is no connection between the Complainant and the Respondent, that the Domain Name has not been used in connection with a *bona fide* offering of goods or services, and that the Respondent has not been commonly known by the Domain Name.

Finally, the Complainant alleges that the Domain Name was registered and is being used in bad faith. The Complainant submits that the Respondent registered the Domain Name with the sole intent of impersonating the Complainant's wholly owned subsidiary Sun-Rype, and of using an email address associated with the Domain Name for fraudulent purposes, in bad faith and without regard for the harm caused to the Complainant and third parties.

3.2 Respondent

No administratively compliant Response has been filed.

3.3 Remedy Sought

The Complainant requests the Domain Name be transferred to it.

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 That the Domain Name is Identical or Confusingly Similar to a Mark in which the Complainant has Rights

The inquiry under the first element is in two parts. The first issue is whether the Complainant has UDRP-relevant rights in a trademark, and the second is whether any such trademark is identical or confusingly similar to the Domain Name. Failure on either issue would result in a failure to satisfy the requirements of Paragraph 4(a)(i) of the Policy and, ultimately, in the failure of the Complaint.

The Complainant has provided evidence that it owns registered rights in the LASSONDE Mark, which predates the registration of the Domain Name by over a decade.

It is well established that a domain name is generally to be considered confusingly similar under the Policy where the trademark is recognizable within the domain name. In this case, the Domain Name fully incorporates the LASSONDE Mark, with the sole change of the vowel "a" to the vowel "e" in the second position of the word. This substitution does not alter the overall impression, particularly given that the two letters are written in lower case within the domain name and, when rendered in this way, are visually quite similar. Consequently, the Panel finds that the Domain Name is confusingly similar to the LASSONDE Mark and that the Complainant has satisfied the requirements of Paragraph 4(a)(i) of the Policy.

4.2.2 Rights or Legitimate Interests in respect of the Domain Name

Even though the Policy requires the Complainant to prove that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name, it is the consensus view among UDRP panels that a complainant need only make a *prima facie* case to satisfy the requirements of Paragraph 4(a)(ii) of the Policy. Once a *prima facie* case is established, the burden of coming forward with evidence of the Respondent's rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name shifts to the Respondent (see section 2.1 of the WIPO Overview 3.0).

The Complainant has substantiated that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in the Domain Name. The Panel finds that the Complainant has made a *prima facie* case to that effect and that the burden of production has accordingly shifted to the Respondent.

The Respondent has not denied these allegations and has therefore failed to provide any evidence to establish rights or legitimate interests in the Domain Name.

Based on the evidence before it, the Panel finds no rights or legitimate interests of the Respondent in the Domain Name. In particular, the Respondent's use of the Domain Name in connection with fraudulent emails does not give rise to any rights or legitimate interests.

4.2.3 Registration and Use of the Domain Name in Bad Faith

The Panel is satisfied that the Respondent registered and used the Domain Name in bad faith.

First, the Panel is satisfied that the Respondent registered the Domain Name with full knowledge of the Complainant and its LASSONDE Mark, and therefore in bad faith. The LASSONDE Mark is well-established. Furthermore, the Respondent deliberately targeted the Complainant by sending fraudulent invoices to the Complainant's customers. It is inconceivable that the Respondent registered the Domain Name in good faith.

Second, by using the Domain Name in the manner described above, the Respondent also used the Domain Name in bad faith. It is well established that using a domain name to deceive a complainant's customers and divert payments constitutes disruption of a complainant's business within the meaning of Paragraph 4(b)(iii) of

the Policy. Furthermore, such use also constitutes intentional attraction for commercial gain by creating a likelihood of confusion as to source or affiliation within the meaning of Paragraph 4(b)(iv) of the Policy.

Consequently, the Panel finds that the Respondent registered and used the Domain Name in bad faith and that the Complainant has satisfied the requirements of Paragraph 4(a)(iii) of the Policy.

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 orders that the disputed domain name <lessonde.com> be transferred to the Complainant.

Made as of August 27, 2026

SIGNATURE OF PANEL

