



CANADIAN INTERNATIONAL INTERNET DISPUTE RESOLUTION CENTRE

DOMAIN NAME DISPUTE

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL

DECISION

CIIDRC case number:	27503-CDRP	Decision date: September 28 ,2026
Disputed Domain Name:	<bitcoincentral.ca>	
Panel:	Brian Gray, FCI Arb (Chair), Steven Levy, R. John Rogers	
Complainant:	Ben Glickman	
Registrant:	Ebenezer Thevasagayam	

1. OVERVIEW

This matter concerns a registered domain, **<bitcoincentral.ca>** (the “Disputed 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

On July 23, 2026, Anish Kamboj, Mattheus Lawford of Solstice Law Professional Corporation, filed a Complaint on behalf of the Complainant, Ben Glickman, pursuant to the Canadian Dispute Resolution Policy (“CDRP”) and the Resolution Rules. The Complaint was found to be in administrative compliance with the requirements of the Canadian Internet Registration Authority (“CIRA”) under Rule 3.2. The required commencement fee was received on July 28, 2026.

CIRA was notified of the proceeding on July 28, 2026, and on the same day, CIRA transmitted its verification response, confirming that Ebenezer Thevasagayam is the Registrant of the Disputed Domain Name. CIRA further confirmed that the Disputed Domain Name had been placed on Registrar LOCK status.

Pursuant to Resolution Rule 4.4, CIIDRC formally notified the Registrant of the present administrative proceeding and forwarded to the Registrant a Notice of Complaint together with a copy of the Complaint on July 29, 2026.

On August 13, 2026, the Registrant requested an extension of time to file a Response to the Complaint. In accordance with Paragraph 5.4 of the Resolution Rules, the requested extension was granted. The original deadline for filing the Response was August 18, 2026. The deadline was extended to August 28, 2026.

On August 27, 2026, the Registrant, Mr. Thevasagayam, filed a Response to the Complaint and paid the required Panel fee.

On September 4, 2026, counsel for the Complainant notified CIIDRC that the Complainant sought to exercise his right under Rule 11.1 to provide an additional submission addressing the issue of the Registrant's legitimate interest.

On September 8, the Panel issued the following order:

Pursuant to the Request of the Complainant to file a further submission under Rule 11.1, please advise the Complainant that they may make their further submission with respect only to the issue of the Registrant's legitimate interest (or lack thereof) by September 15. Such submission shall be served on the Registrant and shall not be more than 5 pages (not including additional documents, if any). The Registrant shall have until September 18 to file a response of no more than 3 pages strictly confined to reply only."

On September 15, the Complainant delivered further submissions under Rule 11.1 and on September 16, the Registrant delivered reply submissions.

On September 22, the Panel extended the time for delivery of its decision until September 30, 2026.

Panel Appointment

Pursuant to Paragraph 6 of the Resolution Rules CIRA is to appoint a three-member Panel having regard to the nominees proposed by the Parties and shall designate one Panelist to serve as Chair.

On September 4, CIIDRC named R. John Rogers and Steven M. Levy as panelists. Brian Gray, FCI Arb., is named as Chair of the Panel. All panelists confirmed acceptance of appointment and completed the statement of impartiality and independence as required under Paragraph 7 of the Resolution Rules.

The Panel considers that it has jurisdiction and has been properly constituted.

The Disputed Domain Name was registered on August 23, 2023.

3. FACTS

The Complainant is the registered owner of the trademark “**Bitcoin Central**” (the “**Mark**” or “**Trademark**”) which was filed on January 30th, 2021, and registered on May 17th, 2023. This Mark is licensed by the Complainant to Mutton Lane Investments Inc (“Mutton Lane”).

Mutton Lane operates under the trademark and trade name BITCOIN CENTRAL primarily by providing Cryptocurrency ATM services in the Greater Vancouver Area and across other locations in Canada. Bitcoin Central’s ATMs allow clients to buy and sell cryptocurrency in exchange for cash.

The Registrant is engaged in acquiring, holding, managing, developing, monetizing and reselling domain names. The Registrant acquired the Disputed Domain Name through a CIRA expired To-Be-Released (TBR) domain name process on August 23, 2023 for \$13.49.

The Registrant does not dispute that the Complainant owns the registered Canadian trademark BITCOIN CENTRAL (the “Mark”),, that the registration predates the Registrant’s August 23, 2023 registration of the Domain Name, or that the Domain Name is Confusingly Similar to the Mark within paragraph 3.3 of the Policy.

4. CONTENTIONS OF THE PARTIES

- **Complainant Contentions**

Prior Confusing Use

The Complainant submits that the Disputed Domain Name is confusingly similar to the Complainant’s business and trademark Bitcoin Central. The Disputed Domain Name is confusing for potential clients who may accidentally visit the Registrant’s domain while searching for the Complainant’s website.

The Mark was registered on May 17th, 2023. The domain was acquired on August 23rd, 2023, which was after the Trademark was registered. The Complainant asserts that it has prior rights.

No legitimate interest

The Registrant is not commonly known by the name “Bitcoin Central,” holds no trademark or trade name corresponding to the Disputed Domain Name, and operates no business under it. The Disputed Domain Name resolves to a pay-per-click parking page hosted on the Bodis monetization platform. Complainant submits that the Registrant does not contest any of these facts.

The Registrant is not making a good-faith offering of wares or services, nor descriptive or generic use, nor non-commercial use within the meaning of paragraph 3.4 for the Policy. The Registrant accordingly has no legitimate interest in the Disputed Domain Name.

While accepting that the circumstances listed in paragraph 3.4 of the Policy are “without limitation”, Complainant asserts that none of the circumstances paragraph 3.4 a-f apply. The Complainant asks the Panel to find that there is nonetheless no “bona fide” interest on the totality of the evidence.

Complainant contends that the Registrant has asserted a similar legitimate interest in two prior CDRP proceedings and both panels rejected it: *Enterprise Rent-A-Car Company v. Ebenezer Thevasagayam* BCICAC File No. DCA-857-CIRA (Aug. 22, 2005) and *Discovery Toys, Inc. v. Ebenezer Thevasagayam*, discoverytoys.ca, Resolution Canada, Inc. (Dec. 16, 2008).

The presence of two CDRP Panel decisions which ultimately found the Registrant to have no legitimate interest and resulted in domain names being transferred, shows a pattern of acquiring domain names without a legitimate interest, and this pattern should favour a similar finding in this case.

Registration in Bad Faith

The Complainant asserts that the Registrant registered the Disputed Domain Name in bad faith within the meaning of paragraph 3.5(d) of the Policy. The Disputed Domain Name resolves to a pay-per-click parking page on the Bodis monetization platform. Bodis is a domain-parking and advertising-monetization service; domains pointed to its nameservers generate revenue for the Registrant from advertising links displayed to visitors. Complainant’s evidence shows that the Disputed Domain Name redirects to a pay-per-click page advertising Tarot card readings.

By registering a domain that is identical to the Complainant’s registered “Bitcoin Central” Trademark and directing it to a commercial parking page, the Complainant alleges that the Registrant has intentionally attempted to attract, for commercial gain, Internet users to its online location by creating a likelihood of confusion with the Complainant’s Mark as to source, sponsorship, affiliation, or endorsement. The Complainant asserts that is precisely the conduct paragraph 3.5(d) identifies as bad faith.

Complainant says that the parking-page conduct described above is sufficient to establish bad faith. On the balance of probabilities, the Registrant’s registration and commercial use of a domain identical to the Complainant’s registered Mark constitutes registration in bad faith under paragraph 3.5(d) of the Policy.

- **Registrant Contentions**

Prior Confusing Use

The Registrant does not dispute that the Complainant owns the registered Canadian trademark BITCOIN CENTRAL (the “Mark”), that the registration predates the Registrant’s August 23, 2023 registration of the Disputed Domain Name, or that the Disputed Domain Name is Confusingly Similar to the Mark within paragraph 3.3 of the Policy.

Legitimate Interest

Registrant asserts that the evidence supports an ordinary domain name -investment explanation independent of the Complainant. The Registrant has engaged in substantial domain-name investment for more than two decades. He acquired the Disputed Domain Name through the ordinary CIRA expired-domain/TBR process because he considered “Bitcoin Central” to be a natural and memorable Bitcoin-related expression with independent development, partnership, investment and resale potential.

Registrant asserts that the current Policy provides that the listed circumstances demonstrate legitimate interest “in particular but without limitation,” based on the Panel’s evaluation of all evidence presented. The Registrant accepts that his asserted interest must be bona fide but need not be limited to the enumerated circumstances as set forth in Rule 3.4 a-f. Registrant states that circumstances relevant to lack of bad faith adoption are relevant here.

In response to the Complainant’s submission of two earlier cases where the Registrant was a party, Registrant points to the fact that in *Enterprise Rent-A-Car Co. v. Thevasagayam* the majority reached its conclusion in part after emphasizing links on the Registrant’s page to Enterprise’s competitors. The 2005 majority also applied an earlier version of the Policy under which it stated that legitimate interest “must meet one or more of the six tests.” That formulation does not govern the present issue: current paragraph 3.4 expressly says the listed circumstances are “in particular but without limitation.” The Registrant therefore asserts that this case cannot establish that the present unenumerated interest has already been considered and rejected.

Further, *Discovery Toys, Inc. v. Thevasagayam*, <discoverytoys.ca> (Dec. 16, 2008) can be distinguished from the present case. In that case, the Registrant filed no Response. The evidence before that panel included a parking page linking to educational-toy products, including competitors, and direct sale discussions in which Registrant offered to sell the domain for prices of \$5,000 to \$15,000.

No Bad Faith

Registrant alleges that the Complaint’s bad-faith case rests principally upon the inference that an exact-match domain associated with commercial parking must have been registered to exploit the Complainant’s trademark. The evidence does not support that inference. The Complaint makes no allegation of conduct which shows awareness by the Registrant of its marks at the time that Registrant registered the Disputed Domain Name.

The Registrant states that when he acquired the Disputed Domain Name, he had never heard of Ben Glickman, Bitcoin Central ATM, <bitcoincentralatm.com> or the BITCOIN CENTRAL trademark. He did not acquire the Domain Name to sell it to the Complainant, prevent the Complainant from registering it, disrupt the Complainant’s business or divert its customers.

The Registrant has engaged in acquiring, holding, managing, developing, monetizing and reselling domain names as a substantial commercial activity for more than two decades.

The Registrant states that current registrar-account records independently document 10,375 domain registrations across three of the Registrant's accounts: 9,967 at Namespro, 333 at BareMetal and 75 at WHC. The Namespro account shows a creation date of November 25, 2004. The evidence establishes that acquiring and holding domain-name inventory is a longstanding activity of the Registrant.

Historical registry records show that the Disputed Domain Name had previously been registered beginning June 4, 2011, almost ten years before the Complainant filed the BITCOIN CENTRAL trademark application on January 30, 2021. The former registration expired in 2023 and entered the deletion process.

On August 23, 2023, the Disputed Domain Name became available through CIRA's expired-domain/TBR process. The Registrant was reviewing expiring domain names in the ordinary course of his domain-investment activity.

The Registrant asserts that he was interested in Bitcoin and cryptocurrency terminology because he considered those terms commercially significant and potentially valuable for domain names. "Bitcoin Central" struck him as a natural-sounding combination suggesting a central Bitcoin destination, hub or resource. He considered it memorable and readily understood when spoken.

The Registrant concedes that he did not have a specific developed website or detailed business plan for the Disputed Domain Name when he acquired it. He considered the Disputed Domain Name suitable for future development, business partnership, investment or eventual lawful resale.

The Registrant asserts that his explanation is corroborated by a historical third-party registrar account record. BareMetal Paid Invoice No. 366970 is dated August 23, 2023 and records four TBR acquisitions in the same transaction: *BitcoinCentral.ca*, *LocalCrypto.ca*, *BKX.ca* and *CESA.ca*, each at \$13.49.

The simultaneous acquisition of *LocalCrypto.ca* independently corroborates the Registrant's evidence that the Disputed Domain Name was acquired as part of cryptocurrency-related domain investment activity rather than because of the Complainant.

Subsequent registrar records are consistent with ordinary portfolio management. On July 25, 2024, the Disputed Domain Name was transferred to Namespro as part of a substantially larger multi-domain transaction. The Namespro transaction included numerous unrelated descriptive and commercially useful domain names.

Remedy Sought

The Complainant requests the Disputed Domain Name be transferred to it.

DISCUSSION AND FINDINGS

4.1 Eligibility- Jurisdiction

The Complainant is the registered owner in Canada of the Trademark BITCOIN CENTRAL and therefore satisfies the CIRA Canadian Presence Requirement as stipulated in paragraph 1.4 of the Policy.

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

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

The Registrant has conceded that the Disputed Domain Name is confusingly similar to the Complainant's Mark and that the Complainant has prior rights, so that the Panel need not consider this further.

4.3.2 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 Disputed 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) states 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

Paragraph 3.5 (b) states that such bad faith may be found where the Registrant 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:

Domain Name: <bitcoincentral.ca>
27503-CDRP

“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.”

The Panel notes that inherent to a finding of bad faith, the provisions contained in Paragraph 3.5 of the Policy require 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.

The Panel accepts that the Complainant’s bad faith case rests principally upon the inference that an exact-match domain associated with commercial parking must have been registered to exploit the Complainant’s trademark. In other words, does the evidence show that the Complainant knew of and specifically targeted the Complainant’s business or acquired the Disputed Domain Name to disrupt the Complainant’s business or to prevent the Complainant from registering its Mark? While the evidence does show that the Complainant did acquire the Disputed Domain Name with the purpose of selling, renting or licensing it, there is no evidence at all that it knew of or intended to sell it to the Complainant or to a competitor of the Complainant. While the Complainant would be a logical acquirer of the Disputed Domain Name, there is no evidence to suggest that it might not be acquired by another person who is not a competitor of the Complainant and therefore used for non-competitive services or business. The Complaint makes no allegation of conduct which shows awareness by the Registrant of its marks at any time prior to Registrant’s acquisition of the Disputed Domain Name.

With respect to Policy 3.5 (a), the evidence of the Registrant is that Ben Glickman instead approached the Registrant through CIRA’s Message Delivery Form on June 4, 2026 and asked what the Registrant was asking for the Disputed Domain Name. The Registrant did not respond, quoted no price and entered into no negotiation. Was this a clever way of avoiding the strictures of Policy 3.5? Perhaps, but the fact remains that there was no price demand even after the trademark owner initiated contact. In any event that evidence does not establish that the Registrant acquired the domain name “primarily” for the purpose of selling it to the Complainant. Again finding “targeting” of the Complainant is a crucial element of this and of all the other circumstances in Policy 3.5.

The evidence of the Registrant supports an ordinary domain-investment explanation independent of the Complainant. The evidence establishes that acquiring and holding domain-name inventory is a longstanding activity of the Registrant.

The panel accepts the evidence of the circumstances of the Registrant’s acquisition of the Disputed Domain Name and of its other domain names (reviewed above as part of the recitation of the Registrant’s contentions). This evidence is consistent with the Registrant’s position that he did not target the Complainant or acquire the domain name for any of the purposes set out in CIRA Policy 3.5 a-f.

The evidence establishes that the Registrant is in the business of acquiring, holding, managing, developing, monetizing and reselling domain names. There may be a fine line between the entrepreneur and the cyber squatter, but this line is only crossed when the evidence establishes that the Registrant targeted the business of the Complainant. The *Entreprise* case cited by the Complainant illustrates that line. In that case involving the domain name <entreprise.ca>, the Panel found that the current Registrant had in effect targeted the well-known car rental business. The Registrant had linked the domain <entreprise.ca> to other car rental businesses. Based on this the Panel concluded that the Registrant had targeted the Complainant's business in bad faith and without legitimate interest. This case is readily distinguished from the present case. No such evidence exists in this case.

It is clear that simply registering and acquiring domain names for eventual sale does not, of itself, represent bad faith where there is no targeting of the Complainant. See for example *Behaviour Interactive v Maser Media CDRP No. 00406 (Dec. 19, 2019)*. The fact that the domain names are parked and/or point to some holding web site is not per se evidence of bad faith. *UAP Inc. v. Jim Strater, napa.ca*, CDRP Dispute No. 00154 (August 3, 2010). Acquiring the domain name at a public auction and offering it for sale does not constitute bad faith where there is no targeting of the Complainant. *Cronos Group Inc. v. Mira Holdings, Inc., cronosgroup.com*, CIIDRC Case No. 23351-UDRP (August 16, 2024). "It is in the nature of domain investing to buy low and sell high, but unless there is some act or conduct in addition to the desire to "maximize profits" it does not support bad faith. Thus: 'Domain name speculation alone is not bad faith.' *Dr. Muscle v. Michael Krell*, FA190300 1833036, (April 19, 2019). "Rather, to constitute bad faith, the speculation must be targeted to the trademark value of a name...". See also WIPO Overview (3.0, 2017,)" (Quoting from *Cronos Group*, cited above).

On a balance of probabilities, the Disputed Domain Name was not registered or acquired in bad faith.

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

Given the panel's decision that there is no bad faith, it is not strictly necessary to consider the issue of legitimate interest. However, the Panel chooses to do so in the hopes of clarifying this ground.

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."

CDRP cases have accepted that paragraph 3.4 is "not exhaustive" and have found a legitimate interest because an ordinary-language domain was capable of lawful use independent of the complainant's trademark rights. *Behaviour Interactive Inc. v. Maser Media Inc., behaviour.ca*, CDRP No. 00406 (Dec. 19, 2019).

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.

Here, the Registrant has no business relationship with the Complainant and has not registered or used the Disputed Domain Name in connection with any business of the Registrant.

The Disputed Domain Name is somewhat descriptive. It appears from the evidence cited above that the Registrant is in the business of acquiring domain names to sell to prospective buyers.

The pursuit of investing in domain names for profit is well known and accepted as a legitimate business strategy. See, e.g., *The Clash Of Trademarks And Domain Names On The Internet*, at 10.02-A.2 (Gerald M. Levine, Legal Corner Press, September 11, 2026). Over the course of many UDRP cases, panels have acknowledged further grounds which, while not codified in the UDRP as such, would establish respondent rights or legitimate interests in a domain name. For example, generally speaking, panels have accepted that aggregating and holding domain names (usually for resale) consisting of acronyms, dictionary words, or common phrases can be bona fide and is not per se illegitimate under the UDRP

WIPO Panels under the UDRP have recognized that aggregating and holding memorable combinations of dictionary or common terms for resale can be bona fide where the registration was not undertaken to target a trademark. A recent panel found a legitimate interest despite a substantial sale price because the phrase had independent value, the respondent's portfolio corroborated the acquisition rationale, the complainant initiated the purchase contact, and the evidence did not show trademark targeting (*Florent Poussier v. TopDomains, Pawel Szablowski, transfer.now*, WIPO Case No. D2026-1326 (May 18, 2026)).

The Registrant claims that he is a domain name investor and the submitted evidence supports this. Nevertheless, there remains the question of whether the Registrant should have conducted some research prior to acquiring the Disputed Domain Name and thus whether he *should have known* of the Complainant and its mark. As this is an unsettled issue in both CDRP and UDRP jurisprudence, the Panel declines to undertake an analysis of it as this case has been decided in favor of the Registrant on other grounds.

In summary, the Panel finds that as long as a disputed domain name is being used in a way that does not trade off the complainant's trademark (whether to host links, content, a landing or sales page, or hosting no content at all), and where there are no other indicia of cybersquatting, such use may support the respondent's claim to a right or legitimate interest. WIPO Overview 3.1, section 2.10.1. *Florent Poussier* (cited above)..

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 Name remain with the Registrant. Transfer is denied.

Made at Toronto, Canada as of 28th day of September 2026

SIGNATURE OF PANEL

