Decision for dispute CAC-UDRP-108046

Case number	CAC-UDRP-108046
Time of filing	2025-10-16 13:06:04
Domain names	speedy-mobile.com, mobile-autoglass.com, xautoglass.com

Case administrator

Name	Olga Slanařová (Case admin)

Complainant

Organization	Belron International Limited

Complainant representative

Organization	HSS IPM GmbH

Respondent

Organization	Toronto Auto Glass

OTHER LEGAL PROCEEDINGS

The Panel is unaware of any other pending or decided legal proceedings in respect of the domain names <speedy-mobile.com>, <mobile-autoglass.com>, and <xautoglass.com> (collectively, 'the Disputed Domain Names').

IDENTIFICATION OF RIGHTS

The Complainant, Belron International Limited, is the holder of the following registered trade marks, among others:

• Canadian trade mark registration no. TMA122222, registered on 19 May 1961, for the word mark SPEEDY AUTO GLASS, in classes 11, 12, 19, 21, 35, 37, and 38 of the Nice Classification;

• Canadian trade mark registration no. TMA339541, registered 22 April 1988, for the figurative mark SPEEDY, in classes 6, 11, 12, 19, 20, 21, and 37; and

• United Kingdom trade mark registration no. 00001303055, registered on 8 October 1993, for the word mark AUTOGLASS, in class 37 of the Nice Classification.

(Each a 'trade mark' and collectively 'the Complainant's trade mark').

The Disputed Domain Names were registered on the following dates:

<speedy-mobile.com>	14 June 2025

<mobile-autoglass.com>	5 June 2025
<xautoglass.com>	3 June 2025

At the time of writing, the Disputed Domain Names resolve to active websites offering vehicle-glass repair and replacement services (collectively, 'the Respondent's websites').

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

A. Complainant's Assertions

The Complainant, based in Egham, Surrey, United Kingdom, forms part of the Belron Group, a global leader in vehicle-glass repair and replacement operating across approximately forty countries and employing around 30,000 people.

The SPEEDY marks have been used in Canada for over seventy years, building a substantial reputation and goodwill. SPEEDY GLASS is a nationally recognised brand, with around 200 service centres serving more than 150,000 customers annually.

In the United Kingdom and Ireland, AUTOGLASS is the market leader, assisting over one million motorists each year. The Complainant also operates the official websites www.autoglass.co.uk, www.autoglass.ie, both registered in 1996, and www.speedyglass.ca, registered in 2000.

B. Respondent's Position

No Response was filed.

PARTIES CONTENTIONS

A. Complainant

A.1 Consolidation

The Complainant requests consolidation of claims concerning the Disputed Domain Names into a single proceeding. The registrar's verification response confirms a common registrant – **Toronto Auto Glass / Anthony McDowall** – and the Disputed Domain Names share similar content, technical configuration, and timing of registration.

The Complainant submits that consolidation is appropriate under the UDRP Policy to ensure procedural efficiency and fairness.

A.2 Substantive Grounds

A.2.1 The Disputed Domain Names are identical or confusingly similar to a trade mark in which the Complainant has rights

Each Disputed Domain Name whole reproduces a registered trade mark of the Complainant with only non-distinctive additions:

• <speedy-mobile.com> incorporates the SPEEDY mark with the addition of 'mobile';

• <mobile-autoglass.com> incorporates the AUTOGLASS mark with 'mobile'; and

• <xautoglass.com> incorporates the AUTOGLASS mark with a single letter 'x'.

The Complainant submits that these additions do not prevent a finding of confusing similarity. Under established UDRP principles (WIPO Overview of WIPO Panel Views on Selected UDRP Questions, Third Edition ('the WIPO Jurisprudential Overview 3.0'), section 1.7), where a trade mark remains recognisable within a domain name, confusing similarity exists. The generic Top-Level Domain ('the TLD') <.com> should be disregarded in this assessment.

A.2.2 The Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the Disputed Domain Names

The Respondent has no relationship with, nor authorisation from, the Complainant to use its marks. The associated websites reproduce the Complainant's marks and imagery, purport to offer identical services in Canada, and provide inconsistent or implausible contact details.

The Complainant contends that such use cannot amount to a bona fide offering of goods or services, nor any fair or non-commercial use. The Respondent has failed to participate in this proceeding or present evidence to the contrary.

A.2.3 The Respondent registered and is using the Disputed Domain Names in bad faith

The Complainant's marks long predate the registration of the Disputed Domain Names and are well known in Canada, the

Respondent's apparent jurisdiction. The Complainant asserts that the Disputed Domain Names have been used to promote identical services, prominently displaying its marks, and therefore show intent to mislead for commercial gain.

The Complainant also relies on three prior UDRP decisions concerning its marks – Beltron International Limited v Md. Rashidul Islam (CAC Case No. 106938); Belron International Limited v Rudranth McDowall (CAC Case No. 107563); and Belron International Limited v DNS Admin (CAC Case No. 106258) – to demonstrate a broader pattern of abusive registrations targeting the Complainant's trade marks. The case Belron International Limited v Rudranth McDowall (CAC Case No. 107563) is said to be particularly relevant, as the domain name <speedy-mobile-auto-glass.com> in that dispute shared factual and technical features with the present registrations.

The Complainant notes that the current registrant, Anthony McDowall, shares the same surname and postal code as the prior registrant, Rudranth McDowall. While unverified, these similarities suggest possible common control or coordination.

A.2.4 Relief sought

The Complainant seeks the transfer of the Disputed Domain Names.

B. Respondent

No Response was filed. The Panel proceeds on the unchallenged evidence before it.

RIGHTS

The Complainant has, to the satisfaction of the Panel, shown the Disputed Domain Names are identical or confusingly similar to a trade mark in which the Complainant has rights (within the meaning of paragraph 4(a)(i) of the UDRP Policy).

NO RIGHTS OR LEGITIMATE INTERESTS

The Complainant has, to the satisfaction of the Panel, shown the Respondent to have no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the Disputed Domain Names (within the meaning of paragraph 4(a)(ii) of the UDRP Policy).

BAD FAITH

The Complainant has, to the satisfaction of the Panel, shown the Disputed Domain Names have been registered and are being used in bad faith (within the meaning of paragraph 4(a)(iii) of the UDRP Policy).

PROCEDURAL FACTORS

1. Consolidation

The Panel has considered the record, the UDRP Rules, and paragraph 4.11.2 of the WIPO Jurisprudential Overview 3.0.

Under Rules 10(b) and 10(c) of the UDRP Rules, the Panel must balance procedural efficiency with equality of treatment and fairness to all parties.

All Disputed Domain Names were registered within close temporal proximity, share the same registrant, registrar, employ the same TLD <.com>, and display consistent website design and content. On that basis, the Panel concludes that the Disputed Domain Names are under common control and grants the Complainant's request for consolidation.

2. Procedural compliance

The Panel finds that all procedural requirements under the UDRP Policy, UDRP Rules, and CAC's UDRP Supplemental Rules, have been satisfied. The matter is properly before the Panel.

PRINCIPAL REASONS FOR THE DECISION

A. Applicable Legal Framework

Pursuant to Rule 15 of the UDRP Rules, the Panel decides on the basis of the statements and evidence submitted, in accordance with the UDRP Policy, the UDRP Rules, and any applicable principles of law.

Under Paragraph 4(a) of the UDRP Policy, the Complainant must establish, on the balance of probabilities, that:

i. The Disputed Domain Names are identical or confusingly similar to a trade mark or service mark in which the Complainant has rights;

ii. The Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the Disputed Domain Names; and

iii. The Disputed Domain Names have been registered and are being used in bad faith.

B. Identical or Confusingly Similar

The Complainant has established rights in the SPEEDY and AUTOGLASS marks. Each Disputed Domain Name incorporates one of those marks in its entirety. Minor additions to the domain name strings, such as 'mobile' and 'x', or a hyphen, do not prevent a finding of confusing similarity. The generic TLD <.com> is immaterial in this assessment.

The Panel therefore finds that paragraph 4(a)(i) of the UDRP Policy is satisfied.

C. Rights or Legitimate Interests

The Respondent has made no attempt to rebut the Complainant's case or to demonstrate any rights or legitimate interests. The unchallenged evidence shows that the Respondent used the Disputed Domain Names for websites offering identical services to those of the Complainant while reproducing the Complainant's marks and imagery. Such conduct cannot constitute bona fide offering of goods or services or any legitimate non-commercial use.

On the balance of probabilities, the Respondent's use of the Disputed Domain Names was intended to mislead consumers and to benefit from the Complainant's reputation. Accordingly, the Panel finds that paragraph 4(a)(ii) of the UDRP Policy is met.

D. Registered and Used in Bad Faith

The Complainant's marks pre-date the registration of the Disputed Domain Names by more than fifty years and enjoy significant reputation in Canada, where the Respondent appears to operate. Given the prominence of the marks and the Respondent's use of them, it is implausible that the Respondent registered the Disputed Domain Names without knowledge of the Complainant's rights.

The evidence indicates that the Disputed Domain Names were deliberately selected to replicate the Complainant's marks and to direct consumers to websites offering identical services in the same jurisdiction. The configuration of these domain names, the use of the Complainant's branding and marks, and the temporal proximity of the registrations all support this finding.

The Complainant has also referred to prior UDRP decisions involving its marks, namely Beltron International Limited v Md. Rashidul Islam (CAC Case No. 106938), Belron International Limited v Rudranth McDowall (CAC Case No. 107563), and Belron International Limited v DNS Admin (CAC Case No. 106258), which demonstrate a well-established history of unauthorised registrations targeting its brands.

The case circumstances of both the earlier Belron International Limited v Rudranth McDowall (CAC Case No. 107563) and the present matter show notable factual overlap. The current registrant, Anthony McDowall, and the respondent in the earlier case share the same surname and postal code, and both sets of domain names concern websites purporting to offer identical services in Canada using the Complainant's marks. While this evidence is not conclusive of identity, it supports a reasonable inference that the registrations are connected or form part of a continuing course of conduct directed at the Complainant's marks.

The Respondent's failure to participate in the proceeding, taken together with the pattern of related registrations and the deliberate use of the Complainant's marks for commercial gain, supports a finding of bad faith within paragraphs 4(b)(ii) and (iv) of the UDRP Policy.

Accordingly, the Panel concludes that the Disputed Domain Names were registered and are being used in bad faith within the meaning of paragraph 4(a)(iii) of the UDRP Policy.

E. Decision

For the foregoing reasons, in accordance with paragraph 4(i) of the UDRP Policy and Rule 15 of the UDRP Rules, the Panel orders that the Disputed Domain Names <speedy-mobile.com>, <mobile-autoglass.com>, and <xautoglass.com> be transferred to the Complainant, Belron International Limited.

FOR ALL THE REASONS STATED ABOVE, THE COMPLAINT IS

Accepted

AND THE DISPUTED DOMAIN NAME(S) IS (ARE) TO BE

1. **speedy-mobile.com**: Transferred

2. **mobile-autoglass.com**: Transferred
3. **xautoglass.com**: Transferred

PANELLISTS

Name	**Gustavo Moser**

DATE OF PANEL DECISION 2025-11-28

Publish the Decision