Decision for dispute CAC-UDRP-108613

Case number	CAC-UDRP-108613
Time of filing	2026-04-30 14:41:49
Domain names	torontospeedymobileautoglass.com

Case administrator

Name	Olga Slanařová (Case admin)

Complainant

Organization	Belron International Limited

Complainant representative

Organization	HSS IPM GmbH

Respondent

Organization	MCDOWALLAN.ANTHONY

OTHER LEGAL PROCEEDINGS

The Panel is not aware of any other legal proceedings which are pending or decided and which relate to the disputed domain name.

IDENTIFICATION OF RIGHTS

The Complainant owns Speedy trademarks in numerous territories, including Canada where Respondent is located, but not limited to:

COUNTRY	TM	REG. NO.	REG DATE	OWNER
CANADA	SPEEDY AUTO GLASS®	TMA122222	May 19, 1961	Belron International Limited
CANADA	SPEEDY AUTO GLASS® & Design	TMA309481	December 20, 1985	Belron International Limited
CANADA	SPEEDY® & Design	TMA339918	May 6, 1988	Belron International Limited

CANADA	SPEEDY® & Design	TMA339541	April 22, 1988	Belron International Limited
CANADA	SPEEDY GLASS®	TMA448212	September 29, 1995	Belron International Limited
CANADA	SPEEDY GLASS® & Design	TMA777589	September 20, 2010	Belron International Limited

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

The Complainant, Belron International Limited, based in Egham, Surrey, United Kingdom, is part of the Belron Group, active worldwide in vehicle glass repair, replacement and recalibration. The Belron Group is present in approx. forty countries across six continents and has around 30,000 employees. The Complainant owns different brands, such as:

- SPEEDY®, SPEEDY AUTO GLASS®, and SPEEDY GLASS® (used in Canada) (hereinafter "Speedy Trademarks");
- AUTOGLASS® (used in the UK, Ireland, Poland);
- CARGLASS® (used in continental Europe, Africa, South America);
- SAFELITE® (used in the United States).

The Speedy trademarks of the Complainant have been a trusted name in vehicle glass repair and replacement services in Canada for over sixty years. Since its initial use, the Speedy trademarks have been widely promoted, advertised and utilized across Canada, building a significant and valuable reputation associated with quality vehicle glass repair and replacement services. In Canada, SPEEDY GLASS® has been recognized nationally for its expertise since 1949, clocking up over one million replacements and repairs. As a go-to destination for the repair and replacement of auto glass across Canada, approx. 200 Speedy Glass service centers serve around 150,000 satisfied clients each year.

The Speedy trademarks owned by Complainant were registered as early as 1961, long predating the registration of the disputed domain name on April 07, 2025.

Due to extensive use, advertising and revenue associated with the Speedy trademarks, Complainant enjoys a high degree of renown by offering high-quality vehicle glass repair, replacement and recalibration services to consumers and businesses in Canada (where Respondent is located) and worldwide.

The Complainant's Speedy trademarks have been the subject of past disputes under the UDRP and CIRA Domain Name Dispute Policies, namely:

- CAC-UDRP-106938 Belron International Limited v. Md. Rashidul Islam concerning the domain names speedyautoglasstoronto.com and autoglassrepairtorontogta.com.
- CAC-UDRP-107563 Belron International Limited v Rudranth McDowall concerning the domain name speedy-mobile-auto-glass.com.
- CAC-UDRP-106258 Belron International Limited v DNS Admin concerning the domain name standardautoglass.com.
- CAC-UDRP-108046 Belron International Limited v Anthony McDowall Toronto Auto Glass concerning the domain names mobile-autoglass.com, speedy-mobile.com, xautoglass.com.
- CIIDRC 25979-CDRP Belron International Limited v Rudranth McDowall concerning the domain name speedymobile.ca.

The Complainant prevailed in all aforementioned disputes.

Additionally, the Complainant owns and actively uses the domain name speedyglass.ca, registered on November 09, 2000, as its official website, where the Complainant and its affiliates inform customers about the Speedy trademarks, related brands, and services.

PARTIES CONTENTIONS

The Complainant contends that the requirements of the Policy have been met and that the disputed domain name should be transferred to it.
No administratively compliant Response has been filed.

RIGHTS

The Complainant has, to the satisfaction of the Panel, shown the disputed domain name is identical or confusingly similar to a

trademark or service mark in which the Complainant has rights (within the meaning of paragraph 4(a)(i) of the 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 name (within the meaning of paragraph 4(a)(ii) of the Policy).

BAD FAITH

The Complainant has, to the satisfaction of the Panel, shown the disputed domain name has been registered and is being used in bad faith (within the meaning of paragraph 4(a)(iii) of the Policy).

PROCEDURAL FACTORS

The Panel is satisfied that all procedural requirements under UDRP were met and there is no other reason why it would be inappropriate to provide a decision.

PRINCIPAL REASONS FOR THE DECISION

According to Paragraph 4(a) of the Policy, the Complainant is required to prove each of the following three elements to obtain an order that the disputed domain name should be transferred or cancelled:

(i) the disputed domain name is identical or confusingly similar to a trademark or service mark in which the Complainant has rights; and

(ii) the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the disputed domain name; and

(iii) the disputed domain name has been registered and is being used in bad faith.

The Panel has examined the evidence available to it and has come to the following conclusion concerning the satisfaction of the three elements of paragraph 4(a) of the Policy in these proceedings:

EARLIER RIGHTS

The Complainant has established rights in the names SPEEDY (and AUTO GLASS). The disputed domain name <TORONTOSPEEDYMOBILEAUTOGLASS.COM> is found to be confusingly similar to the Complainant’s trademarks. This finding is based on the settled practice in evaluating the existence of a likelihood of confusion of:

1. disregarding the top-level suffix in the domain names (i.e. “.COM") in the comparison; and
2. finding that the simple addition of a generic term such as “MOBILE” pointing to the character of the services provided under the trademarks in question to these trademarks (i.e. SPEEDY and AUTO GLASS) would not be considered sufficient to distinguish a domain name from a trademark. This applies equally to the addition of a geographical term indicating where the services could be provided, i.e. in “Toronto”.

The disputed domain name is therefore found to be confusingly similar to the earlier rights in the names SPEEDY (and AUTO GLASS), and the Panel concludes that the Complainant has satisfied the requirement under paragraph 4(a)(i) of the Policy.

NO RIGHTS OR LEGITIMATE INTERESTS

The onus to make out a prima facie case that the Respondent lacks rights or legitimate interests is placed on the Complainant. However, once such a prima facie case is made, the Respondent carries the burden of demonstrating rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name. If the Respondent fails to do so, the Complainant is deemed to have satisfied paragraph 4(a)(ii) of the Policy.

The Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name. The Complainant and the Respondent have not had any previous relationship. The Complainant has never granted the Respondent any rights to use the SPEEDY (and AUTO GLASS)

trademarks in any form, including in the disputed domain name. There is no evidence before the Panel indicating that the Respondent is commonly known by the disputed domain name.

At the time of filing the Complaint, the website, to which the disputed domain name connected, offered the same specialized automotive services (vehicle glass repair and replacement) and was therefore directly competing with the Complainant's business. The disputed domain name listed services encompassing vehicle glass repair and replacement services, purportedly in Brampton, Ontario.

The disputed domain name redirected to <mobile-autoglass.ca>, which featured a logo with a black background and the words MOBILEAUTOGLASS without spaces and with smaller text underneath reading “Speedy Glass Services”. In March 2026, the domain did not redirect; it directly promoted the brand "SPEEDY MOBILE AUTO GLASS". This demonstrates that the Respondent was intentionally leveraging the reputation of the Speedy trademarks, misleading the public into believing that there is a legitimate connection between the disputed domain name and the Complainant.

Further, the website has multiple indicators that it is not a legitimate business such as:

- The Toronto site includes a phone number that does not match the patterns of Toronto numbers, namely “(416) 661 4909 416873- 1998”. If a legitimate business was involved, at a minimum one would expect to see a working phone number, not a 20-numeral string.
- The Toronto site bizarrely includes a link to the <turo.com> website, resolving to a page offering a 2016 Kia Optima for rent.
- The website to which the Toronto site previously resolved included a photo which was copied from the Complainant’s official Speedy Glass Facebook posts.

Such activities were clearly aimed at passing off and benefiting from the reputation of the Complainant and are therefore clearly not an activity which could demonstrate a legitimate or fair use of the disputed domain name, or that would demonstrate a legitimate interest in the disputed domain name. Therefore, there is nothing that could be interpreted as rights or legitimate interests of the Respondent.

The Panel therefore concludes that the Respondent did not refute the Complainant’s prima facie case and has not established any rights or legitimate interest in the disputed domain name (within the meaning of paragraph 4(a)(ii) of the Policy). The Complainant has therefore also satisfied the requirement under paragraph 4(a)(ii) of the Policy.

BAD FAITH

The Panel finds that the Complainant has established that the disputed domain name was registered by the Respondent and is being used by the Respondent in bad faith.

The names SPEEDY (and AUTO GLASS) are distinctive and well known for the goods offered by the Complainant. The Respondent has copied the Complainant’s trademarks SPEEDY (and AUTO GLASS) in the disputed domain name.

The disputed domain name was registered by the Respondent on April 07, 2025, long after the Complainant commenced use of the mark.

The Complainant's SPEEDY (and AUTO GLASS) marks are readily identifiable in publicly accessible trademark databases. Additionally, the top results from a basic Google search of ‘SPEEDY (and AUTO GLASS)’ would clearly point to the Complainant. Notwithstanding any other considerations, the simplest degree of due diligence would have made any prospective registrant of the domain name aware of the Complainant’s rights in the internationally established SPEEDY (and AUTO GLASS) marks.

Internet users encountering the domain name are likely to believe that it is an official online presence of the Complainant, underscoring the Respondent’s bad faith in registering the domain name.

The Respondent's activities under the disputed domain name clearly constituted an attempt to benefit from the Complainant’s trademarks by passing off, an assumption supported by the fact that the Respondent had previously shown similar actions leading to UDRP decisions in favor of the Complainant.

Consequently, there appears to the Panel to be no possible good faith reason for the Respondent to have selected the disputed domain name, and there are demonstrable indications of bad faith present in this case.

The Panel therefore concludes that the Respondent has registered and is using the disputed domain name in bad faith (within the meaning of paragraph 4(a)(iii) of the Policy). The Complainant has therefore also satisfied the requirements under paragraph 4(a)(iii) of the Policy.

FOR ALL THE REASONS STATED ABOVE, THE COMPLAINT IS

Accepted

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

1. **torontospeedymobileautoglass.com**: Transferred

PANELLISTS

Name	**Udo Pfleghar B.A. (Melb.)**

DATE OF PANEL DECISION 2026-06-22

Publish the Decision