Decision for dispute CAC-UDRP-108388

Case number	CAC-UDRP-108388
Time of filing	2026-02-03 14:27:21
Domain names	caasetify.com

Case administrator

Name	Olga Slanařová (Case admin)

Complainant

Organization	Casetagram Limited

Complainant representative

Organization	CSC Digital Brand Services Group AB

Respondent

Name	Zhichao .

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 is the owner of the following registered trademarks for the word mark CASETIFY:

- USPTO Registration No. 4707090 (March 24, 2015);
- USPTO Registration No. 6908208 (November 22, 2022);
- USPTO Registration No. 6908209 (November 22, 2022);
- WIPO International Registration No. 1409914 (April 4, 2018);
- CNIPA Registration No. 19614307 (August 21, 2017).

The disputed domain name <caasetify.com> was registered on July 3, 2025.

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

The Complainant Casetagram Limited, trading as CASETIFY, a Hong Kong-based company founded in 2011 that designs and sells technology accessories, including phone cases and watch bands. The Complainant claims to operate internationally, with offices in Los Angeles, Seoul, and Tokyo, and to have protected over 20 million devices worldwide and maintained an active online presence through its primary domain name <casetify.com>, registered since November 22, 2013, which received approximately 6.6 million visits in December 2025.

The Complainant, owner of the “CASETIFY” trademarks, alleges that the Respondent registered the disputed domain name <caasetify.com> in a manner that is confusingly similar to the Complainant’s marks, without any rights and legitimate interest and in bad faith.

PARTIES CONTENTIONS

The Complainant relies on the above-mentioned registered trademarks for the word mark CASETIFY with the first use in commerce dating to 2011. The Complainant submits that the Respondent has no affiliation with the Complainant and has not been granted any license or authorization to use the CASETIFY trademark. The Respondent has previously been a party to the following UDRP proceedings resulting in adverse decisions: WIPO Cases No. D2025-3675; D2025-3387; D2025-2680; and D2025-0806.

Although the Complainant occasionally refers to the disputed domain names in the plural, only one domain name, <caasetify.com>, is the subject of this proceeding.

The Complainant contends that the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to the CASETIFY trademark, with the applicable TLD disregarded in accordance with established UDRP practice. The disputed domain name differs from the Complainant's mark by a single letter – a repetition of the vowel "a". The Complainant characterizes the registration as deliberate typosquatting and relies on Section 1.9 of the WIPO Jurisprudential Overview 3.0, which provides that intentional misspellings of a trademark are confusingly similar for the purposes of the first UDRP element.

The Complainant submits that the Respondent lacks rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name. The Respondent is not affiliated with the Complainant, has received no authorization to use the CASETIFY mark, and is not commonly known by the disputed domain name (WIPO Cases No. D2008-0642 and D2004-1049). The Respondent is using the disputed domain name to host parked pages featuring pay-per-click links to third-party websites competing directly with the Complainant's business, which does not constitute a bona fide offering of goods or services or a legitimate noncommercial or fair use under paragraphs 4(c)(i) and 4(c)(iii) of the Policy (WIPO Jurisprudential Overview 3.0, Section 2.9). The Respondent's use of a privacy WHOIS service further supports the absence of legitimate interests (WIPO Case No. D2011-1855).

The Complainant advances several cumulative grounds of bad faith. First, given the international reputation of the CASETIFY mark and the Complainant's substantial online presence, the Respondent knew or should have known of the trademark at the time of registration (WIPO Case No. D2005-0517). Second, typosquatting per se evidences bad faith, and the mere registration of a typosquatted version of a well-known mark by an unaffiliated party creates a presumption of bad faith under Section 3.1.4 of the WIPO Jurisprudential Overview 3.0 (WIPO Case No. D2004-1069). Third, the Respondent's use of competitive PPC links to generate commercial revenue through domain names confusingly similar to the Complainant's mark constitutes bad faith under paragraph 4(b)(iv) of the Policy (WIPO Jurisprudential Overview 3.0, Section 3.5; D2006-0162). Respondent's history of adverse UDRP decisions and its registration of domain names misappropriating third-party trademarks (WIPO Cases No. D2004-1028; D2016-2020; D2013-1404) constitutes a pattern of cybersquatting. Fifth, the Respondent's use of a privacy WHOIS service is indicative of bad faith (WIPO Case No. D2003-0230; WIPO Jurisprudential Overview 3.0, Section 3.6). The Complainant concludes that, on a balance of probabilities, the Respondent registered and is using the disputed domain name with full knowledge of and with intent to target the Complainant's trademark (WIPO Case No. D2014-1754), and that no plausible good faith use of the disputed domain name is conceivable (WIPO Cases No. D2000-0003; D2000-0574).

NO ADMINISTRATIVELY COMPLIANT RESPONSE HAS BEEN FILED.

RIGHTS

The Complainant has, to the satisfaction of the Panel, shown the disputed domain name is 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

For the Complainant to succeed it must prove, within the meaning of paragraph 4(a) of the Policy, that:

1. The domain name is identical or confusingly similar to a trademark or service mark in which the complainant has rights; and
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.

I. The domain name is identical or confusingly similar to a trademark or service mark in which the Complainant has rights

The Complainant has demonstrated ownership of several CASETIFY trademark registrations dating from 2015. These registrations significantly predate the Respondent's registration of the disputed domain name. The Complainant also uses a corresponding domain name that includes the CASETIFY designation.

The disputed domain name incorporates the Complainant's CASETIFY trademark in its entirety, with the addition of a duplicated letter "A" (CAASETIFY), which does not prevent a finding of confusing similarity, as established in numerous UDRP decisions. This constitutes a classic case of typosquatting, where a domain name represents a slight alphabetical variation of a trademark. The gTLD ".com" is disregarded for the purposes of the first element.

On the basis of the Complainant's submissions, the Panel considers that the Complainant has made out its case under paragraph 4(a)(i) of the Policy.

II. The respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the domain name

For the Complainant to succeed, it must prove, within the meaning of paragraph 4(a) of the Policy, that (ii) the respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the domain name. Once the Complainant establishes a prima facie case that the Respondent lacks rights or legitimate interests, the burden of production shifts to the Respondent.

The Complainant has established a prima facie case (not challenged by the Respondent, who did not file any response to the complaint) that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name.

While failure to respond does not per se demonstrate that the Respondent does not have rights or legitimate interests, it allows the Panel to draw such inferences as it considers appropriate, see paragraph 14(b) of the Rules and CAC-UDRP-101284 or CAC-UDRP-106228 "A respondent is not obliged to participate in a proceeding under the Policy, but if it fails to do so, reasonable inferences may be drawn from the information provided by the complainant".

There is no evidence that the Respondent is related in any way with the Complainant, is a distributor, agent, or business partner of the Complainant, and that the Respondent has been authorized or licensed to use the CASETIFY trademark or any domain name incorporating it.

The Complainant provided evidence that the disputed domain name was used to resolve to a website featuring pay-per-click links to third-party websites competing directly with the Complainant's business (offering the phone and tablet cases), which does not constitute a bona fide offering of goods or services or a legitimate noncommercial or fair use.

Under WIPO Jurisprudential Overview 3.1 "panels have found that the use of a domain name to host a parked page comprising PPC links does not represent a bona fide offering where such links compete with or capitalize on the reputation and goodwill of the complainant's mark or otherwise mislead Internet users" (see section 2.9).

Given the Respondent's failure to respond and the absence of any apparent legitimate use of the disputed domain name, the Panel considers that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the disputed domain name within the meaning of paragraph 4(a)(ii) of the Policy.

III. The domain name has been registered and is being used in bad faith

For the Complainant to succeed, it must prove, within the meaning of paragraph 4(a) of the Policy, that (iii) the domain name has been registered and is being used in bad faith.

The Complainant proved the reputation of the CASETIFY trademark and the Complainant's substantial online presence under the mark CASETIFY. The Respondent has registered the disputed domain name substantially similar to the Complainant's trademark CASETIFY, and it is, therefore, reasonable to infer that the Respondent registered the disputed domain name in bad faith as the Respondent was or at least should have been aware of the existence and reputation of the Complainant's trademark at the time of registering the disputed domain name.

The disputed domain name was further used to resolve to a website featuring pay-per-click links to third-party websites competing directly with the Complainant's business (offering the phone and tablet cases), i.e. to generate commercial revenue through a domain name confusingly similar to the Complainant's mark. Such use constitutes evidence of bad faith under paragraph 4(b)(iv) of the Policy, as it intentionally attempts to attract Internet users for commercial gain by creating a likelihood of confusion with the Complainant’s trademark.

The Panel therefore considers that 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.

The Panel finally considers that the Complainant has shown that the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to a trademark in which the Complainant has rights, the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the disputed domain name and the disputed domain name has been registered and is being used in bad faith. The Complainant has thus established all three elements of paragraph 4(a) of the Policy.

FOR ALL THE REASONS STATED ABOVE, THE COMPLAINT IS

Accepted

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

1. **caasetify.com**: Transferred

PANELLISTS

Name	**Petr Hostaš**

DATE OF PANEL DECISION 2026-03-06

Publish the Decision