Decision for dispute CAC-UDRP-108432

Case number	CAC-UDRP-108432
Time of filing	2026-02-23 09:46:19
Domain names	casatify.com, casetyfy.com

Case administrator

Name	Olga Slanařová (Case admin)

Complainant

Organization	Casetagram Limited

Complainant representative

Organization	CSC Digital Brand Services Group AB

Respondent

Organization	Fundacion Privacy Services LTD

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 registered owner of trademarks consisting of or containing CASETIFY including:

United States of America Registered Trademark Number 4707090 for the word mark CASETIFY, registered on March 24, 2015, in Class 9;

International Registered Trademark Number 1409914 for the word mark CASETIFY, registered on April 4, 2018, in Class 9, designated in respect of multiple countries and territories; and

Chinese Registered Trademark Number 19614307 for the stylized word mark CASETIFY, registered on August 21, 2017, in Class 9.

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

Founded in 2011, headquartered in Hong Kong, China, and having an international presence, the Complainant is a company that supplies a range of tech accessories, including phone cases and watch bands, which allow customers to express their individuality, creativity, and personal style. Throughout its existence, the Complainant’s products have protected over 20 million devices worldwide, and it has collaborated with over 500 global artists and has offered 30,000 different designs.

The Complainant uses the domain name <casetify.com>, registered on November 22, 2013, for an official website which displays information about the Complainant and its activities. According to SimilarWeb, the Complainant's website received 6.6 million individual visits in December 2025, giving it a global ranking. The Complainant also has a strong presence on social media including 2.7 million Instagram followers; 2.1 million Facebook followers; 777,000 TikTok followers; and 108,400 Twitter/X followers (with a join date to the latter social media service of September 2011).

The registration dates of the disputed domain names are November 2, 2020 in respect of <casetyfy.com>, and November 21, 2023 in respect of <casatify.com>. The Complainant shows via screenshots with tracking information that both disputed domain names resolve to the Complainant's said official website. The Complainant further produces screenshots of online aftermarket service purchase pages indicating that the disputed domain names are offered for sale for a "Premium Domain Purchase (one-time fee)" of USD 1,299 per disputed domain name, namely, an amount likely to exceed the out of pocket costs incurred by the Respondent in respect of their registration or acquisition.

PARTIES CONTENTIONS

Complainant:

The Complainant is the owner of the CASETIFY trademarks. The disputed domain names are purposeful misspellings of said trademarks and must be considered confusingly similar thereto. Specifically, the disputed domain name <casatify.com> varies from the Complainant's said trademarks by only one letter in that the Respondent has removed the letter "e" from CASETIFY and replaced it with the letter "a". The disputed domain name <casetyfy.com> also varies from the Complainant's said trademarks by only one letter in that the Respondent has removed the letter "i" from CASETIFY and replaced it with the letter "y". Such substitutions are prototypical examples of typosquatting, which intentionally take advantage of Internet users who inadvertently type an incorrect address, often a misspelling of a complainant's trademark, when seeking to access the trademark owner's website. A deliberate misspelling of a trademark registered as a domain name, which is intended to confuse Internet users, must be confusingly similar by design.

The disputed domain names are similar to the Complainant's said trademarks in sight, sound, and pronunciation, and the similarities are so close that confusion can arise in the mind of a consumer. The Respondent's use of the disputed domain names to forward to the Complainant's official website contributes to said confusion and shows that the Respondent prima facie seeks to target said trademarks through the disputed domain names.

The disputed domain names were registered after the Complainant filed for registration of its said trademarks, significantly after the Complainant registered its primary domain name, and after the Complainant's first use in commerce of said trademarks in 2011. The Respondent is not sponsored by or affiliated with the Complainant in any way. The Complainant has not licensed, authorized, or permitted the Respondent to use the said trademarks in any manner, including in domain names. In the absence of any license or permission from the Complainant to use its trademarks, no actual or contemplated bona fide or legitimate use of the disputed domain names could reasonably be claimed. The Respondent is not commonly known by the disputed domain names considering the corresponding WHOIS data.

The Respondent is identified as a privacy service (which of itself equates to a lack of legitimate interest) that does not resemble the disputed domain names in any manner. The Respondent is not sponsored by or affiliated with the Complainant in any way. The Complainant has not licensed, authorized, or permitted the Respondent to use the Complainant's said trademarks in any manner, including in domain names. In the absence of such a lack of permission, no actual or contemplated bona fide or legitimate use of the disputed domain names could reasonably be claimed. The redirection of the disputed domain names to the Complainant's official website does not amount to a bona fide offering of goods or services under the Policy, nor a legitimate noncommercial or fair use. The fact that the Respondent is offering the disputed domain names for sale at an amount that far exceeds its out of pocket expenses in connection with their registration serves as further evidence of its lack of rights and legitimate interests.

The Complainant and its marks are known internationally, with its goods and services being sold globally since 2011 using the said trademarks. The Respondent created the disputed domain names, which are purposeful misspellings of the Complainant's said trademarks, are confusingly similar thereto, are almost identical to the Complainant's said primary domain name, and are used to redirect to the Complainant's actual official website. The Respondent has thus demonstrated a knowledge of and familiarity with the Complainant's brand and business. It is not possible to conceive of a plausible situation where the Respondent would have been unaware of the Complainant's said trademarks, which are so closely linked and associated with the Complainant that the Respondent's use of minor variations of such marks strongly implies bad faith. It defies common sense to believe that the Respondent coincidentally selected the disputed domain names without such knowledge, and their very use by someone unconnected to the said marks suggests opportunistic bad faith. The Complainant's fame is demonstrated by the number of devices protected by the Complainant's products worldwide, and the popularity of its said official website. Performing Google searches for the terms in the disputed domain names returns multiple links referencing the Complainant or its business.

Typosquatting itself has been taken as evidence of bad faith registration and use by previous panels under the Policy, and the disputed domain names are slight misspellings of the Complainant's CASETIFY trademark, and of the Complainant's primary domain name. Registering a domain name to take advantage of traffic generated by typing errors committed by another's customers, as here, is evidence of bad faith registration and use pursuant to the Policy. The Respondent's use of the disputed domain names also constitutes a disruption of the Complainant's business because of the lack of corresponding authorization or approval, and affirms the Respondent's bad faith intent to trade upon the Complainant's reputation and goodwill. The Respondent's offer to sell the disputed domain names means that it is seeking to profit from the sale of domain names that are confusingly

similar to the said trademarks, demonstrating bad faith within the meaning of the Policy. The Respondent's use of a privacy service in all of these circumstances, which may block or intentionally delay disclosure of the identity of the underlying registrant, is also an indication of bad faith in the circumstances of this case.

Respondent:

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

The Complainant has provided evidence affirming that it is the registered owner of various CASETIFY trademarks and has shown that the disputed domain names each contain a minor typographical variation of said marks. A domain name which consists of a variation of a trademark (typically a common, obvious, or intentional misspelling, referred to as typosquatting) is considered by panels under the Policy to be confusingly similar to the relevant mark for purposes of the first element (see WIPO Overview of WIPO Panel Views on Select UDRP Questions ("WIPO Overview 3.1"), section 1.9).

The generic Top-Level Domain ("gTLD") ".com" of each of the disputed domain names is typically disregarded under the first element test. WIPO Overview 3.1, section 1.11.1. The Panel therefore finds that the disputed domain names are each confusingly similar to a trademark in which the Complainant has rights, and that the first element test of the Policy is satisfied.

With regard to the second element of the Policy, the Complainant asserts (among other assertions) that the Respondent is not commonly known by the disputed domain names (according to the WHOIS data), and that the Respondent is neither licensed nor authorized by the Complainant in any manner to make any use of the Complainant's said trademarks or to apply for registration of the disputed domain names. The Complainant notes that the disputed domain names are each a typographical variant of its CASETIFY mark, from which they each differ only by the substitution of a single letter. The disputed domain names thus may potentially be used to confuse Internet users looking for (and possibly mistyping the primary domain name for) the Complainant's official website, and to impersonate the Complainant. It is also noted that the disputed domain names are both presently used to forward traffic to the Complainant's said official website, suggesting prior knowledge of, and intent to target, the Complainant's rights.

The Panel finds that the Complainant's assertions, taken together, are sufficient to constitute the requisite prima facie case that the Respondent has no rights and legitimate interests in the disputed domain names (see, for example, section 2.1 of the WIPO Overview 3.1). In particular, the Panel accepts that the disputed domain names are more probably than not typosquatted or intentionally registered typographical variants of the Complainant's trademarks which are intended to take unfair advantage of Internet users' typographical errors in typing the Complainant's mark or corresponding official domain name, to cause confusion in the selection of a hyperlink, or otherwise to impersonate the Complainant. It follows that the disputed domain names have been created and are being used for the purposes of typosquatting, and this strongly suggests a lack of rights and legitimate interests on the Respondent's part.

The Respondent has not replied to the Complainant's allegations and evidence in this case and has failed to set out any alleged rights or legitimate interests which it might have claimed in the disputed domain names. There are no submissions or evidence on the record that might serve to rebut the Complainant's prima facie case. Accordingly, the Panel finds that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain names and that the second element test under the Policy is satisfied.

The Panel accepts the thrust of the Complainant's submissions that the Complainant's CASETIFY marks are well-established and have been in longstanding use globally, predating the registration of each of the disputed domain names by a significant degree. The Panel finds that the disputed domain names are intentionally designed typosquatting variants of the Complainant's said marks. In these circumstances, it is entirely reasonable to infer that the disputed domain names were registered by the Respondent with knowledge of the Complainant and its rights, and with an intent to target these.

Even though the disputed domain names point to the Complainant's official website, they are not under the Complainant's control and are unauthorized by it, whereby the continued registration of the disputed domain names constitutes a threat hanging over the Complainant of which the Complainant is reasonably apprehensive. The existence of such an ongoing threat is typically regarded as an indicator of bad faith under the Policy (see, for example, IP86, LLC v. Name Redacted, WIPO Case No. D2022-4896). Furthermore, the offer of the disputed domain names for sale at an amount likely to be in excess of the Respondent's related out of pocket costs is indicative of registration and use in bad faith within the meaning of paragraph 4(b)(i) of the Policy, insofar as this may have been the Respondent's primary intention.

In all of these circumstances, the Panel considers that the Complainant has made out a sufficient case of registration and use in bad faith under the Policy. The Respondent has not filed a Response in this case and therefore has made no rejoinder to the Complainant's assertions of bad faith registration and use. No explanation has been presented by the Respondent that might have suggested that its actions regarding the disputed domain names were in good faith, and the Panel has been unable to identify any conceivable good faith motivation which the Respondent might have put forward for their registration and use.

In all of these circumstances, the Panel finds that the disputed domain names have been registered and are being used in bad faith and that the third element test under the Policy is satisfied.

FOR ALL THE REASONS STATED ABOVE, THE COMPLAINT IS

Accepted

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

1. **casatify.com**: Transferred
2. **casetyfy.com**: Transferred

PANELLISTS

Name	**Andrew Lothian**

DATE OF PANEL DECISION 2026-03-19

Publish the Decision