Decision for dispute CAC-UDRP-108463

Case number	CAC-UDRP-108463
Time of filing	2026-03-04 12:34:25
Domain names	casetify.net

Case administrator

Organization	Iveta Špiclová (Czech Arbitration Court) (Case admin)

Complainant

Organization	Casetagram Limited

Complainant representative

Organization	CSC Digital Brand Services Group AB

Respondent

Organization	Goalnowtech Limited

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 relies on the following registrations of the trade mark CASETIFY (amongst others) of which it is the registered proprietor:

- Registration no. 303735667 in class 9 in Hong Kong SAR on 8 June 2017
- Registration no. 4707090 in class 9 in the USA on 24 March 2015
- International Registration no. 1409914 in class 9 on 4 April 2018

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

The Complainant's business was founded in Hong Kong in 2011 to supply individualised protective cases for mobile phones. It now sells a range of tech accessories, including mobile phone cases and watch bands, and has offices in Los Angeles, Seoul and Tokyo, as well as its headquarters in Hong Kong. It has supplied cases for over 20 million devices. Its website at casetify.com received 6.6 million individual visits in December 2025.

The disputed domain name, <casetify.net>, was registered by the Respondent on 9 January 2025. It resolves to a web page displaying sponsored links to websites of third parties, including competitors of the Complainant.

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 Panel finds that the Complainant has registered rights in the mark CASETIFY.

The disputed domain name consists of the Complainant's registered mark and the generic top level domain name suffix, .net, which does not constitute any real distinction.

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 Panel does not regard the Respondent's use of the disputed domain name to locate a web page displaying sponsored links to websites of third parties including competitors of the Complainant as a bona fide offering of goods or services.

The Panel finds on the undisputed evidence that the Respondent has not used or made preparations to use the disputed domain name for any bona fide offering of goods or services or for any legitimate non-commercial or fair use, has not been authorised by the Complainant to the use the disputed domain name or any corresponding name, and is not commonly known by the disputed domain name or any corresponding name.

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 Panel finds on the undisputed evidence that the Respondent has intentionally attempted to attract Internet users to its web page by creating, through its use of the disputed domain name, a likelihood of confusion with the Complainant's mark as to the source of this web page, for commercial gain in the form of commissions on sponsored links.

In accordance with paragraph 4(b)(iv) of the Policy this constitutes evidence of registration and use of the disputed domain name in bad faith. There is no evidence rebutting this presumption.

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 disputed domain consists of the Complainant's registered mark and a generic top level domain name suffix. It resolves to a web page displayed sponsored links, including to websites of competitors of the Complainant. The Panel finds that the disputed domain name is identical or confusingly similar to the Complainant's registered mark, that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the disputed domain name, and that it was registered and is being use in bad faith. Paragraph 4(b)(iv) of the Policy was applied.

FOR ALL THE REASONS STATED ABOVE, THE COMPLAINT IS

Accepted

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

1. **casetify.net**: Transferred

PANELLISTS

Name	**Jonathan Turner**

DATE OF PANEL DECISION 2026-04-14

Publish the Decision