Decision for dispute CAC-UDRP-108508

Case number	**CAC-UDRP-108508**
Time of filing	**2026-03-20 08:07:03**
Domain names	**casetify-factory.site**

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	**Yulin Corp.**

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 numerous trademarks filed or registered in several countries, including the following:

- National Hong Kong trademark registration no. 303735667 “CASETIFY”, registered on April 7, 2016, in connection with goods in the class 9;
- International Hong Kong trademark registration no. 1409914 “CASETIFY”, registered on April 4, 2018, in connection with goods in the class 9;
- National US trademark registration no. 4707090 “CASETIFY”, registered on March 24, 2015, in connection with goods in the class 9;
- National Chinese trademark registration no. 19614307 “CASETIFY”, registered on August 21, 2017, in connection with goods in the class 9;
- National Chinese trademark registration no. 35765978 “CASETIFY”, registered on November 21, 2020, in connection with goods in the class 9;

The Complainant owns in particular the domain names <casetify.com> registered on November 22, 2013 which is active since then.

The Respondent registered the disputed domain name on August 13, 2024. Currently, the disputed domain name resolves at the

time of the Complaint to an error webpage (Error 404) but was active previously and has been used for offering goods claimed to be "casetify factory" Complainant's phone cases.

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 date of the disputed domain name is August 13, 2024. The Complainant shows via screenshots with tracking information that disputed domain name resolve to webpages being used for offering goods claimed to be "casetify factory" Complainant's phone cases.

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. The Complainant makes a number of legal arguments and also supplies a set of annexes providing evidence of its activities and of the Respondent's previous use of webpages offering goods claimed to be "casetify factory" Complainant's phone cases.

No administratively compliant Response has been filed by the Respondent.

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

It ought to be indicated that the CAC was unable to confirm receipt of the written notice to the Respondent as no advice of delivery was returned to the CAC.

No other address for correspondence was found on the disputed domain name.

The notices of written notice and the Commencement of the administrative proceeding were sent also by e-mail. Yet, the e-mail notices sent to postmaster@casetify-factory.site and to li-linfei@proton.me were returned back undelivered for the first address and no proof of receipt for the second one. No further e-mail addresses could be found on the disputed site.

The Respondent never accessed the online platform.

PRINCIPAL REASONS FOR THE DECISION

Notwithstanding the fact that no Response has been filed, the Panel shall consider the issues present in the case based on the statements and documents submitted by the Complainant.

Paragraph 4(a) of the Policy directs that the Complainant must prove each of the following elements:

- that the disputed domain name is identical or confusingly similar to a trademark or service mark in which the Complainant has rights; and
- that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the disputed domain name; and
- that the disputed domain name was registered and is being used in bad faith.

1. Confusing similarity

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 trademark.

The disputed domain name consists of the Complainant's Trademark "CASETIFY" identically and wholly reproduced to which is added the generic term "FACTORY", which does not prevent a finding of confusing similarity, as established in numerous UDRP decisions.

The gTLD ".site" may be disregarded when it comes to considering whether a domain name is confusingly similar to a trademark in which the Complainant has rights.

For these reasons, the Panel concludes that the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to a trademark in which the Complainant has rights within the meaning of paragraph 4(a)(i) of the Policy.

2. Rights or legitimate interests

As regards paragraph 4(a)(ii) of the Policy, while the overall burden of proof rests with the Complainant, it is commonly accepted that this should not result in an often-impossible task of proving a negative. Therefore, numerous previous panels have found that the Complainant is required to make out a prima facie case that the Respondent lacks rights or legitimate interests. Once such a prima facie case is made, the burden of production shifts to the Respondent to come forward with appropriate allegations or evidence demonstrating rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name. If the Respondent fails to come forward with such appropriate allegations or evidence, the Complainant is generally deemed to have satisfied paragraph 4(a)(ii) of the Policy. If the Respondent does come forward with some allegations or evidence of relevant rights or legitimate interests, the panel then must weigh all the evidence, with the burden of proof always remaining on the Complainant.

The Complainant argues that:

- the Respondent is not authorized or licensed by the Complainant;
- the disputed domain name does not correspond to the name of the Respondent. The Respondent is not commonly known as "CASETIFY";
- there is no fair or non-commercial use of the disputed domain name.

The Panel finds that the Respondent does not have any rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name from the following facts:

- there is no evidence at all that the Respondent is or has been commonly known by the disputed domain name or by the term "CASETIFY";
- there is no evidence that the Respondent is making a legitimate non-commercial or fair use of the disputed domain name, without intent for commercial gain to misleadingly divert consumers;
- the Respondent did not show to have any trademark rights or other rights in the term "CASETIFY";
- the Respondent does not seem to have any consent or authorization to use the Trademark or variations thereof and does not seem to be related in any way to the Complainant; and
- the Respondent did not file an administratively compliant (or any) response. The Respondent did not provide evidence that it has rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name (the Respondent could, inter alia, have provided evidence of the factors mentioned in paragraph 4(c) of the Policy, but failed to do so).

In summary, on the balance of probabilities, and in the absence of any evidence to the contrary or any administratively compliant response being put forward by the Respondent, the Panel finds that the Complainant has made a prima facie case that the Respondent lacks rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name.

The Panel concludes that the Respondent does not have rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name.

3. Bad faith

The Complainant argues the following:

The Respondent registered the disputed domain name with actual knowledge of the Trademarks. The Complainant provided screenshots of the webpages used on the disputed domain name claiming to be "casetify factory" and selling doubtful products to be Complainant's phone cases "Enjoy the same quality at a cheaper price and get the products directly from the factory" may be read on the landing page of the disputed domain name.

The Respondent does not use the disputed domain name for a bona fide offering of goods or services. Indeed, the disputed domain name resolves to a webpage offering doubtful products supposed to be that of the Complainant and later the disputed domain name resolved to an "error 404" page.

Several panellists have ordered the transfer or the cancellation of disputed domain names in similar CAC cases where CASETAGRAM Ltd was the complainant.

The Panel weighs these arguments and facts as follows:

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 name CASETIFY is distinctive and could not be ignored from the Respondent on top of the fact above-mentioned but also due to the existence of trademark protected in Hong-Kong being furthermore the place of the Respondent's registered postal address;

The Respondent is/was offering, from doubtful origins, goods via the disputed domain name.

Such use of the disputed domain name neither qualifies as a bona fide nor as a legitimate non-commercial or fair use under the Policy and may not of itself confer rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name.

The Respondent, for not responding to the complaint, has failed to demonstrate any activity in respect of the disputed domain name, and it is not possible to conceive of any plausible actual or contemplated active use of the disputed domain name by the Respondent that would not be illegitimate, by passing off, infringement of consumer protection legislation, or infringement of the Complainant’s rights under trademark law.

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 requirement 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. **casetify-factory.site**: Transferred

PANELLISTS

Name	**David-Irving Tayer**

DATE OF PANEL DECISION 2026-04-19

Publish the Decision