Decision for dispute CAC-UDRP-108509

Case number	CAC-UDRP-108509
Time of filing	2026-03-20 09:11:35
Domain names	csaetify.com, casrtify.com, caesetify.com

Case administrator

Name	Olga Slanařová (Case admin)

Complainant

Organization	Casetagram Limited

Complainant representative

Organization	CSC Digital Brand Services Group AB

Respondent

Organization	Zhichao Yang

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 names.

IDENTIFICATION OF RIGHTS

The Complainant owns several trademarks for "CASETIFY", registered worldwide, such as:

- "CASETIFY" (China Reg. No. 19614307) registered on August 21, 2017;
- "CASETIFY" (China Reg. No. 35765978) registered on November 21, 2020;
- "CASETIFY" (US Reg. No. 4707090) registered on March 24, 2015;
- "CASETIFY" (US Reg. No. 6908208) registered on November 22, 2022;
- "CASETIFY" (US Reg. No. 6908209) registered on November 22, 2022; and
- "CASETIFY" (WIPO Reg. No. 1409914) registered on April 4, 2018 (hereinafter cumulatively "the Trademark")

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

The Complainant is Casetagram Limited (trading as Casetify), a Hong Kong company that produces phone cases and electronic accessories, founded on 1 November 2011 by Wesley Ng.

Headquartered in Hong Kong, CASETiFY has a strong international presence, with offices in Los Angeles, Seoul and Tokyo, among others, and employees from over 30 countries. Across its 14-year history, CASETiFY has protected over 20 million devices

worldwide, as well as collaborating with over 500 global artists and offering 30,000 different designs. Complainant has grown in tandem with its sustainability efforts, reflected in its recycling of over 2.1 million phone cases since 2021.

Complainant maintains a strong internet presence. Complainant's main website is connected to its primary domain name <casetify.com>, registered on November 22, 2013.

The disputed domain names are the following:

<caesetify.com> - registered on 7 July 2025;

<csaetify.com> - registered on 8 August 2025;

<casrtify.com> - registered on 8 August 2025;

and at the time of filing the Complaint they were all redirecting internet users to a third-party website at <searchandhelp.com> that offered information about Complainant's phone case products without any authorization.

PARTIES CONTENTIONS

The Complainant contends that the disputed domain names are confusingly similar to the Trademark.

Furthermore, the Complainant contends that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain names. In this regard, the Complainant states that the Respondent is not commonly known by the disputed domain name, that it is not affiliated with nor authorized by the Complainant in any way, that the Complainant does not carry out any activity for, nor has any business with the Respondent, and that neither license nor authorization has been granted to the Respondent to make any use of the Trademark or apply for registration of the disputed domain names by the Complainant.

Finally, the Complainant contends that the disputed domain names were registered and are being used in bad faith. It contends that the Respondent must have been aware of the Complainant and its Trademark at the time of registration of the disputed domain names as the Trademark is well-known and the disputed domain names redirect users to a website relevant to the Complainant and its products. Further, that the Respondent's use of the disputed domain names is evidence of bad faith, as it intentionally tried to attract users by creating a likelihood of confusion with the Complainant's trademark as to the source of the websites associated to the disputed domain names.

RESPONDENT:

No administratively compliant Response has been filed.

RIGHTS

The Complainant has, to the satisfaction of the Panel, shown the disputed domain names are 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 names (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 names have been registered and are 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

Under paragraph 4(a) of the Policy, the Complainant must prove that each of the following three elements is present:

(i) the disputed domain name is identical or confusingly similar to the Complainant's trademark; 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.

1. The Panel accepts that all disputed domain names are confusingly similar to the Trademark, as they are clear cases of typosquatting.

2. Although the overall burden of proof in UDRP proceedings is on the complainant, panels have recognized that proving a respondent lacks rights or legitimate interests in a domain name may result in the difficult task of “proving a negative”, requiring information that is often primarily within the knowledge or control of the respondent. As such, where a complainant makes out a prima facie case that the respondent lacks rights or legitimate interests, the burden of production on this element shifts to the respondent to come forward with relevant evidence demonstrating rights or legitimate interests in the domain name. If the respondent fails to come forward with such relevant evidence, the complainant is deemed to have satisfied the second element.

The Respondent does not appear to have operated any bona fide or legitimate business under the disputed domain names and is not making a noncommercial or fair use of the disputed domain names. Instead, the Respondent used the disputed domain names to redirect internet users to a website that seems to be related to the Complainant and its products. The use of the disputed domain names for this purpose demonstrates clearly that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain names.

Consequently, the Panel finds that the Complainant has fulfilled its obligations under paragraph 4(a)(ii) of the Policy. The Respondent did not deny these assertions in any way and therefore failed to prove any rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain names.

3.1 The Panel is satisfied that the Respondent registered the disputed domain names with full knowledge of the Complainant and its rights in the Trademark as the Trademark is well-established and well-known.

3.2 Furthermore, the Panel accepts the Complainant's contentions that the disputed domain names have been used in bad faith under para. 4(b)(iv) of the Policy. The Respondent has used the disputed domain names to intentionally attract users to its website by creating a likelihood of confusion with the Trademark as to the source, sponsorship, affiliation, or endorsement of the website and by capitalising on Complainant's reputation.

Consequently, by using the disputed domain names in such a manner, the Respondent has fulfilled the elements and requirements for a finding under paragraph 4(a)(iii) of the Policy. The Panel finds that the Complainant has also established the third element of the Policy successfully.

FOR ALL THE REASONS STATED ABOVE, THE COMPLAINT IS

Accepted

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

1. **csaetify.com**: Transferred
2. **casrtify.com**: Transferred
3. **caesetify.com**: Transferred

PANELLISTS

Name	**Stefanie Efstathiou LL.M. mult.**

DATE OF PANEL DECISION 2026-04-22

Publish the Decision