Decision for dispute CAC-UDRP-108489

Case number	CAC-UDRP-108489
Time of filing	2026-03-12 16:42:05
Domain names	caseetify.com, wwwcasetify.com , asetify.com

Case administrator

Name	Olga Slanařová (Case admin)

Complainant

Organization	Casetagram Limited ()

Complainant representative

Organization	CSC Digital Brand Services Group AB

Respondents

Name	Candie Deloach
Name	zhangwei

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

Casetagram Limited (the “Complainant” or “CASETiFY”) is the owner of trademark registrations across various jurisdictions, including:

- CASETiFY (US Reg. No. 4707090) registered on Mar. 24, 2015;
- CASETiFY (US Reg. No. 6908208) registered on Nov. 22, 2022;
- CASETiFY (US Reg. No. 6908209) registered on Nov. 22, 2022;
- CASETiFY (WIPO Reg. No. 1409914) registered on Apr. 4, 2018; and
- CASETiFY (Chinese Reg. No. 19614307) registered on Aug. 21, 2017.

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

CASETiFY was founded by Wesley Ng in November 2011 when he wanted to protect his new iPhone but felt let down by the weighty, boring options at hand. Using his design and innovation skills, he sought to create protective cases that were coverable, sleek and

unique – individualized style statements. Originally, CASETiFY was a way for users to customize phone cases with their own photos. It has since evolved into a company that empowers its customers to express their individuality, creativity and personal style through a range of tech accessories, including phone cases and watch bands.

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. The Complainant has grown in tandem with its sustainability efforts, reflected in its recycling of over 2.1 million phone cases since 2021.

The Complainant maintains a strong internet presence. Complainant's main website is connected to its primary domain name <casetify.com>, registered since November 22, 2013. According to SimilarWeb, the Complainant's website received 6.6 million individual visits in December 2025, making it the 3,421st most popular website in the United States and the 5,993rd globally. The Complainant also promotes its range of unique products through its various social media channels. CASETiFY has 2.7 million Instagram followers; 2.1 million Facebook followers; 777K TikTok followers; and 108.4K Twitter/X followers.

The Respondent registered the disputed domain names on July 9, 2020 at 15h17, a date and time which is significantly later than the Complainant's filing of its CASETiFY trademark with the USPTO, WIPO and CNIPA, and also significantly after the Complainant's first use in commerce of its trademark in 2011. The registrations also fall significantly after the Complainant's registration of its primary domain name <casetify.com> on November 22, 2013.

PARTIES CONTENTIONS

The Complainant contends that the requirements of the Policy have been met and that the disputed domain names should be transferred to it.
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

CONSOLIDATION OF THE PROCEEDINGS

The Complainant has requested that the disputed domain names and the named Respondents be consolidated in a single UDRP proceeding.

The consolidation of multiple registrants as respondents in a single administrative proceeding may be appropriate under certain circumstances under paragraph 3(c) or 10(e) of the Rules, provided that the Complainant can demonstrate that the disputed domain names or the web sites to which they resolve are subject to common control, and the panel, having regard to all of the relevant circumstances, determines that consolidation would be procedurally efficient and fair and equitable to all parties. Once a case is admitted on a prima facie basis, the Respondent is given the opportunity to make its submissions on the validity of the consolidation together with its substantive arguments.

As expressed in WIPO Panel Views on Selected UDRP Questions, Third Edition ("WIPO Overview 3.0"), section 4.11.2, the consensus on this matter is as follows: "Where a complaint is filed against multiple respondents, panels look at whether (i) the domain names or corresponding websites are subject to common control, and (ii) the consolidation would be fair and equitable to all parties. Procedural efficiency would also underpin panel consideration of such a consolidation scenario."

When assessing whether multiple domain names may be found to be under common control, the following circumstances have been evaluated, amongst others, in prior UDRP decisions:

Circumstances indicating that different registrants were alter egos of the same beneficial holder (See Backstreet Productions, Inc. v. John Zuccarini, CupcakeParty, Cupcake Real Video, Cupcake-Show and Cupcakes-First Patrol, WIPO Case No. D2001-0654), may be:

- Cases where respondents had common administrative contact or technical contact, or other instances of commonality in the registration information, such as the same postal address or e-mail address (See ISL Marketing AG, and The Federation Internationale de Football Association v. J.Y. Chung, Worldcup2002.com, W Co., and Worldcup 2002, WIPO Case No. D2000-0034, in which the disputed domain names had the same administrative contact; Caesars World, Inc. v. Starnet Communications and Atlantic West Gaming Entertainment, Ltd., WIPO Case No. D2002-0066, decision rendered against multiple respondents where the same person was indicated as the administrative contact, billing contact; and Adobe Systems Incorporated v. Domain OZ, WIPO Case No. D2000-0057, decision rendered against multiple respondents where respondents shared the same post office box number and email address in their registration information); or
- Circumstances indicating that a single person or entity had registered multiple domain names using fictitious names. See Guccio Gucci S.p.A. v. Huangwensheng, Shirley, wangliang, xiaomeng xiexun, jiangxiuchun, WIPO Case No. D2012-0342; Yahoo!, Inc v. Somsak Sooksripanich and Others, WIPO Case No. D2000-1461 (decision rendered against multiple Respondents which seemed to be fronts for the real respondent); Yahoo! Inc. v. Yahoosexy.com, Yahoo-sexy.com, Yahoosexy.net, Yahousexy.com and Benjamin Benhamou, WIPO Case No. D2001-1188 (domain names <yahoosexy.com>, <yahoo-sexy.com>, <yahoosexy.net> and <yahoo-sexy.net>); Nintendo of America Inc v. Marco Beijen, Beijen Consulting, Pokemon Fan Clubs Org., and Pokemon Fans Unite, WIPO Case No. D2001-1070; General Electric Company v. Marketing Total S.A, WIPO Case No. D2007-1834.

In the case at hand, all three disputed domain names, which all incorporate simple one-letter misspellings of the Complainant's trademark CASETiFY, meet the requirements for finding that they are under the control of a single individual or entity or, at least, the control of a group of individuals acting in concert:

They were all registered on the same date and at the same time. They are all registered with the same registrar. Both registrant names are connected to other UDRP proceedings where it was held that they had obtained infringing registrations, thus demonstrating a pattern of cybersquatting. Both are geographically connected to China, in one case through the email service in use and in the other through the geographic address provided.

In light of the above, the Complainant requested that the disputed domain names and the named Respondents be consolidated in a single UDRP proceeding. The Respondent has not in any way challenged the prima facie evidence provided by the Complainant, as no administratively compliant Response was filed. The evidence provided by the Complainant is sufficient to convince the Panel of the existence of common control over these domain names. For that reason, the Panel finds that the consolidation of the dispute is equitable and procedurally efficient.

The Panel is therefore 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

According to Paragraph 4(a) of the Policy, a complainant is required to prove each of the following three elements for obtaining an order that a domain name should be transferred or cancelled:
(i) the domain name is identical or confusingly similar to a trademark or service mark in which the complainant has rights; and
(ii) the respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the domain name; and
(iii) the domain name has been registered and is being used in bad faith.

The Panel has examined the evidence available to it and has come to the following conclusion concerning the satisfaction of the three elements of paragraph 4(a) of the Policy in these proceedings:

RIGHTS

The disputed domain names are confusingly similar to the Complainant's Trademark CASETiFY and the domain name <casetify.com>. This finding is based on a well-established practice in evaluating the existence of a likelihood of confusion:

1) Disregarding the top-level suffix in the domain name (i.e. ".com", which is in use for all three disputed domain names); and

2) Holding that the addition or omission of single letters to simulate typographical errors to or from distinctive names and trademarks do not prevent a likelihood of confusion from arising. The disputed domain names are:

a. <caseetify.com>
b. <wwwcasetify.com>
c. <asetify.com>

Even without analyzing or dissecting the disputed domain names, the name CASETIFY is clearly recognizable. In the case of a., the letter “E” is repeated as it would be in the case of a misspelling. In the case of b., the full stop separating the letters “WWW” from “CASETIFY.COM” was omitted, again mimicking a typographical error. And finally, in the case of c., the first letter was omitted with the same intention.

This is clearly an attempt to create and register domain names which represent typographical errors when Internet users attempt to use the name of the Complainant as a domain name. There is no other logical reason for combining these letters in this order and it is highly unlikely that the order was the result of pure chance. The differences are therefore not sufficient to prevent finding that the disputed domain names are confusingly similar to the trademark CASETiFY.

The Panel therefore concludes that the Complainant has satisfied the requirement under paragraph 4(a)(i) of the Policy.

NO RIGHTS OR LEGITIMATE INTERESTS

The onus to make out a prima facie case that the Respondent lacks rights or legitimate interests is placed on the Complainant. However, once such a prima facie case is made, a respondent carries the burden of demonstrating rights or legitimate interests in a domain name. If the respondent fails to do so, the complainant is deemed to have satisfied paragraph 4(a)(ii) of the Policy, which has been concluded e.g. in WIPO case no. D2003-0455, Croatia Airlines d.d. v. Modern Empire Internet Ltd.

The Complainant has put forward that the Respondent is not commonly known by the disputed domain names. Neither is the Respondent in any way commercially associated with the Complainant, nor in any way authorized or issued with a license by the Complainant to use the disputed domain names. This has not been contested by the Respondent. Instead, the Respondent failed to provide any information or evidence whatsoever that could have shown that it has relevant rights or legitimate interests in respect of the disputed domain names (within the meaning of paragraph 4(a) (ii) of the Policy).

The absence of credible evidence of use or demonstrable preparation of use of the disputed domain names in connection with a bona fide offering of products or services demonstrates the lack of legitimate interests within the meaning of paragraph 4(a) (ii) of the Policy. This is supported by the finding in WIPO case No. D2000-1164, Boeing Co. v. Bressi, in which the Panel stated that the “Respondent has advanced no basis on which the Panel could conclude that it has a right or legitimate interest in the domain names”. At the time of filing the complaint, the Respondent was using a privacy WHOIS service, which past Panels have also found to equate to a lack of legitimate interest.

The Panel therefore also concludes that the Respondent did not establish any right or legitimate interest to the disputed domain names (within the meaning of paragraph 4(a)(ii) of the Policy). The Complainant has therefore also satisfied the requirement under paragraph 4(a)(ii) of the Policy.

BAD FAITH

The Panel finds that the Complainant has established that the disputed domain names were registered by the Respondent and are being used by the Respondent in bad faith. For this purpose, the Complainant has successfully put forward prima facie evidence that the Respondent has not made use, or demonstrable preparations to use, of either the disputed domain names in connection with a bona fide offering of goods or services, or of making a legitimate non-commercial or fair use of the disputed domain names.

The disputed domain names <caseetify.com> and <wwwcasetify.com> redirect internet users to a third-party affiliate link website which then in turn redirects users on to the Complainant’s own website, <www.casetify.com>. Since this is done without the consent of the Complainant, the Respondent is not using the disputed domain names to provide a bona fide offering of goods or services as allowed under Paragraph 4(c)(i) of the Policy, nor a legitimate noncommercial or fair use as allowed under Paragraph 4(c)(iii) of the Policy. This has been confirmed by past Panel decisions, e.g. in Mandarin Oriental Services B.V. v. Domain Administrator, Matama, D2017-0615 (WIPO, May 10, 2017) where it was held that the“Panel cannot otherwise find any rights or legitimate interests of the Respondent either. In particular, the fact that the Respondent was redirecting the disputed domain name to the Complainant's own website, […] does not constitute rights or legitimate interests of the Respondent in the disputed domain name”.

The Respondent is using the third disputed domain name <asetify.com> to resolve to a website featuring links to third-party websites presumably in order to collect pay-per-click fees from the linked websites that are listed at this disputed domain name’s website. Therefore, the Respondent is attempting to compete with or capitalize on the reputation and goodwill of the complainant’s mark or otherwise mislead Internet users in bad faith.

The Panel concludes that the Respondent has registered and is using the disputed domain names 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. **caseetify.com**: Transferred
2. **wwwcasetify.com** : Transferred
3. **asetify.com**: Transferred

PANELLISTS

Name	**Udo Pfleghar B.A. (Melb.)**

DATE OF PANEL DECISION 2026-04-23

Publish the Decision