Decision for dispute CAC-UDRP-108569

Case number	CAC-UDRP-108569
Time of filing	2026-04-10 14:36:59
Domain names	casetifi.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 relies on several of its registered trademarks, in territories around the world, including:

Mark	Territory	Registration No.	Registration Date
CASETIFY	United States	4707090	March 24, 2015
CASETIFY	United States	6908208	November 22, 2022
CASETIFY	United States	6908209	November 22, 2022
CASETIFY	WIPO International Registration	1409914	April 4, 2018

CASETIFY	China	19614307	August 21, 2017

Further, the Complainant operates its business using its domain name <casetify.com>, which was registered on November 22, 2013.

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

The Complainant is a Hong Kong company specializing in customizable and protective technology accessories, including phone cases and watch bands, marketed under the CASETIFY brand. Founded in 2011 by Wesley Ng, the Complainant has grown into an international business with offices in multiple jurisdictions and customers worldwide.

The Complainant states that it has protected more than 20 million devices globally and has collaborated with hundreds of artists and designers. The Complainant maintains a substantial online presence through its official website and social media platforms including 2.7M followers on Instagram, 2.1M followers on Facebook and 777K followers on TikTok.

According to SimilarWeb data submitted by the Complainant, the Complainant's website received approximately 6.6 million visits in December 2025.

Registration of the disputed domain name

The disputed domain name <casetifi.com> was registered on May 6, 2020.

First UDRP Element - disputed domain name is Confusingly Similar to the Complainant's Trademark

The Complainant asserts that the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to its CASETIFY trademark because it differs by only one letter, namely the substitution of the letter "i" for the letter "y".

The Complainant contends that this constitutes a classic example of typosquatting intended to capitalize on typographical errors made by Internet users attempting to reach the Complainant's official website.

The Complainant further submits that the ".com" gTLD does not avoid confusing similarity.

Second UDRP Element – The Respondent has no Rights or Legitimate Interests in the disputed domain name

The Complainant asserts that the Respondent is not affiliated with, licensed by, or otherwise authorized to use the CASETIFY trademark.

The Complainant further asserts that the Respondent is not commonly known by the disputed domain name. The Whois information identifies the registrant as "Domain Administrator / Fundacion Privacy Services LTD", which bears no resemblance to the disputed domain name.

The Complainant also contends that the disputed domain name resolves to a parking page displaying pay-per-click links, including links relating to products competing with those of the Complainant.

Further, the disputed domain name has active MX records configured, suggesting possible use for email communications that could facilitate phishing or impersonation activity.

The Complainant additionally submits that the disputed domain name is being offered for sale for valuable consideration far exceeding the Respondent's out-of-pocket registration costs.

Third UDRP Element – The disputed domain name was Registered and is Being Used in Bad Faith

The Complainant asserts that its CASETIFY trademark had become known internationally with trademark registrations across numerous countries long before registration of the disputed domain name in 2020.

The Complainant contends that the disputed domain name is an intentional misspelling of the CASETIFY trademark and of the Complainant's primary domain name <casetify.com>, demonstrating that the Respondent had the Complainant in mind when registering the disputed domain name.

The Complainant further submits that the disputed domain name has been used to host a pay-per-click parking page containing links related to the Complainant's field of business, thereby attempting to attract Internet users for commercial gain through confusion with the Complainant's trademark.

The Complainant also relies on the existence of MX records associated with the disputed domain name, enabling the disputed domain name to be used for email communications, as additional evidence of bad faith.

Finally, the Complainant notes that the disputed domain name has been offered for sale and that the Respondent employed privacy services to conceal its identity.

The foregoing facts and arguments asserted by the Complainant are uncontested because no Response was filed.

PARTIES CONTENTIONS

Complainant´s contentions are summarized above.

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 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

LANGUAGE OF PROCEEDING

According to Rule 11 of the Rules for Uniform Domain Name Dispute Resolution Policy, (the “Rules”) “...the language of the administrative proceeding shall be the language of the Registration Agreement, subject to the authority of the Panel to determine otherwise, having regard to the circumstances of the administrative proceeding.”

According to the information on the case file, the Registrar confirmed that the Respondent is the current registrant of the disputed domain name, and that the language of the registration agreement is English.

As neither party has asked to deviate from the English language, the Panel finds that this proceeding may be properly conducted in English.

PRINCIPAL REASONS FOR THE DECISION

THREE ELEMENTS THE COMPLAINANT MUST ESTABLISH UNDER THE POLICY

According to Paragraph 4(a) of the Policy, the Complainant is required to prove each of the following three elements to obtain an order that a disputed domain name should be transferred or cancelled:

(i) the disputed 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 disputed domain name; and

(iii) the disputed 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 conclusions concerning the satisfaction of the three elements of paragraph 4(a) of the Policy in these proceedings:

(A) THE COMPLAINANT'S RIGHTS AND CONFUSING SIMILARITY OF THE DISPUTED DOMAIN NAME TO THE COMPLAINANT'S RIGHTS

The Complainant has demonstrated registered trademark rights in the term CASETIFY in multiple jurisdictions, including the United States, China, and through international registration systems. These trademark rights predate the registration of the disputed domain name by several years.

A registered trademark constitutes sufficient evidence of rights for purposes of paragraph 4(a)(i) of the Policy. The Panel therefore finds that the Complainant possesses rights in the CASETIFY trademark.

The disputed domain name <casetifi.com> differs from the Complainant's CASETIFY trademark by only a single letter, namely the substitution of the final letter "y" with the letter "i".

UDRP panels have consistently held that domain names containing common or intentional misspellings of trademarks constitute confusing similarity for purposes of the Policy. The Panel finds that the disputed domain name reproduces the dominant and recognizable portion of the Complainant's trademark and represents a classic example of typosquatting.

The disputed domain name is also phonetically similar to the Complainant's trademark and official domain name <casetify.com>.

The ".com" gTLD is generally disregarded for purposes of the confusing similarity analysis because it is a technical requirement of domain name registration.

Accordingly, the Panel concludes that the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to a trademark in which the Complainant has rights and that the Complainant has satisfied paragraph 4(a)(i) of the Policy.

(B) THE RESPONDENT'S LACK OF RIGHTS OR LEGITIMATE INTERESTS IN THE DISPUTED DOMAIN NAME

The second element of the Policy requires the Complainant to establish that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name.

The Panel accepts that the Complainant has made out a prima facie case. The burden of production therefore shifts to the Respondent to demonstrate rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name. As no Response has been filed, the Panel may draw appropriate inferences from the Respondent's default.

The Complainant states that the Respondent is neither affiliated with nor authorized by the Complainant to use the CASETIFY trademark in any manner.

The Whois information identifies the registrant as "Domain Administrator / Fundacion Privacy Services LTD", which does not correspond to the disputed domain name. There is no evidence before the Panel indicating that the Respondent has been commonly known by the disputed domain name within the meaning of paragraph 4(c)(ii) of the Policy.

The evidence submitted by the Complainant further shows that the disputed domain name resolves to a parking page containing pay-per-click links, including links associated with products competing with those of the Complainant. Such use does not constitute a bona fide offering of goods or services where the links capitalize on the reputation and goodwill associated with the Complainant's trademark.

The Panel also notes the existence of active MX records associated with the disputed domain name. While there is no direct evidence of fraudulent email use in the present case, the configuration of MX records in circumstances involving a typosquatted domain name supports the inference that the disputed domain name may be intended for misleading or deceptive email activity.

Further, the record shows that the disputed domain name has been offered for sale via the GoDaddy platform for ₱78,072.39 (approximately USD $1,300). In the circumstances of this case, where the disputed domain name clearly targets the Complainant's distinctive trademark, such conduct does not confer rights or legitimate interests upon the Respondent.

Accordingly, the Panel concludes that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name and that the Complainant has satisfied paragraph 4(a)(ii) of the Policy.

(C) BAD FAITH REGISTRATION AND USE OF THE DISPUTED DOMAIN NAME

The Panel finds that the Complainant's CASETIFY trademark had acquired goodwill and reputation prior to the registration of the disputed domain name in 2020.

The disputed domain name constitutes an obvious misspelling of both the Complainant's CASETIFY trademark and its official domain name <casetify.com>, differing only by the substitution of the letter "y" with the letter "i". The Complainant has submitted evidence of a Google search for the term "casetifi," showing search results exclusively referencing the Complainant and its CASETIFY brand. This supports the conclusion that the term "casetifi" has no independent meaning apart from its association with the Complainant. Had the Respondent conducted even a basic Internet search prior to registering the disputed domain name, it would inevitably have become aware of the Complainant and its well-established CASETIFY trademark rights. In these circumstances, the Panel finds it implausible that the Respondent registered the disputed domain name without knowledge of the

Complainant and its mark. The deliberate substitution of a single letter constitutes typosquatting and is itself persuasive evidence of bad faith registration and use.

The evidence also demonstrates that the disputed domain name has been used in connection with a pay-per-click parking page displaying links related to the Complainant's business. The Panel finds that the Respondent intentionally attempted to attract Internet users for commercial gain by creating a likelihood of confusion with the Complainant's trademark within the meaning of paragraph 4(b)(iv) of the Policy.

The existence of active MX records associated with the disputed domain name further supports a finding of bad faith because the disputed domain name could be used for deceptive email communications for purposes of impersonating the Complainant.

The Panel additionally notes that the disputed domain name has been offered for sale for an amount in excess of out-of-pocket costs. In circumstances where a disputed domain name incorporates a distinctive trademark in a typosquatted form, offering the disputed domain name for sale supports an inference of bad faith under paragraph 4(b)(i) of the Policy.

Considering the totality of the circumstances, including:

1. i) the distinctiveness and reputation of the Complainant's CASETIFY trademark;
2. ii) the typosquatting nature of the disputed domain name;

iii) the use of the disputed domain name for pay-per-click advertising links;

1. iv) configuration of MX records associated with the disputed domain name;
2. v) the offer to sell the disputed domain name for valuable consideration in excess of out-of-pocket costs; and
3. vi) the Respondent's failure to participate in this proceeding,

the Panel concludes that the disputed domain name was registered and is being used in bad faith.

The Complainant has therefore satisfied 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. **casetifi.com**: Transferred

PANELLISTS

Name	**Claire Kowarsky**

DATE OF PANEL DECISION 2026-05-11

Publish the Decision