Decision for dispute CAC-UDRP-108667

Case number	CAC-UDRP-108667
Time of filing	2026-05-20 17:09:52
Domain names	casetifystore.com

Case administrator

Name	Olga Slanařová (Case admin)

Complainant

Organization	Casetagram Limited ()

Complainant representative

Organization	CSC Digital Brand Services Group AB

Respondent

Name	stokesk stokesk

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 the mark CASETiFY registered, inter alia, as:

- US registration number 4707090 registered on March 24, 2015;

- US registration number 6908208 registered on November 22, 2022;

- US registration number 6908209 registered on November 22, 2022;

- International registration number 1409914 registered on April 4, 2018; and

- Chinese registration number 19614307 registered on August 21, 2017.

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

The Complainant was founded in November 2011 with the mission of creating iPhone cases as individualized style statements. Originally, it offered a way for users to customize phone cases with their own photos. It has since evolved into a company that allows its customers to express their personal style through a range of tech accessories, including phone cases and watch bands.

Headquartered in Hong Kong, the Complainant has a strong international presence, including offices in Los Angeles, Seoul and Tokyo and employees from over 30 countries. Across its 14-year history, the Complainant has protected over 20 million devices worldwide, as well as collaborating with over 500 artists and offering 30,000 different designs.

Complainant's main website is connected to its primary domain name <casetify.com>, registered since November 22, 2013. 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. 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.

Respondent registered the disputed domain name on February 28, 2026. The disputed domain name points to a copy of the Complainant's website.

PARTIES CONTENTIONS

Complaint

The Complainant's contentions can be summarised as follows:

The Disputed Domain Name is Identical or Confusingly Similar to a Trademark or Service Mark in which the Complainant has Rights

(Policy, Paragraph 4(a)(i); Rules, Paragraphs 3(b)(viii), (b)(ix)(1))

When comparing a disputed domain name to a Complainant's trademark, it is standard practice not to take the top level domain extension into account.

It is well established that the addition of a generic or descriptive term is not sufficient to overcome a finding of confusing similarity pursuant to Policy paragraph 4(a)(i). The disputed domain name contains the Complainant's CASETiFY trademark in its entirety, simply adding the generic term "store," which does not negate the confusing similarity between the disputed domain name and the Complainant's trademark under Policy paragraph4(a)(i).

Accordingly the disputed domain name must be considered confusingly similar to the Complainant's trademark.

The Respondent has no Rights or Legitimate Interests in Respect of the Disputed Domain Name

(Policy, Paragraph 4(a)(ii); Rules, Paragraph 3(b)(ix)(2))

Respondent registered the disputed domain name on February 28, 2026, a date which is significantly after Complainant registered its CASETiFY trademark with the USPTO, WIPO and CNIPA, and also significantly after Complainant's first use in commerce of its trademark in 2011. The registration of the disputed domain name also falls significantly after the Complainant's registration of its primary domain name <casetify.com> on November 22, 2013.

Respondent is not sponsored by or affiliated with the Complainant in any way. The Complainant has not licensed, authorized, or permitted the Respondent to use the Complainant's trademarks in any manner, including in domain names.

The disputed domain name data registration details identify the Registrant as "stokesk stokesk" which does not resemble the disputed domain name. Where no evidence, including the Whois record for the disputed domain name, suggests that the Respondent is commonly known by the disputed domain name, then the Respondent cannot be regarded as having acquired rights to or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name within the meaning of paragraph 4(c)(ii).

The disputed domain name connects Internet users to a website that copies and attempts to duplicate the Complainant's official website by copying the Complainant's logo and favicon, design, color scheme, images and text found on the Complainant's own website. As such, the Respondent's website is a means of deceiving Internet users into believing that the disputed domain name is associated with Complainant. Respondent's attempts to pass off the disputed domain name as being affiliated with or operated by the Complainant are in themselves evidence of the fact that Respondent does not have rights and legitimate interests in the disputed domain name pursuant to paragraph4(a)(ii). Panels have taken the view that such cases of impersonation, where the relationship with the Complainant is not properly disclosed, cannot be deemed fair use.

The Disputed Domain Name was Registered and is Being Used in Bad Faith

(Policy, paragraphs 4(a)(iii), 4(b); Rules, paragraph 3(b)(ix)(3))

The Respondent is creating a likelihood of confusion with the Complainant and its trademarks by attempting to duplicate the Complainant's website and displaying the Complainant's official logo and images of CASETiFY-branded goods, attempting to profit from such confusion and showing actual knowledge of the Complainant and its business. It is well established that such conduct constitutes bad faith.

The Respondent's use of the disputed domain name constitutes a disruption of Complainant's business and qualifies as bad faith registration and use under Policy paragraph 4(b)(iii) because the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to Complainant's trademarks and its website is suspected to be used to offer counterfeit goods. Past panels have confirmed that such use is evidence of bad faith registration and use.

The Respondent has previously been involved in at least one other UDRP decision, which provides evidence of a pattern of cybersquatting. See Adanola Limited v. stokesk stokesk, D2026-1222 (WIPO, May 5, 2026).

Response

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

The disputed domain name is confusingly similar to the Complainant's prior mark adding only a generic term and gTLD which do not prevent said confusing similarity.

The Respondent is not authorised by the Complainant or commonly known by the disputed domain name.

The use by the Respondent of the disputed domain name for a site purporting to be a site of the Complainant using the Complainant's mark in its logo form as a masthead is confusing and deceptive and impersonates the Complainant. As such, it does not amount to a bona fide offering of goods or services. The use is commercial and so is not non commercial legitimate fair use.

The Respondent did not respond to the Complaint and has not rebutted the prima facie case evidenced by the Complainant.

The use of the Complainant's logo and the copying of the Complainant's website shows the Respondent is aware of the Complainant and its business.

The Respondent has impersonated the Complainant, intentionally attempted to cause confusion with the Complainant's mark for commercial gain and has disrupted the Complainant's business with competing activity, all indications of bad faith.

The fact that the Respondent has been the subject of another adverse decision under the UDRP suggests a pattern of bad faith activity.

FOR ALL THE REASONS STATED ABOVE, THE COMPLAINT IS

Accepted

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

1. **casetifystore.com**: Transferred

PANELLISTS

Name	**Dawn Osborne**

DATE OF PANEL DECISION 2026-06-23

Publish the Decision