Decision for dispute CAC-UDRP-108722

Case number	CAC-UDRP-108722
Time of filing	2026-06-18 12:22:42
Domain names	geekbarcentral.com

Case administrator

Name	Olga Slanařová (Case admin)

Complainant

Organization	Guangdong Qisitech CO., LTD.

Complainant representative

Organization	Chofn Intellectual Property

Respondent

Name	Salomon Loreto

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 several trademarks consisting of the word element “GEEK BAR”, such as:

Madrid International Registration for “GEEK BAR” No. 1676896 of June 8, 2022 in class 34;
U.S. Registration for “GEEK BAR” No. 6275589 of February 23, 2021 in class 34;
EU Registration for “GEEK BAR” No. 018225081 of August 26, 2020 in class 34;
China Registration for “GEEK BAR” No. 45380452 of January 7, 2021 in class 34;
China Registration for “GEEK BAR” No. 47625710 of October 14, 2021 in class 34;
UK Registration for “GEEK BAR” No. UK00003480964 of August 10, 2020 in class 34;
Peru Registration for “GEEK BAR” No. 00370611 of March 17, 2025 in class 34.

All of the above trademarks were registered prior to the registration of the disputed domain name and cover goods in international class 34 (electronic cigarettes, cigarettes, liquid solutions for use in electronic cigarettes, and related goods).

Furthermore, the Complainant operates, inter alia, the domain name <geekbar.com> for its official website.

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

The Complainant, Guangdong Qisitech CO., LTD., established in 2016, is the registered proprietor and owner of the trademarks associated with the “GEEK BAR” brand. The Complainant is a wholly-owned subsidiary of Shenzhen Geekvape Technology Co., Ltd. The two entities operate as affiliated members of the same corporate group and cooperate in the development, promotion, and international marketing of the GEEK BAR brand.
The Complainant has long been engaged in the research and development, manufacture, and global distribution of GEEK BAR disposable e-cigarette products, and has achieved substantial market penetration in Russia, the United States, the Middle East, and Europe, thereby establishing a significant global user base and brand reputation.

GEEK BAR e-cigarettes have shown strong sales momentum in the global market, especially in the UK market, where Geek Bar and Elf Bar are recognized as the clear market leaders in the disposable vape category. In the United States, the world’s largest consumer market for e-cigarettes, Geek Bar first appeared in Nielsen Market Scan data in November 2023, with its subsequent rise and commercial success in 2024 being well documented by The Center for Rapid Surveillance of Tobacco (CRST).

GEEK BAR and its parent company Geekvape have actively collaborated with social media influencers as part of their marketing efforts. Geekvape has been identified as one of the e-cigarette brands with the largest influencer presence on social media platforms. Numerous GEEK BAR review videos are available on YouTube.
GEEK BAR has also been active in various industry exhibitions in recent years and has won many awards for its excellent product design. According to historical data from Google Trends, the search term “GEEK BAR” has consistently maintained a relatively high level of global search volume over the past five years, with multiple breakout queries such as “geek bar pulse”, “geek bar flavors” and “geek bar pulse x” reflecting sustained and growing consumer interest.

The Complainant uses, inter alia, the domain name <geekbar.com> as well as its trademark “GEEK BAR” for its services and as its brand name.

The disputed domain name <geekbarcentral.com> was registered by the Respondent. According to the WHOIS database, the WHOIS information for the disputed domain name is privacy-protected. The Respondent’s name was subsequently disclosed through the Czech Arbitration Court. The registrar is GoDaddy.com, LLC.

The disputed domain name resolves to a website prominently displaying the Complainant’s GEEK BAR trademark and offering products directly related to the Complainant’s core business and product category, including various disposable vape devices from multiple brands. The website operates as an online vape shop under the name “Geek Bar Central” and offers products for sale with pricing, customer reviews, and promotional offers such as “BOGO” deals and free shipping.

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.

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

As the Respondent did not file an administratively compliant Response, pursuant to paragraph 14(b) of the Rules for Uniform Domain Name Dispute Resolution Policy (the "Rules"), the Panel may draw such inferences therefrom as it considers appropriate. Thus, the Panel accepts the contentions of the Complainant as admitted by the Respondent. Taking the statements and documents submitted by the Complainant under careful consideration, the Panel concludes that the Complainant has established all the elements entitling it to claim the transfer of the disputed domain name.

I. Identical or Confusingly Similar disputed domain name
The Complainant has, to the satisfaction of the Panel, shown the disputed domain name to be 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.

The Complainant has, to the satisfaction of the Panel, shown that it has valid trademark rights in “GEEK BAR”. The Complainant holds numerous trademark registrations for GEEK BAR in multiple jurisdictions, including the Madrid System (No. 1676896), the United States (No. 6275589), the European Union (No. 018225081), the United Kingdom (No. UK00003480964), China (Nos. 45380452 and 47625710), and Peru (No. 00370611), all registered in class 34 and all predating the registration of the disputed domain name.

The disputed domain name incorporates the Complainant’s GEEK BAR trademark in its entirety. The omission of the space between the words “GEEK” and “BAR” is dictated by the technical requirements of the domain name system and does not prevent a finding of confusing similarity.
The addition of the descriptive term “central” does not prevent a finding of confusing similarity. The trademark of the Complainant is recognizable within the disputed domain name, the addition of other terms – whether descriptive, geographical, pejorative, meaningless, or otherwise – does not prevent a finding of confusing similarity under the first element. In the present case, the term “central” is a common English dictionary word suggesting a principal or official hub, which, far from distinguishing the disputed domain name, actually reinforces the misleading impression that it identifies an official GEEK BAR online destination.

It is well established in UDRP practice that the generic Top-Level Domain (“gTLD”) suffix “.com” is a standard registration requirement and does not serve to distinguish the disputed domain name from the Complainant’s trademark.

The Complainant’s trademark remains clearly recognizable and is the dominant element of the disputed domain name. Accordingly, the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to the Complainant’s GEEK BAR trademark, and the requirement of paragraph 4(a)(i) of the Policy is satisfied.

II. Respondent’s Rights or Legitimate Interests in the disputed domain name

The Complainant has established a prima facie case that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name, since the Complainant has not licensed, authorized, or otherwise permitted the Respondent to use the GEEK BAR trademark or to register any domain name incorporating that trademark. The Respondent is not an authorized distributor, reseller, or business partner of the Complainant, and there is no relationship whatsoever between the Parties.
The Complainant is unaware of any trademark rights or other rights held by the Respondent in the term “GEEK BAR”. Nor is there any evidence that the Respondent has been commonly known by the disputed domain name.

The disputed domain name resolves to a website prominently displaying the Complainant’s GEEK BAR trademark and offering products directly related to the Complainant’s core business and product category. Such use is plainly commercial in nature and seeks to capitalize on the goodwill associated with the Complainant’s trademark.

The Panel notes that the Respondent’s conduct does not satisfy the criteria established in Oki Data Americas, Inc. v. ASD, Inc., WIPO Case No. D2001-0903, under which a reseller may, in limited circumstances, establish rights or legitimate interests. In that decision, the panel set out minimum requirements for a bona fide offering of goods or services by a reseller, including: (a) the respondent must actually be offering the trademarked goods or services at issue; (b) the site must be used to sell only the trademarked goods; (c) the site must accurately disclose the registrant’s relationship with the trademark owner and must not falsely suggest that it is the trademark owner or that the website is the official site; and (d) the respondent must not try to corner the market in domain names incorporating the trademark.

In the present case, the Respondent’s website at <geekbarcentral.com> sells not only GEEK BAR products but also a wide range of competing vape products from other brands, including RAZ, Breeze, Lost Mary, HQD, North, and others. Furthermore, the Respondent does not accurately and prominently disclose the absence of any relationship with the Complainant. On the contrary, the domain name “geekbarcentral” – combining the Complainant’s trademark with the term “central” – conveys the impression that it identifies an official GEEK BAR website, customer portal, or other online platform operated, sponsored, endorsed, or otherwise affiliated with the Complainant. The corresponding website reinforces this misleading impression by prominently displaying the Complainant’s trademark.

Moreover, such use of the disputed domain name cannot be considered legitimate non-commercial or fair use, as the Respondent is clearly operating a commercial website attempting to exploit the reputation and goodwill associated with the Complainant’s GEEK BAR trademark.

In the absence of any evidence to the contrary, and in light of the Respondent's failure to submit a Response, the Panel concludes that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name within the meaning of paragraph 4(a)(ii) of the Policy.

III. The disputed domain name has been registered and is being used in Bad Faith

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's GEEK BAR trademark rights substantially predate the registration of the disputed domain name. By the time the disputed domain name was registered, the Complainant had extensively used the GEEK BAR trademark worldwide and had established substantial goodwill and reputation in the mark. GEEK BAR products had achieved significant commercial success and widespread consumer recognition in numerous jurisdictions, particularly in the UK market and in the United States. The brand's global reputation is further evidenced by numerous industry exhibitions and awards.

While the individual words "geek" and "bar" may have dictionary meanings, the combined expression "GEEK BAR" has no descriptive meaning in relation to the relevant goods and has become uniquely associated with the Complainant and its products. In these circumstances, it is inconceivable that the Respondent independently selected the disputed domain name without knowledge of the Complainant and its trademark rights.

The Respondent's actual knowledge is further confirmed by the use made of the disputed domain name. The disputed domain name resolves to a website prominently displaying the Complainant's GEEK BAR trademark and offering products directly related to the Complainant's business. The Respondent therefore plainly had actual knowledge of the Complainant and its trademark rights when registering the disputed domain name.

Far from distinguishing the disputed domain name from the Complainant, the addition of the descriptive term "central" reinforces the misleading impression that the disputed domain name identifies an official GEEK BAR website or principal online destination operated by, or affiliated with, the Complainant. By using a domain name incorporating the Complainant's trademark in its entirety together with the term "central", and by operating a website prominently featuring the Complainant's trademark and related products, the Respondent has intentionally attempted to attract, for commercial gain, Internet users to its website by creating a likelihood of confusion as to the source, sponsorship, affiliation, or endorsement of the website and the products offered thereon.

Such conduct falls squarely within paragraph 4(b)(iv) of the Policy and constitutes bad faith registration and use. The intentional registration and use of a domain name incorporating a complainant's trademark to attract Internet users for commercial gain by creating a likelihood of confusion establishes bad faith within the meaning of the Policy.

Moreover, the mere registration of a domain name that is confusingly similar to a well-known or widely used trademark by an unrelated party is sufficient to give rise to a presumption of bad faith.

The Panel therefore concludes that the Respondent registered and is using the disputed domain name in bad faith within the meaning of paragraph 4(a)(iii) of the Policy. The Respondent has not provided any evidence of actual or contemplated good faith registration or use of the disputed domain name that could refute this prima facie assessment.

FOR ALL THE REASONS STATED ABOVE, THE COMPLAINT IS

Accepted

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

1. **geekbarcentral.com**: Transferred

PANELLISTS

Name	**Dominik Eickemeier**

DATE OF PANEL DECISION 2026-07-20

Publish the Decision