Decision for dispute CAC-UDRP-108735

Case number	CAC-UDRP-108735
Time of filing	2026-06-16 11:33:22
Domain names	casetifycases.com, casedify.com, casefify.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 names.

IDENTIFICATION OF RIGHTS

The Complainant has proved to own the following trademark rights, inter alia:

- United States trademark CASETiFY No. 4707090 registered on March 24, 2015 in class 9, and duly renewed;
- United States trademark CASETiFY No. 6908208 registered on November 22, 2022 in class 10;
- United States trademark CASETiFY No. 6908209 registered on November 22, 2022 in class 25;
- International trademark CASETiFY No. 1409914 registered on April 4, 2018 in class 9;
- Chinese trademark CASETiFY No. 19614307 registered on August 21, 2017 in class 9.

The Complainant also owns the following domain name:

- <casetify.com>, registered on November 22, 2013.

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

The Complainant, Casetagram Limited, is a company founded in 2011 offering to its customers a range of tech accessories, including phone cases and watch bands. Headquartered in Hong Kong, the Complainant has an international presence, with offices

in Los Angeles, Seoul and Tokyo, among others, 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 global artists and offering 30,000 different designs.

The Respondent, Fundacion Privacy Services LTD, registered the following domain names, inter alia:

- <casetifycases.com> registered on December 4, 2020;
- <casedify.com> registered on September 18, 2019;
- <casefify.com> registered on December 9, 2019.

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 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

Procedural compliance

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

Identity (paragraph 4(a)(i) of the Policy)

The Panel finds that the disputed domain name <casetifycases.com> is confusingly similar to the Complainant’s trademarks.

The Complainant’s trademarks are incorporated in their entirety into the disputed domain names, together with the descriptive term “cases”, which directly relates to the Complainant’s business. The addition of such a term does not avoid confusing similarity and may even reinforce the association with the Complainant.

Moreover, the Panel finds that the domain names <casedify.com> and <casefify.com> are also confusingly similar because they are intentional misspellings of the Complainant’s CASETiFY trademarks, differing by only one letter, through the replacement of the letter “t” with, respectively, the letters “d” and “f”.

Thus, the Panel finds that the disputed domain names are confusingly similar to the Complainant’s trademarks.

Absence of Rights or Legitimate Interests (paragraph 4(a)(ii) of the Policy)

The Complainant asserted that it has never licensed, authorized or otherwise permitted the Respondent to use that trademark,

including in domain names. The Complainant further states that the Respondent is not commonly known by any of the Disputed domain names. The WHOIS information identifies the registrant as “Domain Administrator, Fundacion Privacy Services LTD”, which bears no resemblance to the names at issue, and the use of a privacy service further supports the absence of any legitimate connection with the CASETiFY name.

Consequently, the Panel finds that the Respondent lacks any right or legitimate interest in using the disputed domain names.

The Complainant also asserted that the Respondent’s actual use of the disputed domain names <casetifycases.com> and <casefify.com> redirect users through an affiliate link to the Complainant’s own website, which does not constitute a bona fide offering of goods or services or a legitimate non-commercial use (See WIPO Case No. D2017-0615 Mandarin Oriental Services B.V. v. Domain Administrator, Matama)

The disputed domain name <casedify.com> resolves to a parked page containing pay-per-click links, including links relating to custom phone cases that may compete with the Complainant’s business. As such, the Panel finds that the Respondent is not using the disputed domain name to provide a bona fide offering of goods or services

Finally, the Respondent had the opportunity to provide its arguments in support of its rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain names. However, by failing to file a response, the Respondent has missed this opportunity and the Panel is entitled to draw such inferences from the Respondent's failure as it considers appropriate in accordance with Paragraph 14 of the Rules.

Accordingly, the Panel finds that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the disputed domain names.

Bad faith (paragraph 4(a)(iii) of the Policy.)

The Panel notes that the Complainant’s trademarks had been used since 2011 and was internationally protected well before the domains were registered between 2019 and 2020. By registering three domain names that either reproduce the trademark with a related descriptive term or contain deliberate one-letter misspellings, the Respondent knew of and targeted the Complainant, its trademarks and its official domain name <casetify.com>.

The Panel finds that the disputed domain names <casedify.com> and <casefify.com> are classic examples of typo squatting, intended to capture Internet users who mistype the CASETiFY name. The use of <casetifycases.com> and <casefify.com> to redirect users to the Complainant’s official website further demonstrates the Respondent’s knowledge of the trademarks and creates a risk that users may wrongly believe the disputed domain names are authorized or controlled by the Complainant.

The Panel further notes that the disputed domain name <casedify.com> creates a likelihood of confusion with the Complainant’s trademarks as to its source, sponsorship, affiliation, or endorsement. By using the disputed domain name in connection with a website displaying multiple pay-per-click links relating to the Complainant’s field of activity, the Respondent has sought to capitalize on the reputation and goodwill associated with the Complainant’s trademarks in order to attract Internet users and generate commercial gain. Such use constitutes evidence of registration and use in bad faith within the meaning of paragraph 4(b)(iv) of the Policy.

The Panel finds that the fact that the disputed domain names were also offered for sale for amounts exceeding the Respondent’s likely registration costs provides further evidence of bad faith.

The Panel further notes that, in addition to the three disputed domain names at issue in the present proceeding, the same Parties were previously involved in two UDRP proceedings concerning the same CASETiFY trademarks, both of which resulted in orders for the transfer of the disputed domain names (See CAC Case No. 108432 Casetagram Limited v. Fundacion Privacy Services LTD, March 19, 2026, CAC Case No. 108569 Casetagram Limited v. Fundacion Privacy Services LTD, May 11, 2026). These repeated registrations targeting the Complainant’s CASETiFY trademarks further support a finding that the Respondent has engaged in a pattern of abusive domain name registrations and constitute additional evidence of bad faith under paragraph 4(b)(ii) of the Policy.

Finally, in light of all the circumstances set out above, the Panel finds that the Respondent was aware of and deliberately targeted the Complainant’s trademarks when registering the disputed domain names.

To the Panel’s opinion, this shows that the disputed domain names were registered and used in bad faith.

FOR ALL THE REASONS STATED ABOVE, THE COMPLAINT IS

Accepted

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

1. **casetifycases.com**: Transferred
2. **casedify.com**: Transferred
3. **casefify.com**: Transferred

PANELLISTS

Name	**Nathalie Dreyfus**

DATE OF PANEL DECISION 2026-07-24

Publish the Decision