Decision for dispute CAC-UDRP-108731

Case number	CAC-UDRP-108731
Time of filing	2026-06-26 12:51:48
Domain names	geekbarjersey.com

Case administrator

Name	Olga Slanařová (Case admin)

Complainant

Organization	Guangdong Qisitech CO., LTD.

Complainant representative

Organization	Chofn Intellectual Property

Respondent

Name	Hudson Barnes

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 <geekbarjersey.com>.

IDENTIFICATION OF RIGHTS

The Complainant, Guangdong Qisitech Co., Ltd., specializes in the development, production, and sale of GEEK BAR disposable electronic cigarettes, which are distributed in Russia, the United States, the Middle East, Europe, and other regions.

To protect the GEEK BAR brand, the Complainant has proactively filed trademark applications with the trademark authorities in the countries and regions where it conducts significant business. As a result, the Complainant holds exclusive rights to the GEEK BAR trademark in multiple jurisdictions. In particular, the Complainant is the owner of the following registrations, all of which predate the registration of the disputed domain name:

- Madrid Registration No. 1676896 for GEEK BAR, effective June 8, 2022, covering goods in International Class 34;
- U.S. Registration No. 6275589 for GEEK BAR, effective February 23, 2021, covering goods in International Class 34;
- European Union Registration No. 018225081 for GEEK BAR, effective August 26, 2020, covering goods in International Class 34; and
- China Registration No. 45380452 for GEEK BAR, effective January 7, 2021, covering goods in International Class 34.

The disputed domain name <geekbarjersey.com> was registered on December 13, 2025.

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

The Complainant was established in 2016 and is engaged in the research, development, manufacture, and global distribution of disposable electronic cigarettes marketed under the GEEK BAR brand. The Complainant is a wholly owned subsidiary of Shenzhen Geekvape Technology Co., Ltd., and the two companies cooperate in the development, promotion, and international marketing of the GEEK BAR brand.

The GEEK BAR brand was launched prior to the registration of the disputed domain name. The Complainant markets a range of disposable electronic cigarette products under the GEEK BAR brand, including the Pulse Series (among them the product line marketed as "Pulse X"), Geek Bar Skyview, Geek Bar Wondar, and MeLoso. According to the evidence submitted, GEEK BAR products are distributed in numerous countries, including Russia, the United States, the Middle East, and Europe.

The evidence submitted by the Complainant further shows that the GEEK BAR brand has been promoted through collaborations with social media influencers, participation in industry exhibitions, and other marketing activities, and that it has received various industry awards. The Complainant also relies on market reports, Google Trends data, and online review videos as evidence that the GEEK BAR brand had acquired international recognition prior to the registration of the disputed domain name.

The disputed domain name resolves to a commercial website that offers jersey-style clothing for sale and prominently displays the GEEK BAR name together with the stylized GEEK BAR figurative logo. The website presents individual product listings (including items designated "Ice-Mint Geek Bar Jersey" and "Rose-Pink Geek Bar Jersey"), quotes prices in US dollars, and includes "Contact" and "Wholesale" pages. The website contains no disclaimer or other statement addressing the existence or absence of any relationship between the Respondent and the Complainant.

PARTIES CONTENTIONS

FACTS ASSERTED BY THE COMPLAINANT AND NOT CONTESTED BY THE RESPONDENT:

I. The disputed domain name is confusingly similar to the protected mark

The Complainant argues that the disputed domain name incorporates its GEEK BAR trademark in its entirety. The omission of the space between the words “GEEK” and “BAR” is merely a technical consequence of the domain name system and does not affect the recognizability of the trademark.

The Complainant further contends that the addition of the term “jersey” does not dispel confusing similarity but, in the circumstances of the present case, reinforces the association with the Complainant. According to the Complainant, the term “jersey” is commonly understood as referring to sports apparel or branded merchandise, and Internet users are accustomed to well-known brands offering official apparel, accessories and lifestyle merchandise under the same brand name. As a result, Internet users encountering the disputed domain name are likely to perceive it as referring to an official or authorized merchandise platform associated with the GEEK BAR brand.

The Complainant further submits that this is reflected in the Respondent’s actual use of the disputed domain name. According to the Complaint, the Respondent operates a commercial website offering clothing products bearing the GEEK BAR branding, thereby reinforcing, rather than dispelling, the impression that the disputed domain name is connected with the Complainant.

The Complainant also submits that the addition of a descriptive term does not prevent a finding of confusing similarity where the Complainant’s trademark remains recognizable within the disputed domain name. Finally, the Complainant contends that the generic Top-Level Domain (“gTLD”) ”.com” is a standard registration requirement and should be disregarded for the purpose of assessing confusing similarity.

Accordingly, the Complainant argues that the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to its GEEK BAR trademark and that the first element of paragraph 4(a) of the Policy is satisfied.

II. The Respondent does not have any rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name

The Complainant contends that it has not licensed, authorized or otherwise permitted the Respondent to use the GEEK BAR trademark or to register any domain name incorporating that mark. The Complainant further submits that the Respondent is not commonly known by the disputed domain name and has not acquired any trademark or other rights in the term GEEK BAR.

The Complainant argues that the Respondent has appropriated the GEEK BAR trademark as the dominant and distinctive element of the disputed domain name and combined it with the term "jersey”, which is commonly associated with branded apparel and merchandise. According to the Complainant, the disputed domain name therefore conveys the impression of an official or authorized GEEK BAR merchandise platform.

The Complainant further contends that the content of the website reinforces that impression. The website prominently displays the Complainant’s GEEK BAR trademark and logo and offers clothing products bearing the GEEK BAR branding. The Complainant states that the website contains no disclaimer or other indication that it is independently operated or unaffiliated with the Complainant.

According to the Complainant, consumers are accustomed to brand owners expanding into apparel and lifestyle merchandise. Internet users encountering the disputed domain name and a website offering GEEK BAR-branded clothing would therefore be likely to expect the website to be operated by, authorized by or affiliated with the Complainant. The Complainant argues that the

Respondent has done nothing to dispel that expectation and instead relies on it as the basis of its commercial activity.

The Complainant also submits that the Respondent cannot establish rights or legitimate interests by characterizing itself as a reseller or merchandise seller. Relying on Oki Data Americas, Inc. v. ASD, Inc., WIPO Case No. D2001-0903, the Complainant argues that a reseller must accurately and prominently disclose its relationship with the trademark owner and must not falsely suggest sponsorship or endorsement. According to the Complainant, the Respondent satisfies neither requirement because the disputed domain name itself falsely suggests official sponsorship, while the website contains no clear disclosure that the Respondent has no relationship with the Complainant.

The Complainant further argues that use of a domain name and website in a manner that impersonates the trademark owner or creates a false impression of affiliation cannot constitute a bona fide offering of goods or services or confer rights or legitimate interests under the Policy.

Accordingly, the Complainant argues that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the disputed domain name and that the second element of paragraph 4(a) of the Policy is satisfied.

III. The disputed domain name has been registered and is being used in bad faith

The Complainant argues that the circumstances of the case demonstrate a deliberate attempt by the Respondent to exploit consumers' expectation that the GEEK BAR brand has expanded beyond its core products into official merchandise and apparel.

According to the Complainant, the Respondent did not combine the Complainant's trademark with an arbitrary or unrelated term but deliberately selected the term "jersey", which is commonly associated with branded sports apparel and merchandise. The Complainant submits that this choice was intentional and corresponds directly to the Respondent's subsequent use of the disputed domain name for a commercial website offering clothing products bearing the Complainant's GEEK BAR branding.

The Complainant further contends that the consistency between the composition of the disputed domain name and the content of the associated website demonstrates that the Respondent registered the disputed domain name with the intention of exploiting the goodwill associated with the GEEK BAR trademark and creating the false impression of an official or authorized GEEK BAR merchandise platform.

The Complainant submits that consumers are accustomed to well-known brands extending their business into branded apparel, accessories and lifestyle merchandise. By combining the Complainant's trademark with a merchandise-related term and using the disputed domain name for a website displaying the Complainant's trademark and logo while offering products bearing the GEEK BAR branding, the Respondent intentionally creates a likelihood of confusion as to the source, sponsorship, affiliation or endorsement of the website and the products offered thereon.

The Complainant therefore argues that the Respondent has intentionally attempted to attract, for commercial gain, Internet users to its website by creating a likelihood of confusion with the Complainant's trademark within the meaning of paragraph 4(b)(iv) of the Policy. The Complainant further submits that the Respondent's conduct constitutes impersonation and a false suggestion of affiliation within the meaning of section 3.1.4 of the WIPO Overview 3.1.

Accordingly, the Complainant argues that the disputed domain name has been registered and is being used in bad faith and that the third element of paragraph 4(a) of the Policy is satisfied.

Therefore, the Complainant contends that the requirements of the Policy have been met and requests transfer of the disputed domain name.

RESPONDENT:

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 UNIFORM DOMAIN NAME DISPUTE RESOLUTION POLICY (UDRP) of the Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers (ICANN) (the "Policy") provides that complainant must prove each of the following to obtain transfer or cancellation of the domain name:

1. that respondent's domain name is identical or confusingly similar to a trademark or service mark in which complainant has rights; and

2. that respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the domain name; and

3. the domain name has been registered and is being used in bad faith.

1) The disputed domain name is confusingly similar to a trademark in which the Complainant has rights

Paragraph 4(a)(i) of the Policy requires the Complainant to establish that the disputed domain name is identical or confusingly similar to a trademark in which it has rights.

The Panel finds that the Complainant has established rights in the GEEK BAR trademark through its trademark registrations identified above.

The disputed domain name incorporates the Complainant's GEEK BAR trademark in its entirety. The Panel further notes that the absence of the space between the words "GEEK" and "BAR" is a technical feature of domain names and does not affect the recognizability of the Complainant's trademark.

The additional term "jersey" does not prevent a finding of confusing similarity. The Complainant's trademark remains readily recognizable within the disputed domain name. Consistent with section 1.8 of the WIPO Overview 3.1, where the relevant trademark is recognizable within the disputed domain name, the addition of descriptive or other terms does not prevent a finding of confusing similarity under the first element of the Policy.

The Panel notes that the goods for which the Complainant's GEEK BAR mark is registered (International Class 34) differ from the clothing offered under the disputed domain name. That difference is immaterial to the first element, which functions as a standing test: it is enough that the Complainant holds rights in the GEEK BAR mark and that the mark is recognizable within the disputed domain name. The nature of the goods or services covered by the registration, and any relationship between them and the Respondent's use, are matters relevant, if at all, to the second and third elements.

Finally, the ".com" generic Top-Level Domain is a standard registration requirement and is disregarded for purposes of the confusing similarity assessment.

Accordingly, the Panel finds that the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to the Complainant's GEEK BAR trademark. The Complainant has therefore satisfied paragraph 4(a)(i) of the Policy.

2) The Respondent lacks rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name

Paragraph 4(a)(ii) of the Policy requires the Complainant to establish that the Respondent lacks rights or legitimate interests in respect of the disputed domain name.

Although the overall burden of proof rests with the Complainant, it is well established that once a complainant makes out a prima facie case, the burden of production shifts to the Respondent to demonstrate rights or legitimate interests (section 2.1 of the WIPO Overview 3.1).

The Panel is satisfied that the Complainant has established such a prima facie case. The Complainant has stated that it has never authorized the Respondent to use the GEEK BAR trademark or to register a domain name incorporating that mark. There is no evidence that the Respondent has been commonly known by the disputed domain name or has acquired any trademark rights in the term GEEK BAR.

The Respondent has not submitted a Response and has therefore failed to rebut the Complainant's prima facie case.

The evidence further shows that the disputed domain name resolves to a commercial website prominently displaying the Complainant's GEEK BAR trademark and logo while offering clothing products bearing the GEEK BAR branding. The website contains no disclaimer or other indication that it is operated independently from, or without authorization by, the Complainant.

The Panel does not consider such use to constitute a bona fide offering of goods or services or a legitimate noncommercial or fair use under the Policy. The disputed domain name reproduces the Complainant's trademark in its entirety and combines it with the term "jersey", which, in the circumstances of this case, reinforces the impression that the website constitutes an official or authorized merchandise platform associated with the Complainant.

The Panel has also considered whether the Respondent's use could qualify as a bona fide reseller under the principles established in Oki Data Americas, Inc. v. ASD, Inc., WIPO Case No. D2001-0903. However, even assuming that those principles were applicable, the Respondent's conduct would not satisfy them. The disputed domain name itself suggests an official association with the Complainant, and the website provides no clear disclosure that the Respondent lacks any relationship with the trademark owner. Instead, the overall presentation of the disputed domain name and website conveys the impression of an official or authorized GEEK BAR merchandise website.

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

3) The disputed domain name has been registered and is being used in bad faith

Paragraph 4(a)(iii) of the Policy requires the Complainant to establish that the disputed domain name was both registered and is being used in bad faith.

As a preliminary matter, the Panel is satisfied, on the evidence submitted and in the absence of any rebuttal from the Respondent, that the GEEK BAR mark had acquired a substantial reputation in connection with disposable electronic cigarettes prior to the registration of the disputed domain name on December 13, 2025. Although part of that evidence concerns the activities of the Complainant's parent company, Shenzhen Geekvape, it is well established that goodwill developed by an affiliated entity within the same corporate group may be attributed to the trademark owner, and the Panel takes that evidence into account accordingly. The Panel notes, consistent with section 4.3 of the WIPO Overview 3.1, that the Respondent's default does not by itself establish the Complainant's assertions, and the Panel has reached this conclusion on the evidence of record. The Panel further notes that each of the Complainant's registrations predates the disputed domain name by several years.

The Panel finds that the Respondent registered the disputed domain name with knowledge of, and with the intention of targeting, the Complainant and its GEEK BAR mark. That conclusion does not rest on the incorporation of the term "geek bar" alone. The website to which the disputed domain name resolves reproduces the Complainant's distinctive figurative GEEK BAR logo and displays apparel bearing the designation "Pulse X," which corresponds to one of the Complainant's actual product lines. The Complainant's registered rights identified above are word marks; the reproduction of the figurative logo and of the specific product-line name is relevant not to the Complainant's standing, but as evidence that the Respondent was familiar with, and deliberately drew upon, the Complainant's specific branding. The fact that the Respondent offers clothing rather than electronic cigarettes does not assist it. The consistent presentation of the GEEK BAR name, the stylized logo, and the reference to a GEEK BAR product line demonstrates that the Respondent selected the disputed domain name because of its association with the Complainant, and not for any independent or descriptive reason.

The Panel further finds that the combination of the Complainant's distinctive trademark with the term "jersey" — a term commonly associated with branded apparel and merchandise — corresponds directly to the Respondent's use of the disputed domain name for a commercial website offering GEEK BAR-branded clothing, and reinforces the impression of an official or authorized GEEK BAR merchandise platform. The website contains no disclaimer or other indication that it is operated independently of, or without authorization by, the Complainant.

Such conduct falls squarely within paragraph 4(b)(iv) of the Policy. By using the disputed domain name to attract Internet users to a commercial website that displays the Complainant's mark and logo and offers products bearing its branding, the Respondent has intentionally attempted to attract, for commercial gain, Internet users to its website by creating a likelihood of confusion with the Complainant's mark as to the source, sponsorship, affiliation, or endorsement of the website and of the products offered on it.

The Panel further finds that the disputed domain name and the associated website constitute a case of impersonation and false suggestion of affiliation within the meaning of section 3.1.4 of the WIPO Overview 3.1. Rather than merely referring to the Complainant or its products, the Respondent has adopted a domain name and a website presentation that falsely suggest an official commercial relationship with the Complainant.

As further factors consistent with this finding, the Panel notes the Respondent's use of a privacy service to shield its identity in the WHOIS record, and its failure to respond to the Complaint in circumstances that called for an explanation. Neither factor is determinative. The Panel regards them only as consistent with the conclusion already reached on the basis of the evidence discussed above.

Accordingly, the Panel finds 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. **geekbarjersey.com**: Transferred

PANELLISTS

Name	**Barbora Donathová**

DATE OF PANEL DECISION 2026-07-27

Publish the Decision