Decision for dispute CAC-UDRP-108740

Case number	CAC-UDRP-108740
Time of filing	2026-06-23 09:26:17
Domain names	officialgeekbarpulsex.com

Case administrator

Organization	Iveta Špiclová (Czech Arbitration Court) (Case admin)

Complainant

Organization	Guangdong Qisitech CO., LTD.

Complainant representative

Organization	Chofn Intellectual Property

Respondent

Name	clarice mokom

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

Complainant is the owner, among others, of the following registrations for the trademarks as mentioned in the Complaint:

Madrid Registration Number 1676896 for GEEK BAR, registration date is June 8, 2022, designating goods and services in international classes 34;

U.S. Registration Number 6275589 for GEEK BAR, registration date is February 23, 2021, designating goods and services in international classes 34;

EU Registration Number 018225081 for GEEK BAR, registration date is August 26, 2020, designating goods and services in international classes 34;

China Registration Number 45380452 for GEEK BAR, registration date is January 7, 2021, designating goods and services in international classes 34.

Complainant has submitted evidence of the above mentioned registrations as well as registrations in the United Kingdom and Peru through registration certificates.

As the Chinese certificate is only in Chinese, it will be disregarded by the Panel.

The UK and Peru registration that are enclosed to the Complaint but not mentioned in the argumentation of Complainant are not mentioned here as the above is already sufficient to start a Complaint under the Policy.

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

Complainant Guangdong Qisitech CO., LTD. with domicile in Guangdong, China, was established in 2016. Complainant is the registered proprietor and owner of the trademarks associated with the "GEEK BAR" brand. 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.

Complainant is a wholly-owned subsidiary of Shenzhen Geekvape Technology Co., Ltd. ("Shenzhen Geekvape"), as confirmed by China's National Enterprise Credit Information Publicity System of which evidence is enclosed to the Complaint. 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.

Complainant alleges that it is well established under UDRP precedent that trademark rights and associated goodwill developed by affiliated entities within the same corporate group may be attributed to the trademark owner for purposes of establishing rights under the Policy. Accordingly, evidence of commercial activities conducted by Shenzhen Geekvape in connection with the GEEK BAR brand is directly relevant to, and probative of, Complainant's trademark rights and the goodwill associated therewith.

The Fame and Reputation of the GEEK BAR Brand

GEEK BAR is the name of one of the most popular lines of disposable vapes on the market. Currently there are over ten different disposable vapes under the name Geek Bar, like the Pulse Series (Patriot, Pulse, and Pulse X), Geek Bar Skyview, and the Geek Bar Wondar.

GEEK BAR products use dual-core technology, and this technical advantage makes GEEK BAR products highly competitive in the market. Complainant mentions for example, its Geek Bar Pulse 15000 product can provide 15,000 puffs in regular mode and up to 7,500 puffs in pulse mode. The product is also equipped with a full-screen display, 16ml e-liquid capacity and a 650mAh battery, meeting users' needs for large capacity and long-lasting use. In addition, GEEK BAR's MeLoso series products are also well received for their durability.

Complainant further explains that it has strong R&D strength and fine division of labor, with more than 100 experienced senior R&D engineers specializing in basic product research, ID design, structure optimization, application of new materials, process processing, product testing and upgrading, product project management and patent application. In the R&D and design process, Complainant also introduces the international advanced process design method to maximize the satisfaction of customers' customization needs and provides customers with one-stop electronic cigarette OEM solutions from design, R&D, purchasing, manufacturing to after-sales service.

GEEK BAR e-cigarettes have shown strong sales momentum in the global market, especially in the UK market, of which a report is enclosed to the Complaint. In response to increasing sales and to meeting deliveries, GEEK BAR has spent £120 million on a new production facility as part of its UK growth plans. The complex will be located in the Zhuhai National High-Tech Industrial Development Zone in China's Guangdong Province and is expected to be completed within two years, which is illustrated by a to the Complaint enclosed article on www.conveniencestore.co.uk.

In the United States, the world's number one consumer market for e-cigarettes, Geek Bar first appeared in the Nielsen Market Scan data in November 2023, however the brand's sudden rise and success in 2024, which is illustrated by ‘The Center for Rapid Surveillance of Tobacco (CRST) report issued in July 2024 in the United States’ report.

GEEK BAR and its parent company, Geekvape, have also 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. For example, Austin Lawrence, also known as “Vape God”, has approximately 4 million followers on Instagram and has promoted Geekvape products through his social media activities. Complainant includes an article from The Center for Rapid Surveillance of Tobacco (CRST) report issued in July 2024 in the United States, in which this is described. In addition, there have been numerous GEEK BAR related review videos on YouTube. Some video links are enclosed as well as a print out of a YouTube search showing review videos.

Further, Complainant encloses awards won for the product design and relatively high level of global search volume on Google Trends over the past 5 years.

In sum, as Complainant concludes, the combination of reports from prominent industry and mainstream media, historical global search traffic and metrics, and prestigious international accolades collectively and incontrovertibly demonstrate that the "GEEK BAR" brand had already acquired a substantial degree of international recognition, distinctiveness, and commercial goodwill long prior to the registration of the disputed domain name.

Disputed domain name due for renewal

Respondent is Clarice Mokom with domicile in New York, United States of America. The disputed domain name was registered on 9

July 2025 and due for renewal during the UDRP proceedings.

According to the Art. 3.7.5.7. of the Registrar Accreditation Agreement, in the event that a domain which is the subject of a UDRP dispute is deleted or expires during the course of the dispute, Complainant in the UDRP dispute will have the option to renew or restore the name under the same commercial terms as the registrant. If Complainant renews or restores the name, the name will be placed in Registrar HOLD and Registrar LOCK status, the WHOIS contact information for the registrant will be removed, and the WHOIS entry will indicate that the name is subject to dispute.

Complainant has elected to continue the administrative proceedings. Accordingly, Complainant requested to renew/restore the disputed domain name under the applicable Registrar terms, in order to maintain the status quo during the course of the dispute.

Disputed domain resolves into a website

The disputed domain name resolves into a website on which vapes of the brand GEEK BAR are sold.

Respondent did not react in this Complaint procedure.

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

According to the Policy paragraph 4(a)(i) it needs first to be established that:

(i) The domain name is identical or confusingly similar to a trademark or service mark in which the complainant has rights;

Complainant submits that the disputed domain name <officialgeekbarpulsex.com> is confusingly similar to Complainant's GEEK BAR trademark. Complainant illustrates this argument with the following allegations:

- The disputed domain name incorporates Complainant's GEEK BAR trademark in its entirety, together with the product designation "Pulse X"—itself a reference to one of the Complainant's flagship product lines. The omission of spaces between words is a technical necessity of the domain name system and does not prevent Complainant's trademark from remaining clearly recognizable within the disputed domain name.

- The addition of the terms "official" and "pulsex" does not prevent a finding of confusing similarity. To the contrary, both terms dramatically intensify the association between the disputed domain name and Complainant.

- "Pulse X" is not a generic or descriptive term—it is Complainant's own product series name, designating one of the flagship lines within the GEEK BAR range. Its incorporation into the disputed domain name demonstrates that Respondent was not only aware of Complainant's trademark but had sufficient knowledge of Complainant's product portfolio to select a specific product line by name.

- "Official" compounds this further: it is a term of authorization and endorsement by its very nature, and its placement at the head of a domain name built around another party's trademark and product series name does not distinguish that domain name from the Complainant—it asserts a direct and authoritative connection to Complainant that does not exist.

- Section 1.8 of the WIPO Overview 3.1 provides that where the relevant trademark is recognizable within the disputed domain name, the addition of other terms does not prevent a finding of confusing similarity. That principle applies with particular force where, as here, the additional terms serve to amplify rather than diminish the association with the Complainant's mark.

- Furthermore, the generic Top-Level Domain ".com" is a standard registration requirement and is generally disregarded for the purpose of assessing confusing similarity under the first element of the Policy (WIPO Overview 3.1, section 1.11, also see

Annex 13 WIPO Case No. D2017-0275).

Accordingly, Complainant concludes that the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to it’s trademark.

The Panel findings

Complainant’s trademark registrations predate the registration of the disputed domain name and thus the trademark rights prevail.

This is the starting point of the assessment.

Next step is to determine whether confusing similarity is applicable between trademark and disputed domain name and the Panel decides that in case the disputed domain name can be read and understood in more than one variety, paragraph 4(a)(i) of the Policy is applicable if the disputed domain name can be understood as applicable in one of those varieties.

The Panel reads the disputed domain name as: OFFICIAL GEEK BAR PULSE X or OFFICIAL GEEK BAR PUL SEX.

The argumentation of Complainant is geared to the reading of the first variant: OFFICIAL GEEK BAR PULSE X.

In that respect the Panel agrees with Complainant that GEEK BAR is standing out in the disputed domain name.

Further, the Panel finds that -unlike Complainant- all the additional elements are descriptive:

- Official is descriptive because it refers to a website originating from the trademark owner;

- Pulse is descriptive as it refers to the pulse mode which is-in the vaping industry- the advanced function of a vape that offers a more consistent and smooth damp experience;

- X is descriptive as it stands for a big size.

The top level domain can indeed be disregarded. This has been ruled by many panels.

Now that all elements, except for GEEK BAR, in the disputed domain name are descriptive section 1.8 of the WIPO Overview 3.1 applies: the trademark GEEK BAR is standing out in the disputed domain name and thus the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to the trademark.

The Panel concludes that the disputed domain name is identical or confusingly similar to a trademark or service mark in which Complainant has rights (within the meaning of paragraph 4(a)(i) of the Policy).

NO RIGHTS OR LEGITIMATE INTERESTS

According to the Policy paragraph 4(a)(ii) it needs further to be established that:

(ii) Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the domain name.

Paragraph 4 (c) of the Policy provides circumstances that could demonstrate that Respondent has no rights to and legitimate interests in the Domain Name. These circumstances are not exclusive.

Circumstance that are providing rights or legitimate interests to the domain name are:

(i) before any notice to the Respondent of the dispute, the use of, or demonstrable preparations to use, the domain name or a name corresponding to the domain name in connection with a bona fide offering of goods or services; or

(ii) Respondent (as an individual, business, or other organization) has been commonly known by the domain name, even if though it has acquired no trademark or service mark rights; or

(iii) Respondent is making a legitimate noncommercial or fair use of the domain name, without intent for commercial gain to misleadingly divert consumers or to tarnish the trademark or service mark at issue.

Further, according to the WIPO Case No. D2003-0455, Croatia Airlines d. d. v. Modern Empire Internet Ltd., Complainant is required to make out a prima facie case that Respondent lacks rights or legitimate interests. Once such prima facie case is made, Respondent carries the burden of demonstrating rights or legitimate interests in the domain name. If Respondent fails to do so, Complainant is deemed to have satisfied paragraph 4(a) (ii) of the Policy.

Complainant alleged that:

- It has never licensed, authorized, or otherwise permitted the Respondent to use the GEEK BAR trademark;
- No distribution agreement, reseller arrangement, or relationship of any kind exists between the Parties;
- No searches of trademark registers or corporate records have revealed any rights in "GEEK BAR" standing in the Respondent's name, and there is nothing to suggest the Respondent has ever been commonly known by the disputed domain name.

In addition, Complainant alleges that Respondent wishes consumers to believe the website of the disputed domain name is the official online presence of the Complainant's GEEK BAR Pulse X product line. The word "official" carries a precise and unambiguous meaning in the mind of any consumer—it means authorized, endorsed, and operated by the brand owner. A registrant who places that word at the head of a domain name built around another party's trademark and product name is not engaging in fair use or descriptive reference. It is making a false representation of authorization from the moment a consumer reads the URL.

Moreover, Complainant continues, the website of the disputed domain name deploys Complainant's full visual identity: the GEEK BAR logo, official product photography, and marketing imagery across the complete product range. Further, the websites footer says: "Copyright 2026 © Official Geek Bar PulseX." and also uses this sentence in the legal notice that appears on every page of the website, asserting copyright ownership under a name that directly incorporates Complainant's trademark and the word "Official."

A consumer navigating this website encounters a seamlessly constructed environment that presents itself, at every point of contact, as Complainant's own retail platform, as Complainant alleges.

Complainant ends its allegations by writing that should Respondent nevertheless seek to invoke the reseller framework established in the Oki Data case (Oki Data Americas, Inc. v. ASD, Inc., WIPO Case No. D2001-0903), that argument is foreclosed at the threshold.

The Oki Data framework demands that a reseller clearly and prominently disclose the absence of any official relationship with the trademark owner. A respondent that has registered a domain name beginning with the word "official," constructed a website presenting Complainant's complete product range under Complainant's branding, and asserted copyright ownership as "Official Geek Bar PulseX" has not disclosed the absence of a relationship—it has fabricated the presence of one, at every level and in every available forum. There is no form of Oki Data analysis that can rescue a Respondent whose entire commercial identity is built upon a false claim of official authorization.

The Panel findings

Complainant’s allegations of lack of license, authorization, distribution agreement, resellers’ agreement and trademark rights at Respondent’s end can be considered true as no response to the contrary has been issued by Respondent.

Further, from the enclosed evidence it appears that Respondent has used it website for GEEK BAR products only. This is an indication that the use of the trademark GEEK BAR in the disputed domain name may be justified as ruled in the Oki data case and further elaborated in the Lost Mary Direct case (Dashing Joys Limited, Imiracle (Shenzhen) Technology Co., Ltd v. Mohammad Zafar, CAC Case No. CAC-UDRP-107605).

In the Lost Mary Direct case the Panel reformulated the Oki Data criteria as such:

1. There is actual offering of goods and services via Respondent’s website at issue;
2. The use of the website is to sell only the specific trademarked goods which have been brought into the market by the trademark owner and;
3. The Respondent’s website can be easily distinguished from that of the trademark owner. Aspects that can be decisive to distinguish Respondent’s website from that of the trademark owner are inter alia (but not limited):

i. the placing of a disclaimer disclosing Respondent’s relationship with the trademark owner on the home page of the website;

ii. the creation of a different look and feel of the website of Respondent as compared to the website of the trademark owner;

iii. the dominant use of resellers’ websites specific elements like pricing and depiction of the goods;

vi. the use of a logo on the top of the home page, not including the trademark as mentioned in the disputed domain name, that addresses the entity of Respondent on the website.

4. Respondent must also not try to corner the market in domain names that reflect the trademark.

The Panel notes that criteria 1 and 2 are applicable in this case: Respondent is actual offering goods via Respondent's website and this offering is only about the trademarked goods originating from Complainant.

However, criterium 3 is not met by Respondent as Respondent's website cannot be easily distinguished from that of the trademark owner:

- Respondent's website shows professional photos of the products being official product photography, and marketing imagery originating from Complainant as alleged by Complainant and not denied by Respondent and this use is misleading as to the origin of the website;
- Respondent's website shows a small logo in the left top corner being GEEK BAR, which is the logo of Complainant's trademark, another misleading element;
- Furthermore, with respect to this logo: it is custom that this position is referring to a company name. At this place it would have been expected that Respondent's company name would be visible which is not the case;
- The home page ends with "Copyright 2026 © Official Geek Bar Pulse X, which is a statement that will be perceived as verification and originality referring to Complainant and thus also this is a misleading element.

Another argument that applies here is the fact that the addition of 'official' in the disputed domain name enhances the perception that the disputed domain name and its website are originating from Complainant.

In sum, it appears that Respondent is trying to corner the market of the trademark owner.

All those factors lead to the conclusion that the Lost Mary criteria that could justify the use of a third party trademark in a resellers' domain name are not met.

Complainant has, to the satisfaction of the Panel, shown 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

According to the Policy paragraph 4(a)(iii) it finally needs to be established that:

(iii) the domain name has been registered and is being used in bad faith.

Paragraph 4 (b) of the Policy provides circumstances on that demonstrate that Respondent has registered and used the domain name in bad faith. These circumstances are not exclusive.

Those circumstances are for example:

(i) circumstances indicating that Respondent has registered or has acquired the domain name primarily for the purpose of selling, renting, or otherwise transferring the domain name registration to the complainant who is the owner of the trademark or service mark or to a competitor of that complainant, for valuable consideration in excess of your documented out-of-pocket costs directly related to the domain name; or

(ii) Respondent has registered the domain name in order to prevent the owner of the trademark or service mark from reflecting the mark in a corresponding domain name, provided that Respondent has engaged in a pattern of such conduct; or

(iii) Respondent has registered the domain name primarily for the purpose of disrupting the business of a competitor; or

(iv) by using the domain name, Respondent has intentionally attempted to attract, for commercial gain, Internet users to it's web site or other on-line location, by creating a likelihood of confusion with the complainant's mark as to the source, sponsorship, affiliation, or endorsement of your web site or location or of a product or service on your web site or location.

The registration was a calculated act of impersonation, not merely targeting.

Complainant starts with alleging that when a registrant selects a domain name that begins with the word "official" and then incorporates a well-known trademark together with one of its flagship product designations, the inference of bad faith does not require elaboration. The word "official" has no descriptive or generic function in this context. It serves one purpose only: to tell consumers that the domain name leads to an authorized, brand-endorsed destination, as Complainant writes.

Moreover, Complainant continues, a party that knew nothing of Complainant could not have constructed this domain name—and a party with only passing familiarity with the brand would not have known to specify "Pulse X" by name.

The selection of a specific product series within Complainant's portfolio, combined with the word "official" and Complainant's trademark, points to a registrant with detailed knowledge of Complainant's business, acting with the deliberate intention of impersonating an authorized product-specific retail channel.

A party that knew Complainant and had any legitimate purpose would have had no reason to use it. The registration of <officialgeekbarpulsex.com> was, from the outset, a deliberate act of impersonation directed at Complainant, its trademark, and its consumers—and it was carried out with full knowledge of what those words, in that combination, would lead consumers to believe, concludes Complainant.

The use of the domain name gives that impersonation full commercial effect.

With respect to the use Complainant starts with alleging that the website to which the disputed domain name resolves is a complete and detailed replica of what a consumer would expect an official GEEK BAR retail platform to look like. Complainant's logo anchors the navigation bar. Official product photography populates every category page. The full product range—Digi Flavor BRK 20000, Meloso Bar 30K, Pulse 15K, Sky View 25K, RIA Powered by Geek Bar 30K—is presented in organized retail categories, with pricing, add-to-cart functionality, and a discrete shipping notice for all 50 US states. Consumer who arrives at this website via the disputed domain name has been told, by the domain name itself, that they are in an official place—and everything they then see on the website confirms that expectation. That is not accidental. It is the deliberate construction of a confusion loop: the domain name creates the expectation, and the website fulfils it. This constitutes use in bad faith within the meaning of paragraph 4(b)(iv) of the Policy, so Complainant alleges.

The copyright notice removes any possibility of innocent explanation.

Further Complainant continues, if any residual ambiguity existed—and none does—the footer of every page on the Respondent's website eliminates it. The copyright notice reads: "Copyright 2026 © Official Geek Bar PulseX." Respondent has claimed legal ownership, under copyright, of a website operating under a name that combines Complainant's trademark with the word "Official." Copyright notices are not inserted carelessly. They are deliberate legal statements. A respondent that places such a notice on a website built entirely around another party's trademark has committed itself, in terms, to the proposition that it owns what it has built—and what it has built is an impersonation of Complainant. That commitment, expressed in a legal notice on every page of the website, is among the clearest evidence of bad faith that a panel could encounter.

Taken together, the registration of a domain name that places the word "official" before Complainant's trademark and flagship product designation, the construction of a website that replicates an authorized GEEK BAR retail environment in comprehensive detail, and the assertion of copyright ownership under the name "Official Geek Bar PulseX" constitute bad faith registration and use in the fullest and most unambiguous sense of paragraph 4(a)(iii) of the Policy.

The Panel findings

Complainant has given clear explanation of the applicability of bad faith with respect to article 4(b)(iv) of the Policy. Moreover, Respondent did not respond in the Complaint.

It is further reminded that the examples of bad faith as mentioned in the Policy are not exclusively. In this respect The Panel like to add that the registration of the disputed domain name could also be considered in bad faith as the disputed domain name can also be read as: Official Geek Bar Pul Sex. Caused by the Sex element the disputed domain name can be considered as detrimental, having a negative impact on Complainant’s trademark. Also, to that extent the registration of the disputed domain name is in bad faith.

In sum, taking all arguments of Complainant together which have not been counterargued by Respondent, the Panel concludes that Complainant has delivered sufficient arguments substantiated by evidence.

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.

FOR ALL THE REASONS STATED ABOVE, THE COMPLAINT IS

Accepted

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

1. **officialgeekbarpulsex.com**: Transferred

PANELLISTS

Name	**Marieke Westgeest**

DATE OF PANEL DECISION 2026-07-27

Publish the Decision