Decision for dispute CAC-UDRP-108739

Case number	CAC-UDRP-108739
Time of filing	2026-06-23 09:25:49
Domain names	geekbargrok.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	Ryan Zhang

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 owns several "GEEK BAR" trademarks, registered worldwide, such as:

- Madrid Registration Number 1676896 for "GEEK BAR", registered since June 8, 2022;
- U.S. Registration Number 6275589 for "GEEK BAR", registered since February 23, 2021;
- EU Registration Number 018225081 for "GEEK BAR", registered since August 26, 2020;
- China Registration Number 45380452 for "GEEK BAR", registered since January 7, 2021 (hereinafter cumulatively referred to as the "Trademark").

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

The Complainant, Guangdong Qisitech CO., LTD., was established in 2016 and is the registered proprietor and owner of the trademarks associated with 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.

The disputed domain name <geekbargrok.com> was registered on July 28, 2025 and is actively used in connection with a website impersonating the Complainant and offering its products.

PARTIES CONTENTIONS

The COMPLAINANT:

The Complainant asserts that the GEEK BAR brand was founded in 2016 and is now independently operated by the Complainant and that GEEK BAR is among the most popular lines of disposable vape products on the market. The Complainant states that it possesses substantial R&D capacity, with over 100 senior engineers, and that GEEK BAR products are sold in Russia, the United States, the Middle East, Europe, and numerous other countries, providing services to hundreds of millions of users.

The Complainant further contends that the brand has demonstrated strong sales momentum globally, particularly in the UK market, where it has committed £120 million to a new production facility to support UK distribution growth. The Complainant also relies on evidence of influencer partnerships, numerous third-party review videos on YouTube, and historical Google Trends data showing sustained high global search volume for the term "GEEK BAR" over the past five years, particularly prior to the registration of the disputed domain name, as evidence of the brand's international recognition and goodwill.

The Complainant contends that each of the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to its GEEK BAR trademark, as each consists of the trademark in its entirety combined with the term" grok", and that the generic top-level domain ".com" does not affect this comparison.

The Complainant asserts that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name because the website to which it resolves display content highly relevant to the Complainant's core business in a manner that makes it difficult for consumers to distinguish genuine from counterfeit sources, effectively impersonating the Complainant or falsely implying sponsorship or endorsement. The Complainant further contends that the Respondent's website fail to meet the Oki Data standard (WIPO Case No. D2001-0903) for legitimate resale, as they lack any prominent disclaimer disclosing the absence of a relationship with the Complainant. The Complainant adds that it has never authorized the Respondent to use the GEEK BAR mark, found no trademark rights held by the Respondent in any jurisdiction.

Regarding bad faith, the Complainant argues that GEEK BAR is a highly distinctive, coined term with no independent meaning, making it implausible that the Respondent selected this domain name by coincidence. The Complainant further contends that the Respondent's use of the domain name to operate website reproducing the Complainant's commercial presentation is intended to attract Internet users for commercial gain by creating a likelihood of confusion as to source, sponsorship, affiliation, or endorsement, within the meaning of paragraph 4(b)(iv) of the Policy.

The Complainant contends that the requirements of the Policy have been met and that the disputed domain name should be transferred to it.

THE RESPONDENT

No administratively compliant Response has been filed by Respondent. It ought to be indicated that the Centre sent of the complaint but nor the advice of delivery thereof was returned to the Czech Arbitration Court. The notice of the Commencement of the administrative proceeding was therefore only sent by e-mail. Yet, the e-mail notice sent to service@geekbargrok.com and to postmaster@geekbargrok.com were returned back undelivered as the e-mail addresses had permanent fatal errors. The e-mail notices were also sent to 738572310@qq.com, but the Czech Arbitration Court never received any proof of delivery or notification of undelivery. No further e-mail addresses could be found on the disputed sites.

The Respondent never accessed the online platform.

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

Notwithstanding the fact that no Response has been filed, the Panel shall consider the issues present in the case based on the statements and documents submitted by the Complainant.

Paragraph 4(a) of the Policy directs that the Complainant must prove each of the following elements:

i. that the disputed domain names are identical or confusingly similar to a trademark or service mark in which the Complainant has rights; and
ii. that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the disputed domain names; and
iii. that the disputed domain names were registered and are being used in bad faith.

Identical or confusingly similar

The Complainant has provided evidence and has thus established its rights in the GEEK BAR trademark.

The disputed domain name <geekbargrok.com> is found to be confusingly similar to the Complainant's Trademark. This finding is based on the settled practice in evaluating the existence of a likelihood of confusion of:

- disregarding the top-level suffix in the domain names (i.e. ".shop");

The Panel notes that a common practice has emerged under the Policy to disregard in appropriate circumstances the general Top-Level Domain ("gTLD") section of domain names for the purposes of the comparison under the Policy, paragraph 4(a)(i). The Panel sees no reason not to follow the same approach here, so it will disregard the ".com" gTLD section of the disputed domain name.

- finding that the identical reproduction of the trademark right or same with the adding of generic words i.e. "GROK" would not be considered sufficient to distinguish the domain names from the concerned trademark being reproduced strictly identically which is intentionally designed to be confusingly similar with the trademark, i.e. a case of typosquatting. Moreover, the term "GROK", neologism meaning "in depth knowledge" -or eventually refers to the AI Grok- would lead the consumer believe to have a full knowledge of the Complainant's products or "help" AI to spot the domain name.

The disputed domain names are therefore confusingly similar to the earlier right "GEEK BAR", and the Panel concludes that the Complainant has satisfied the requirement under paragraph 4(a)(i) of the Policy.

No Rights or Legitimate Interests

The Complainant's assertions that the Respondent is not commonly known by either disputed domain name and are not affiliated with or authorised by the Complainant are sufficient to constitute prima facie showing of absence of rights or legitimate interest in the disputed domain name on the part of the Respondent.

Therefore, in the absence of the Respondents' response, the Panel concludes that there is no indication that the disputed domain names were intended to be used in connection with a bona fide offering of goods or services as required by Policy.

Consequently, the evidentiary burden shifts to the Respondent to show by concrete evidence that they do have rights or legitimate interests in that respective disputed domain name. However, the Respondents failed to provide any information and evidence that it has relevant rights or legitimate interests in respect of the disputed domain names (within the meaning of paragraph 4(a) (ii) of Policy).

Bad Faith

The Panel finds that the Complainant has established that the disputed domain name was registered by the Respondent and is being used by the Respondent in bad faith.

The Respondent is using the disputed domain name for a website displaying the Complainant's trademark and its products offered at a discounted price or sold in bulk, or again at low price.

The Complainant's trademark registrations significantly predate the registration of the disputed domain name. The disputed domain name incorporates the GEEK BAR mark in its entirety with a mere added term "GROK". Moreover, the disputed domain name is being used displaying the Complainant's trademark and products.

In these circumstances, it cannot be envisaged that the Respondent registered the disputed domain name without knowledge of the

Complainant and its trademark rights.

The evidence shows that the disputed domain name was used for a website that reproduced the GEEK BAR mark, displayed images of GEEK BAR-branded products, offered products for sale at discounted price, and may collect personal data from users. This conduct demonstrates that the Respondent intentionally attempted to attract Internet users to its website for commercial gain by creating a likelihood of confusion with the Complainant's mark as to source, sponsorship, affiliation, or endorsement.

The Panel further considers that the Respondent's conduct constitutes impersonation or passing off. The website was designed to mislead users into believing that it was operated by, or affiliated with, the Complainant. The collection of personal data through such a website creates an additional risk of phishing or other fraudulent activity. Such use is manifestly evidence of bad faith.

In light of these circumstances, the Panel finds that the Respondent registered and used the disputed domain name in bad faith.

The Panel concludes that 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 has therefore also satisfied the requirement under 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. **geekbargrok.com**: Transferred

PANELLISTS

Name	**David-Irving Tayer**

DATE OF PANEL DECISION 2026-07-27

Publish the Decision