Decision for dispute CAC-UDRP-108759

Case number	CAC-UDRP-108759
Time of filing	2026-06-30 09:10:05
Domain names	geekbar9000.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	Jacory Gomez

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 relies on its rights in the trademark GEEK BAR, and in particular on the following trademark registrations, all of which designate goods in class 34 of the Nice Classification and all of which predate the registration of the disputed domain name:

- International (Madrid) trademark GEEK BAR no. 1676896, with effective date of June 8, 2022;
- United States trademark GEEK BAR no. 6275589, with effective date of February 23, 2021;
- European Union trademark GEEK BAR no. 018225081, with effective date of August 26, 2020;
- Chinese trademark GEEK BAR no. 45380452, with effective date of January 7, 2021.

The disputed domain name <geekbar9000.com> was registered on November 9, 2023.

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

The Complainant, Guangdong Qisitech CO., LTD., is a company established in 2016 which is engaged in the research and development, manufacture and worldwide distribution of disposable electronic cigarette products under the brand GEEK BAR. The Complainant is a wholly-owned subsidiary of Shenzhen Geekvape Technology Co., Ltd., as confirmed by China's National Enterprise Credit Information Publicity System. The two entities form part of the same corporate group and cooperate in the development, promotion and international marketing of the GEEK BAR brand.

GEEK BAR products are distributed in Russia, the United States, the Middle East, Europe and numerous other countries. The GEEK BAR product portfolio comprises several distinct disposable vape product lines, including the Pulse series (Patriot, Pulse and Pulse X), the Geek Bar Skyview, the Geek Bar Wondar and the MeLoso series. The Geek Bar Pulse 15000 delivers up to 15,000 puffs in regular mode and 7,500 puffs in pulse mode, and features a full-screen display, a 16 ml e-liquid capacity and a 650 mAh battery. The Complainant's research and development team comprises more than 100 senior engineers, and the Complainant provides one-stop OEM solutions spanning design, research and development, procurement, manufacturing and after-sales service.

The GEEK BAR brand has been the subject of media coverage since 2022, in particular in respect of its performance on the United Kingdom market, has maintained a presence at major international industry exhibitions and has received awards in recognition of its product design and innovation. In January 2023, the Complainant announced a commitment of GBP 120 million to the construction of a new production facility to be located in the Zhuhai National High-Tech Industrial Development Zone, Guangdong Province, China. Google Trends data record sustained worldwide consumer search interest in the term "GEEK BAR" from January 2022 through October 2023. United States-specific Google Trends data record a sustained upward trajectory of consumer search interest throughout 2022 and 2023, culminating in the maximum index value of 100 in October 2023, that is, in the month immediately preceding the registration of the disputed domain name.

The Complainant is the owner of the trademark registrations identified above, each of which was registered before the registration of the disputed domain name.

The disputed domain name <geekbar9000.com> was registered on November 9, 2023 with the registrar NAMECHEAP INC. The identity of the registrant was concealed by a privacy service in the publicly available WHOIS database and was disclosed in the course of these proceedings as "Jacory Gomez".

The disputed domain name resolves to a website which presents itself as a GEEK BAR retail platform. The title bar of the website reads "Geek Bar Vape | Buy Geek Bar" and its homepage displays the words "GEEK BAR" and "THE BEST SELLING DISPOSABLE VAPE" in large stylised lettering. The website offers for sale, at commercial prices, products from multiple GEEK BAR product lines, including the Meloso Max 9000 series, the B5000 series and the Pulse 15000 series, under headings such as "GEEK BAR VAPES | GEEK BAR MELOSO MAX 9000", and reproduces the Complainant's official product imagery and promotional language. The website contains no disclaimer or any other indication as to the absence of a relationship between the Respondent and the Complainant, and states an address in Los Angeles, California, together with a sales e-mail address at the disputed domain name.

The Complainant has not licensed or otherwise authorised the Respondent to use the GEEK BAR trademark, and there is no distribution agreement, reseller arrangement or other relationship of any kind between the Parties. The Respondent did not file a Response.

PARTIES CONTENTIONS

The Complainant contends that each of the three elements set out in paragraph 4(a) of the Policy is satisfied.

The Complainant contends that it holds registered rights in the GEEK BAR trademark in a number of jurisdictions and that the trademark rights and goodwill developed by affiliated entities within the same corporate group, in this case Shenzhen Geekvape Technology Co., Ltd., may be attributed to the trademark owner for the purposes of establishing rights under the Policy, so that evidence of the commercial activities carried out by that entity in connection with the GEEK BAR brand is probative of the Complainant's rights and of the goodwill attaching to them. The Complainant further contends that, by reason of its media coverage, industry accolades, product range and documented consumer search interest, the GEEK BAR brand had acquired substantial international recognition, distinctiveness and commercial goodwill well before the disputed domain name was registered.

As to the first element, the Complainant submits that the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to its GEEK BAR trademark, which it incorporates in its entirety, the omission of the space between the two words being a technical necessity of the domain name system which does not prevent the trademark from remaining clearly recognisable. The Complainant submits that the suffix "9000" does not prevent a finding of confusing similarity and in fact reinforces it, since "9000" is not a generic or independently meaningful numeral in the context of disposable electronic cigarettes but a specific model designation within the Complainant's GEEK BAR product line denoting a device capable of delivering approximately 9,000 puffs, as confirmed by the Respondent's own website, which markets products under the heading "GEEK BAR VAPES | GEEK BAR MELOSO MAX 9000". The Complainant relies on section 1.8 of the WIPO Overview 3.0, according to which the addition of other terms does not prevent a finding of confusing similarity where the trademark is recognisable within the domain name, and submits that this principle applies with particular force where the additional term is itself drawn from the Complainant's own product nomenclature. The Complainant adds that the generic top-level domain ".com" is a standard registration requirement which is disregarded under the first element, referring to section 1.11 of the WIPO Overview 3.0.

As to the second element, the Complainant submits that it has never licensed, authorised or otherwise permitted the Respondent to use the GEEK BAR trademark and that no distribution agreement, reseller arrangement or relationship of any kind exists between the Parties. It submits that searches of trademark registers and corporate records have not revealed any rights in "GEEK BAR" or "geekbar9000" standing in the Respondent's name and that there is nothing to suggest that the Respondent has ever been commonly known by the disputed domain name. The Complainant further submits that the composition of the disputed domain name itself signals the Respondent's purpose, since the appending of a specific product model designation to the trademark causes the disputed domain name to read, to any consumer familiar with the product, as a dedicated official page for that GEEK BAR model, and is designed to intercept the consumers searching for it. The Complainant submits that the content of the website confirms that

assessment, in that the website presents itself as a comprehensive GEEK BAR retail platform reproducing the Complainant's entire brand environment, product catalogue, official imagery and marketing language, without any disclosure that the Respondent has no relationship with the Complainant, and that such conduct constitutes impersonation or passing off rather than a bona fide offering of goods or services. The Complainant submits that any reliance by the Respondent on the reseller framework established in WIPO Case No. D2001-0903 (Oki Data) is foreclosed by those same facts, because that framework requires, as a threshold condition, the clear and prominent disclosure of the absence of any official relationship with the trademark owner, and that, as stated in section 2.13.1 of the WIPO Overview 3.0, conduct amounting to impersonation or passing off can never confer rights or legitimate interests.

As to the third element, the Complainant submits that the disputed domain name was registered with detailed prior knowledge of the Complainant, its brand and its product architecture. The Complainant contends that GEEK BAR is a well-known trademark and that the element "9000" is not a generic number but a capacity designation associated with the GEEK BAR Meloso Max 9000 product line, so that the selection of that combination demonstrates that the Respondent had studied the Complainant's product range in sufficient depth to identify a specific model by its numerical identifier, which cannot be reconciled with innocent intent. The Complainant further relies on the timing of the registration, submitting that United States consumer search interest in GEEK BAR reached its highest recorded index value of 100 in October 2023, the month immediately preceding the registration of the disputed domain name on November 9, 2023, so that the registration was made at the moment of peak consumer demand and constituted a targeted act directed at the consumer segment most likely to search for that product model by name. As to use, the Complainant submits that the Respondent has converted that targeting into full-scale commercial impersonation by operating, under the disputed domain name, a comprehensive GEEK BAR retail environment covering multiple product lines at commercial prices, reproducing the Complainant's official imagery and promotional language, the commercial purpose of which is to capture consumer traffic generated by the Complainant's brand and convert it into revenue for the Respondent, which constitutes use in bad faith within the meaning of paragraph 4(b)(iv) of the Policy. The Complainant finally submits that the complete absence of any disclaimer or disclosure of non-affiliation, coupled with the statement of a Los Angeles address and of a sales email address at the disputed domain name, projects the appearance of an authorised commercial operation directed at United States consumers and removes any remaining doubt as to the Respondent's bad faith.

NO ADMINISTRATIVELY COMPLIANT RESPONSE HAS BEEN FILED.

RIGHTS

The Complainant has, to the satisfaction of the Panel, shown the disputed domain name is 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 Complaint was filed with the Czech Arbitration Court (the "CAC") in accordance with the Uniform Domain Name Dispute Resolution Policy (the "Policy" or "UDRP"), the Rules for the Uniform Domain Name Dispute Resolution Policy (the "Rules") and the CAC Supplemental Rules (the "Supplemental Rules").

The CAC verified that the Complaint satisfied the formal requirements of the Policy, the Rules and the Supplemental Rules. The CAC formally notified the Respondent of the Complaint and the proceedings commenced. The due date for a Response was duly set.

The Respondent did not submit any Response. Accordingly, the CAC notified the Respondent of its default. The Panel was appointed in accordance with the Rules. The Panel has submitted its Statement of Acceptance and Declaration of Impartiality and Independence, as required by the CAC to ensure compliance with the Rules.

The language of the proceedings is English, being the language of the disputed domain name Registration Agreement.

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

For the Complainant to succeed it must prove, within the meaning of paragraph 4(a) of the Policy, that:

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

(ii) The respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the domain name; and

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

The Respondent has not filed a Response. In accordance with paragraph 14(b) of the Rules, the Panel may draw such inferences from that default as it considers appropriate. The Panel may accordingly accept the reasonable and uncontradicted factual allegations of the Complaint as established, but the Complainant nevertheless remains obliged to establish each of the three elements of paragraph 4(a) of the Policy on the balance of probabilities.

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

Pursuant to paragraph 4(a)(i) of the Policy, the Complainant must establish that the disputed domain name is identical or confusingly similar to a trademark or service mark in which it has rights.

The Complainant has established, by the evidence on record, that it holds rights in the trademark GEEK BAR, in particular by virtue of the international trademark no. 1676896, the United States trademark no. 6275589, the European Union trademark no. 018225081 and the Chinese trademark no. 45380452, each registered in class 34 and each predating the registration of the disputed domain name. The Complainant has therefore satisfied the threshold requirement of having trademark rights for the purposes of paragraph 4(a)(i) of the Policy. The location of the trademark, its date of registration and the goods for which it is registered are not, as a rule, material to the assessment under the first element.

The disputed domain name <geekbar9000.com> reproduces the GEEK BAR trademark in its entirety as its leading element. The only differences between the trademark and the second-level portion of the disputed domain name are the omission of the space between the words “geek” and “bar” and the addition of the numerical element “9000”. Spaces cannot be reproduced in the domain name system, and their omission is a technical requirement of registration which does not prevent the trademark from remaining clearly recognisable within the disputed domain name.

As to the numerical element “9000”, it is well established that, where the relevant trademark is recognisable 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 (section 1.8 of the WIPO Overview 3.1). The GEEK BAR trademark is plainly recognisable within the disputed domain name, and that finding would suffice. The Panel further notes, however, that on the uncontradicted evidence the element “9000” is not an arbitrary or generic numeral in the relevant market but a capacity designation used within the Complainant’s own GEEK BAR Meloso Max 9000 product line, denoting a device delivering approximately 9,000 puffs. That element therefore reinforces, rather than dispels, the association between the disputed domain name and the Complainant’s trademark.

The generic top-level domain “.com” is a standard registration requirement and is, as a rule, disregarded when assessing identity or confusing similarity under the first element (section 1.11 of the WIPO Overview 3.1).

The Panel accordingly finds that the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to a trademark in which the Complainant has rights, and that the first element of paragraph 4(a) of the Policy is satisfied.

II. The Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the disputed domain name

Pursuant to paragraph 4(a)(ii) of the Policy, the Complainant must establish that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the disputed domain name.

In accordance with consistent UDRP practice, the burden of proof under this element rests upon the Complainant. However, given that proving a negative fact lying within the exclusive knowledge of the Respondent would entail an excessive evidentiary burden, it suffices for the Complainant to make out a prima facie case that the Respondent lacks rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name. Once such a prima facie case is established, the burden of production shifts to the Respondent to demonstrate that it does possess rights or legitimate interests within the meaning of paragraph 4(c) of the Policy. If the Respondent fails to come forward with relevant allegations or evidence, the Complainant is generally deemed to have satisfied the second element.

In the present case, the Complainant has submitted, and the Panel accepts, that:

- The Complainant has never licensed, authorised or otherwise permitted the Respondent to use the GEEK BAR trademark or to register the disputed domain name, and no distribution agreement, reseller arrangement or relationship of any kind exists between the Parties.
- Searches of trademark registers and corporate records have not disclosed any rights in “GEEK BAR” or “geekbar9000” standing in the Respondent’s name, and there is nothing on record to suggest that the Respondent, identified as “Jacory Gomez”, has ever been commonly known by the disputed domain name within the meaning of paragraph 4(c)(ii) of the Policy.
- The website to which the disputed domain name resolves does not constitute a bona fide offering of goods or services within the meaning of paragraph 4(c)(i) of the Policy. The website presents itself as a comprehensive GEEK BAR retail platform, displaying the Complainant’s trademark prominently in stylised lettering, offering for sale products across multiple GEEK BAR product lines at commercial prices, and reproducing the Complainant’s official product imagery and promotional language. The use is manifestly commercial and cannot amount to a legitimate non-commercial or fair use under paragraph 4(c)(iii) of the Policy.
- The website contains no disclaimer and no disclosure of any kind as to the absence of a relationship between the Respondent and the Complainant. On the contrary, the statement of an address in Los Angeles, California and of a sales e-mail address at the disputed domain name reinforces the impression of an authorised commercial operation.

The composition of the disputed domain name is itself instructive. By combining the Complainant’s trademark with a numerical designation drawn from the Complainant’s own product nomenclature, the Respondent has created a domain name which carries a high risk of implied affiliation, in that it reads, to consumers familiar with the Complainant’s products, as a dedicated official resource for a particular GEEK BAR model. A domain name so composed cannot constitute fair use, since it effectively impersonates or suggests sponsorship or endorsement by the trademark owner.

The Panel has considered whether the Respondent might benefit from the principles applicable to resellers and distributors, as set out in WIPO Case No. D2001-0903 (Oki Data) and summarised in section 2.8 of the WIPO Overview 3.1. Those principles require, cumulatively, that the respondent actually offer the goods at issue, that it use the site to sell only the trademarked goods, that the site accurately and prominently disclose the respondent’s relationship with the trademark owner, and that the respondent not attempt to corner the market in domain names reflecting the trademark. On the uncontradicted evidence before the Panel, the third of those conditions is not met: the website contains no disclosure whatsoever of the absence of any relationship with the Complainant, and is instead constructed so as to convey the opposite impression. The Respondent therefore cannot bring itself within those principles. As reflected in section 2.13.1 of the WIPO Overview 3.1, use of a domain name for activity amounting to impersonation or passing off can never confer rights or legitimate interests on a respondent.

The Panel therefore finds that the Complainant has established a prima facie case that the Respondent lacks rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name. The Respondent, having failed to file a Response, has not rebutted that prima facie case and has not put forward any of the circumstances set out in paragraph 4(c) of the Policy, or any other basis on which rights or legitimate interests might be founded.

Accordingly, the Panel finds 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

Pursuant to paragraph 4(a)(iii) of the Policy, the Complainant must establish that the disputed domain name has been registered and is being used in bad faith. Paragraph 4(b) of the Policy sets out a non-exhaustive list of circumstances which, if found by the Panel to be present, shall be evidence of registration and use in bad faith, including, in paragraph 4(b)(iv), circumstances in which the respondent has intentionally attempted to attract, for commercial gain, Internet users to its website or other online location, by creating a likelihood of confusion with the complainant's mark as to the source, sponsorship, affiliation or endorsement of that website or location or of a product or service on it.

As to registration in bad faith, the Complainant's GEEK BAR trademark had been registered in several major jurisdictions, including the European Union, the United States, China and through the Madrid system, between 2020 and 2022, that is, well before the registration of the disputed domain name on November 9, 2023. On the evidence on record, the GEEK BAR brand had by that date acquired substantial recognition in the disposable electronic cigarette market internationally and, in particular, in the United States.

The Panel finds it inconceivable that the Respondent registered the disputed domain name without knowledge of the Complainant and its trademark. That conclusion does not rest on the reputation of the trademark alone. The Respondent did not simply reproduce the trademark; it combined the trademark with the numerical element "9000", which corresponds to a specific capacity designation within the Complainant's Meloso Max 9000 product line. The selection of that particular combination demonstrates a degree of familiarity with the Complainant's product architecture that cannot plausibly be attributed to coincidence, and the Respondent, having chosen not to respond, has offered no explanation of any kind.

The timing of the registration reinforces that inference. The uncontradicted Google Trends evidence shows that consumer search interest in GEEK BAR in the United States reached its highest recorded index value in October 2023, the month immediately preceding the registration of the disputed domain name. The Panel is satisfied that the disputed domain name was registered in deliberate awareness of, and with the intention of taking unfair advantage of, the Complainant's trademark and the commercial momentum then attaching to it.

As to use in bad faith, the disputed domain name resolves to a website which is designed to appear as an official or authorised GEEK BAR online retail presence. The website displays the Complainant's trademark prominently in stylised lettering, bears the title "Geek Bar Vape | Buy Geek Bar", offers for sale products across multiple GEEK BAR product lines at commercial prices, and reproduces the Complainant's official product imagery and promotional language. Internet users arriving at that website, having been led there by a domain name which combines the Complainant's trademark with one of the Complainant's own product designations, are likely to be confused as to the source, sponsorship, affiliation or endorsement of the website and of the products offered on it. The Respondent thereby derives, or seeks to derive, commercial gain from that confusion. This is precisely the conduct contemplated by paragraph 4(b)(iv) of the Policy.

The absence of any disclaimer or other disclosure of non-affiliation confirms that assessment. A respondent genuinely offering the Complainant's products on an independent basis would have had every reason to make its independence clear. The Respondent has done the opposite, and the statement of a United States address and of a sales e-mail address at the disputed domain name serves further to project the appearance of an authorised operation directed at consumers in the market in which the Complainant's brand had just reached its greatest prominence.

Having regard to the distinctiveness and reputation of the Complainant's trademark, to the composition of the disputed domain name and the knowledge of the Complainant's product range that it evidences, to the timing of the registration, to the content of the website to which the disputed domain name resolves, to the absence of any disclosure of non-affiliation, and to the Respondent's failure to file any Response or to provide any explanation for its conduct, the Panel finds that the disputed domain name was registered and is being used in bad faith, and that the third element of paragraph 4(a) of the Policy is satisfied.

Conclusion

All three elements set out in paragraph 4(a) of the Policy having been established to the satisfaction of the Panel, the Panel concludes that the Complaint is well-founded and that the disputed domain name should be transferred to the Complainant.

FOR ALL THE REASONS STATED ABOVE, THE COMPLAINT IS

Accepted

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

1. **geekbar9000.com**: Transferred

PANELLISTS

Name	**Petr Hostaš**

DATE OF PANEL DECISION 2026-07-30

Publish the Decision