Decision for dispute CAC-UDRP-108757

Case number	CAC-UDRP-108757
Time of filing	2026-06-30 10:13:40
Domain names	wholesalegeekbar.com

Case administrator

Name	Olga Slanařová (Case admin)

Complainant

Organization	Guangdong Qisitech CO., LTD.

Complainant representative

Organization	Chofn Intellectual Property

Respondent

Name	atif shahzad

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 is the owner of numerous registrations for the trademark "GEEK BAR", including the international trademark No. 1676896, “GEEK BAR”, registered on June 8, 2022, for goods and services in class 34.

The disputed domain name was registered on December 2, 2025.

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

The Complainant is a Chinese-based company established in 2016 which is engaged in the research and development, manufacture and worldwide distribution of disposable electronic cigarette products.

The Complainant's products are distributed in Russia, the United States, the Middle East, Europe and numerous other countries.

The Complainant submits that the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to the Complainant's trademark.
The Complainant points out that the disputed domain name incorporates the Complainant's trademark in its entirety, and that the prefix "wholesale" does not prevent a finding of confusing similarity, because "wholesale" is a generic commercial descriptor referring to the sale of goods in bulk quantities, typically to retailers or distributors.

The Complainant observes that 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.

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

The Complainant states that it has never licensed, authorized, or otherwise permitted the Respondent to use the GEEK BAR trademark. The Complainant clarifies that no distribution agreement, wholesale arrangement, reseller relationship, or commercial engagement of any kind exists between the parties.
The Complainant asserts that there is nothing to suggest the Respondent has ever been commonly known by the disputed domain name.

The Complainant considers that the disputed domain name has been registered and is being used in bad faith.

The Complainant argues that the registration of the disputed domain name was a deliberate and targeted act, carried out by a party with specific knowledge of the GEEK BAR trademark.
The Complainant underlines that GEEK BAR is a trademark enjoying substantial global recognition and goodwill at the time of the disputed domain name's registration.
The Complainant considers that the disputed domain name is used for impersonating the Complainant, because the Respondent's website presents itself as the wholesale arm of the GEEK BAR brand operation.
The Complainant argues that the Respondent's conduct falls within paragraph 4(b)(iv) of the Policy because 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 the wholesale commercial services offered therein.

PARTIES CONTENTIONS

The Complainant, relying on the arguments summarised above, 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

For the reasons outlined in the Principal Reasons for the Decision below, the Panel does not make a formal finding regarding paragraph 4(a)(i) of the Policy.

NO RIGHTS OR LEGITIMATE INTERESTS

For the reasons outlined in the Principal Reasons for the Decision below, the Panel does not make a formal finding regarding paragraph 4(a)(ii) of the Policy.

BAD FAITH

For the reasons outlined in the Principal Reasons for the Decision below, the Panel does not make a formal finding regarding paragraph 4(a)(iii) of the Policy.

PROCEDURAL FACTORS

After the notification of commencement of the proceeding, the Respondent has given his unconditional consent to the remedy sought by the Complainant and has agreed to the immediate transfer of the disputed domain name to the Complainant.

At section 4.10 of the WIPO Overview of WIPO Panel Views on Select UDRP Questions (“WIPO Overview 3.1”) it is clarified that where the respondent has given its consent on the record to the transfer remedy sought by the complainant, many panels will order the requested remedy solely on the basis of such consent. However, in some cases, "despite such respondent consent, a panel may in its discretion still find it appropriate to proceed to a substantive decision on the merits. Scenarios in which a panel may find it appropriate to do so include (i) where the panel finds a broader interest in recording a substantive decision on the merits – notably recalling UDRP paragraph 4(b)(ii) discussing a pattern of bad faith conduct, (ii) where while consenting to the requested remedy the respondent has expressly disclaimed any bad faith, (iii) where the complainant has not agreed to accept such consent and has

expressed a preference for a recorded decision on the merits, (iv) where there is ambiguity as to the scope of the respondent's consent, or (v) where the panel wishes to be certain that the complainant has shown that it possesses relevant trademark rights".

The Panel considers that none of the above-mentioned scenarios where it would be appropriate to proceed to a substantive decision on the merits apply; therefore, in the circumstances of this case it appears appropriate to order the requested remedy solely on the basis of the Respondent's consent.

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 Respondent has given his unconditional consent to the remedy sought by the Complainant and has agreed to the immediate transfer of the disputed domain name to the Complainant.

In the circumstances of this case, pursuant to paragraph 10 of the Rules and taking into account section 4.10 of the WIPO Overview 3.1, it appears appropriate to order the transfer of the disputed domain name to the Complainant on the basis of the Respondent's consent, in line with the approach taken by other panels in similar cases (see, for example, WIPO Case No. D2023-1722 and CAC Case No. 104036).

FOR ALL THE REASONS STATED ABOVE, THE COMPLAINT IS

Accepted

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

1. **wholesalegeekbar.com**: Transferred

PANELLISTS

Name	**Michele Antonini**

DATE OF PANEL DECISION 2026-08-01

Publish the Decision