Decision for dispute CAC-UDRP-108733

Case number	**CAC-UDRP-108733**
Time of filing	**2026-06-23 09:23:24**
Domain names	**geekbarprice.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	**portia huang**

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 holder of the registered word mark GEEK BAR in numerous jurisdictions worldwide, including the International Registration No. 1676896 under the Madrid system for GEEK BAR, with an effective date of 8 June 2022, in class 34; the United States Registration No. 6275589 for GEEK BAR, with an effective date of 23 February 2021, in class 34; the European Union Registration No. 018225081 for GEEK BAR, with an effective date of 26 August 2020, in class 34; and the China Registration No. 45380452 for GEEK BAR, with an effective date of 7 January 2021, in class 34.

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

The Complainant, Guangdong Qisitech CO., LTD., is a company incorporated in 2016, headquartered in Dongguan, Guangdong, China. It is a wholly-owned subsidiary of Shenzhen Geekvape Technology Co., Ltd. The Complainant manufactures and distributes GEEK BAR disposable e-cigarette products.
The Complainant is the owner of the registered trademark GEEK BAR in multiple jurisdictions. All trademark registrations predate the registration of the disputed domain name.
The disputed domain name <geekbarprice.com> was registered on 16 July 2025. According to the Complainant, the disputed

domain name used to redirect to a commercial website on <goofyvape.com>. The website features the Complainant's GEEK BAR trademark and logo, product descriptions and listings for GEEK BAR products, alongside products of competing brands. The website footer includes the statement "100% Authentic / Officially licensed merchandise". The Complainant has not granted any licence or authorization to the Respondent or to the operator of the website. The WHOIS information for the disputed domain name was initially privacy-protected.

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

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

Paragraph 15 of the Rules provides that the Panel is to decide the complaint on the basis of the statements and documents submitted in accordance with the Policy, the Rules and any rules and principles of law that it deems applicable.
The onus is on the Complainant to make out its case and it is apparent, both from the terms of the Policy and the decisions of past UDRP panels, that the Complainant must show that all three elements set out in Paragraph 4(a) of the Policy have been established before any order can be made to transfer a domain name. As the proceedings are administrative, the standard of proof is the balance of probabilities.
Thus, for the Complainant to succeed it must prove, within the meaning of Paragraph 4(a) of the Policy and on the balance of probabilities that:

1. The disputed domain name is identical or confusingly similar to a trademark or service mark in which the Complainant has rights;

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

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

The Panel has therefore dealt with each of these requirements in turn.

1. Identity or confusing similarity
The Complainant must first establish that there is a trademark or service mark in which it has rights. The Complainant is the holder of several registered GEEK BAR trademarks predating the registration of the disputed domain name, including registrations in the United States, the European Union, China, and through the Madrid system. It is therefore established that there is a trademark in which the Complainant has rights.
The disputed domain name <geekbarprice.com> incorporates the Complainant's GEEK BAR trademark in its entirety, with the omission of the space between "GEEK" and "BAR" being a technical necessity of the domain name system, and merely adds the term "price". In the Panel's view, this addition does not prevent the Complainant's trademark from being recognizable within the disputed domain name (see section 1.8 WIPO Overview 3.1).
Additionally, it is well established that the generic Top Level Domain ("gTLD") such as ".com" may be disregarded when considering whether the disputed domain name is identical or confusingly similar to the trademark in which the Complainant has rights (see section 1.11 WIPO Overview 3.1).
Therefore, the Panel finds that the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to the Complainant's trademark. Accordingly, the Complainant has made out the first of the three elements that it must establish.

2. No rights or legitimate interests
Under paragraph 4(a)(ii) of the Policy, the Complainant has the burden of establishing that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the disputed domain name.
It is established case law that it is sufficient for the Complainant to make a prima facie showing that the Respondent has no right or legitimate interest in the disputed domain name in order to shift the burden of proof to the Respondent (see section 2.1 WIPO Overview 3.1 and Champion Innovations, Ltd. v. Udo Dussling (45FHH), WIPO Case No. D2005-1094; Croatia Airlines d.d. v. Modern Empire Internet Ltd., WIPO Case No. D2003-0455; Belupo d.d. v. WACHEM d.o.o., WIPO Case No. 2004-0110).
The Panel notes that the Respondent has not been commonly known by the disputed domain name and has not acquired trademark or service mark rights. The Respondent's use and registration of the disputed domain name was not authorized by the Complainant. There are no indications that any connection between the Complainant and the Respondent existed.
A respondent's use of a domain name will not be considered "fair" if it falsely suggests affiliation with the trademark owner (see section 2.5.1 WIPO Overview 3.1). In the present case, the disputed domain name incorporates the Complainant's GEEK BAR trademark in its entirety and adds the term "price", which directly evokes consumers' search for pricing information concerning the Complainant's products. This structure creates the impression of an official or authorized pricing portal for GEEK BAR products, carrying a clear risk of implied affiliation with the Complainant.
Furthermore, the website to which the disputed domain name used to redirect uses the Complainant's trademark and logo, reproduces product descriptions and listings for GEEK BAR products, and explicitly states in its footer "100% Authentic / Officially licensed merchandise" — a representation that is false, as no licence or authorization from the Complainant exists. Such conduct, which amounts to impersonation and passing off, cannot confer rights or legitimate interests regardless of how it is framed (see section 2.13.1 WIPO Overview 3.1).
The Respondent cannot seek refuge in the reseller or nominative use framework established in Oki Data Americas, Inc. v. ASD, Inc., WIPO Case No. D2001-0903. That framework requires, as a threshold condition, that the respondent clearly and prominently disclose the absence of any official relationship with the trademark owner. Here, the Respondent has done the opposite, affirmatively and falsely representing to consumers that its merchandise is officially licensed. A respondent that constructs its commercial credibility upon a false claim of official licensing cannot invoke a doctrine designed exclusively to protect honest and transparent resellers.
The Respondent had the opportunity to demonstrate its rights or legitimate interests but did not do so. In the absence of a Response from the Respondent, the prima facie case established by the Complainant has not been rebutted.
Therefore, the Panel finds that the Complainant has established that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name. In light of the above, the Complainant succeeds on the second element of the Policy.

3. Bad faith
The Complainant must prove on the balance of probabilities that the disputed domain name was registered in bad faith and that it is being used in bad faith (see section 4.2 WIPO Overview 3.1 and Telstra Corporation Limited v. Nuclear Marshmallow, WIPO Case No. D2000-0003; Control Techniques Limited v. Lektronix Ltd, WIPO Case No. D2006-1052).
Paragraph 4(b)(iv) of the Policy provides that evidence of bad faith registration and use may consist of circumstances

indicating 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 mark as to the source, sponsorship, affiliation, or endorsement of the Respondent's website or of a product or service on that website.

In the instant case, the Panel finds that the Respondent must have had knowledge of the Complainant's rights in the GEEK BAR trademark at the moment it registered the disputed domain name. The GEEK BAR trademark is a commercially recognized mark in the disposable e-cigarette market, with registered protection in multiple jurisdictions. By conducting a simple online search regarding the term "GEEK BAR", the Respondent would inevitably have learned about the Complainant, its trademark, and its products. The domain name <geekbarprice.com> specifically replicates the search query a prospective consumer would use when looking for pricing information for GEEK BAR products, targeting that consumer at the point of commercial intent. There is no plausible explanation for that choice other than prior knowledge of the Complainant and a deliberate intention to exploit it.

The Respondent's use of the disputed domain name further confirms bad faith. The website to which the domain displays the Complainant's logo and brand elements, lists specific GEEK BAR product models and technical specifications, and uses promotional copy written in the Complainant's own brand voice — all in order to create an environment that consumers are likely to perceive as an official or authorized GEEK BAR destination. The website additionally features products of competing brands, revealing that the GEEK BAR trademark functions as a traffic acquisition instrument for a multi-brand commercial platform. This constitutes use in bad faith within the meaning of paragraph 4(b)(iv) of the Policy.

The Respondent's false representation of official licensing status — "100% Authentic / Officially licensed merchandise" — further discloses its awareness, at the time the website was constructed, that official authorization is commercially material to consumers. A party that fabricates a licensing claim does so because it knows that consumers will make purchasing decisions on the basis of it. That deliberate misrepresentation is a clear indicator of bad faith.

Finally, the initial use of a privacy shield service to conceal the Respondent's identity in the publicly available WHOIS record serves as an additional indicator of bad faith (see section 3.6 WIPO Overview 3.1), as does the Respondent's failure to participate in these administrative proceedings.

Therefore, the Panel finds that, on the balance of probabilities, it is sufficiently shown that the disputed domain name was registered and is being used in bad faith.

FOR ALL THE REASONS STATED ABOVE, THE COMPLAINT IS

Accepted

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

1. **geekbarprice.com**: Transferred

PANELLISTS

Name	**Flip Petillion**

DATE OF PANEL DECISION 2026-08-03

Publish the Decision