

Decision for dispute CAC-UDRP-108795

Case number	CAC-UDRP-108795
-------------	-----------------

Time of filing	2026-07-03 13:28:04
----------------	---------------------

Domain names	geekbarvapes.store
--------------	--------------------

Case administrator

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

Complainant

Organization	Guangdong Qisitech CO., LTD.
--------------	------------------------------

Complainant representative

Organization	Chofn Intellectual Property
--------------	-----------------------------

Respondent

Name	ANYANG PETER TABI
------	-------------------

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 has provided evidence of ownership of several trademark registrations in the terms GEEK BAR, notably the following:

- **International trademark GEEK BAR** registered on June 8, 2022 under No. 1676896 and designating goods in international class 34;
- **US trademark GEEK BAR** registered on February 23, 2001 under No. 6275589 and designating goods in international class 34.

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

The Complainant is a Chinese manufacturer and producer of electronic cigarettes with substantial market presence in Russia, the United States, the Middle East, and Europe.

The disputed domain name <geekbarvapes.store> was registered on February, 27 2026 and resolves to an active website offering electronic cigarettes for sale.

COMPLAINANT

A. THE DISPUTED DOMAIN NAME IS IDENTICAL OR CONFUSINGLY SIMILAR

The Complainant states that the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to its trademark GEEK BAR, with the mark reproduced in its entirety, combined with the generic term "vapes."

It does not change the overall impression of the designation as being connected to the Complainant's trademark GEEK BAR. It does not prevent the likelihood of confusion between the disputed domain name and the Complainant, its trademark and the domain names associated.

Furthermore, the Complainant contends that the addition of the gTLD ".STORE" does not change the overall impression of the designation as being connected to the Complainant's trademark. It does not prevent the likelihood of confusion between the disputed domain name and the Complainant, its trademark and its domain names associated.

B. RESPONDENT HAS NO RIGHTS OR LEGITIMATE INTEREST IN RESPECT OF THE DISPUTED DOMAIN NAME

The Complainant asserts that it has never licensed, authorized, or otherwise permitted the Respondent to use the GEEK BAR trademark in any capacity. No distribution agreement, reseller arrangement, or commercial relationship of any kind exists between the Parties.

Further the Complainant submits that the Respondent is not known by the disputed domain name and owns no trademark in the terms GEEK BAR.

Moreover, the use of the disputed domain name in connection with an active page seemingly impersonating the Complainant is not a bona fide offering of goods or services under the Policy.

Thus, in accordance with the foregoing, the Complainant contends that the Respondent has no right or legitimate interest in respect of the disputed domain name.

C. THE DISPUTED DOMAIN NAME WAS REGISTERED AND IS BEING USED IN BAD FAITH

The Complainant contends that the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to its distinctive trademark GEEK BAR. The Complainant's trademark GEEK BAR enjoys substantial recognition across the disposable vape market and the Respondent's choice of domain name could not have been coincidental.

The disputed domain name is linked to a website that repeatedly and explicitly proclaims its products "GENUINE," "Authentic," and backed by "official verification codes for authenticity," that claims to source "directly from authorized distributors." The Complainant submits 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 website and the products offered through it, and has gone further still by expressly and falsely claiming that very authorization in the website's own text.

Thus, Complainant contends that Respondent has registered the disputed domain name and is using it in bad faith.

RESPONDENT

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

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 name is 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 name; and
- iii. that the disputed domain name was registered and is being used in bad faith.

A. Identical or Confusingly Similar

A complainant must establish that it has a trademark or service mark and that a domain name is identical or confusingly similar to that trademark or service mark for the complainant to succeed.

The Complainant is a Chinese manufacturer and producer of electronic cigarettes with substantial market presence in Russia, the United States, the Middle East, and Europe. The Complainant has provided evidence of ownership of the mark "GEEK BAR".

As regards the question of identity or confusing similarity for the purpose of the Policy, it requires a comparison of the disputed domain name with the trademarks in which the complainant holds rights. According to section 1.7 of the WIPO Overview of WIPO Panel Views on Selected UDRP Questions, Third Edition ("WIPO Overview 3.1"), "this test typically involves a side-by-side comparison of the domain name and the textual components of the relevant trademark to assess whether the mark is recognizable within the disputed domain name".

Also, according to section 1.7 of the WIPO Overview 3.1, "in cases where a domain name incorporates the entirety of a trademark, or where at least a dominant feature of the relevant mark is recognizable in the domain name, the domain name will normally be considered confusingly similar to that mark for purposes of UDRP standing".

The Panel finds that the Complainant's mark GEEK BAR is easily recognizable within the dispute domain name, and the addition of the generic term "vapes" to the mark in the disputed domain name is not sufficient to avoid a finding of confusing similarity under the Policy. On the contrary, the Complainant being an electronic cigarette producer, the use of the term "vapes" by the Respondent reinforces the likelihood of confusion.

It is well accepted by UDRP panels that a generic Top-Level Domain ("gTLD"), such as ".STORE", is typically ignored when assessing whether a domain name is identical or confusingly similar to a trademark.

This Panel concludes that the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to the Complainant's trademark and therefore finds that the requirement of paragraph 4(a)(i) of the Policy is satisfied.

B. Rights or Legitimate Interests

Under paragraph 4(c) of the Policy, any of the following circumstances, if found by the Panel, may demonstrate the Respondent's rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name:

- i. before any notice to it of the dispute, the Respondent's use of, or demonstrable preparations to use, the disputed domain name or a name corresponding to the disputed domain name in connection with a bona fide offering of goods or services; or
- ii. the Respondent has been commonly known by the disputed domain name, even if it has acquired no trademark or service mark rights; or
- iii. the Respondent is making a legitimate non-commercial or fair use of the disputed domain name, without intent for commercial gain to misleadingly divert consumers or to tarnish the trademark or service mark at issue.

The consensus view of UDRP panels on the burden of proof under paragraph 4(a)(ii) of the Policy is summarized in section 2.1 of

the WIPO Overview 3.1, which states: “[...] where a Complainant makes out a prima facie case that the Respondent lacks rights or legitimate interests, the burden of production on this element shifts to the Respondent to come forward with relevant evidence demonstrating rights or legitimate interests in the domain name. If the Respondent fails to come forward with such relevant evidence, the Complainant is deemed to have satisfied the second element.”

The evidence on record does not show that the Respondent was commonly known, as an individual or an organization, by the disputed domain name.

The Panel also finds, in the absence of a rebuttal from the Respondent, that the Respondent uses the Complainant's trademarks in the disputed domain name without authorization from the Complainant. Equally, the Panel accepts that the Respondent has not made a legitimate non-commercial or fair use of the disputed domain name. On the contrary, the current use of the disputed domain name in connection with a website offering GEEK BAR-branded products for sale and impersonating the Complainant is strictly seen as a non-legitimate use of the domain name under the Policy.

Therefore, the Panel concludes that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name and therefore finds that the requirement of paragraph 4(a)(ii) of the Policy is satisfied.

C. Registration and Use in Bad faith

For the purpose of Paragraph 4(a) (iii) of the Policy, the following circumstances, in particular but without limitation, if found by the Panel to be present, shall be evidence of the registration and use of the disputed domain name in bad faith:

- i. circumstances indicating that the holder 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 the holders documented out-of-pocket costs directly related to the domain name; or
- ii. the holder 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 the holder has engaged in a pattern of such conduct; or
- iii. the holder has registered the domain name primarily for the purpose of disrupting the business of a competitor; or
- iv. by using the domain name, the holder has intentionally attempted to attract, for commercial gain, Internet users to the holder's 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 your website or location or of a product or service on the holder's website or location.

This Panel has no doubts that the Respondent registered and is using the domain name in bad faith. The evidence on record shows without the shadow of a doubt that the Respondent specifically targeted the Complainant when registering the domain name, by reproducing the GEEK BAR trademark in its entirety, followed by the generic term “vapes” that directly relates to the Complainant's core business.

The GEEK BAR trademark enjoys a continuous reputation in the market of electronic cigarettes. Such reputation, coupled with the evidence on record, shows that the Respondent was certainly aware of the existence of the Complainant and of the rights of the Complainant on the trademark. The Panel finds that the Respondent, by registering and using the disputed domain name has intentionally attracted internet users by creating a likelihood of confusion with the Complainant's trademark.

The Panel also finds that the current use of the disputed domain name in connection with a website impersonating the Complainant and claiming to offer for sale GEEK BAR-branded goods without any authorization from the Complainant, is further evidence on bad faith on the part of the Respondent.

The Panel finally notes that the Respondent was provided the opportunity to rebut the Complainant's arguments but failed to do so.

The Panel concludes that the Respondent has registered and is using the disputed domain name in bad faith, and therefore finds that the requirements of paragraph 4(a)(iii) of the Policy is satisfied.

FOR ALL THE REASONS STATED ABOVE, THE COMPLAINT IS

Accepted

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

1. **geekbarvapes.store**: Transferred

PANELLISTS

Name	Arthur Fouré
------	--------------

DATE OF PANEL DECISION	2026-08-07
------------------------	------------

Publish the Decision	
----------------------	--