

Decision for dispute CAC-UDRP-108798

Case number	CAC-UDRP-108798
-------------	-----------------

Time of filing	2026-07-09 10:44:42
----------------	---------------------

Domain names	geekbarsus.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	scott francis
------	---------------

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 the following trademarks:

Madrid Registration Number 1676896 for GEEK BAR, registered on June 8, 2022, designating inter alia electronic cigarettes in international class 34;

U.S. Registration Number 6275589 for GEEK BAR, registered on February 23, 2021, designating inter alia electronic cigarettes in international class 34;

EU Registration Number 018225081 for GEEK BAR, registered on August 26, 2020, designating inter alia electronic cigarettes in international class 34.

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

Established in 2016, 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 was registered on October 5, 2025. It resolves to a website prominently displaying the Complainant's GEEK BAR mark and images of the Complainant's products, which are offered for sale. The website displays the notice: Copyright © 2026 GEEK BAR. All rights reserved.""

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(a) of the Rules instructs this Panel to "decide a complaint on the basis of the statements and documents submitted in accordance with the Policy, these Rules and any rules and principles of law that it deems applicable."

Paragraph 4(a) of the Policy requires that the Complainant must prove each of the following three elements to obtain an order that a domain name should be cancelled or transferred:

(1) the disputed domain name registered by the Respondent is identical or confusingly similar to a trademark or service mark in which the Complainant has rights; and

(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.

In view of the Respondent's failure to submit a response, the Panel shall decide this administrative proceeding on the basis of the Complainant's undisputed representations pursuant to paragraphs 5(f), 14(a) and 15(a) of the Rules and draw such inferences as it considers appropriate pursuant to paragraph 14(b) of the Rules. The Panel is entitled to accept all reasonable allegations set forth in a complaint; however, the Panel may deny relief where a complaint contains mere conclusory or unsubstantiated arguments. See WIPO Jurisprudential Overview 3.1 at paragraph 4.3; see also eGalaxy Multimedia Inc. v. ON HOLD By Owner Ready To Expire, FA 157287 (Forum June 26, 2003) ("Because Complainant did not produce clear evidence to support its subjective allegations [. . .] the Panel finds it appropriate to dismiss the Complaint").

As to the first element, the Complainant has shown that it has rights in the GEEK BAR mark and that the mark is well-known. The Panel finds the disputed domain name <geekbarsus.com> to be confusingly similar to the Complainant's trademark GEEK BAR because it incorporates the mark in its entirety, omitting only the space between the words, and merely adds the letter "s" and the "us" abbreviation for United States. These differences do nothing to distinguish the disputed domain name from the mark. The

inconsequential top-level domain “.com” may be ignored. The Complainant has established this element.

As to the second element, paragraph 4(c) of the Policy sets out three illustrative circumstances as examples which, if established by the Respondent, shall demonstrate rights to or legitimate interests in a disputed domain name for the purposes of paragraph 4(a)(ii) of the Policy, i.e.

- (i) before any notice to the Respondent of the dispute, the use by the Respondent of, or demonstrable preparations to use, the 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 (as an individual, business or other organization) has been commonly known by the disputed domain name, even if the Respondent has acquired no trademark or service mark rights; or
- (iii) the Respondent is making a legitimate noncommercial or fair use of the disputed domain name, without intent for commercial gain to misleadingly divert customers or to tarnish the trademark or service mark at issue.

The Complainant contends that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the disputed domain name. The Complainant 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. Searches of trademark registers and corporate records have disclosed no rights in "GEEK BAR" or "GEEKBARSUS" standing in the Respondent's name, and there is no evidence the Respondent has ever been commonly known by the disputed domain name.

The Panel notes that the disputed domain name <geekbarsus.com> was registered by the Respondent on October 5, 2025, long after the Complainant has shown that its GEEK BAR mark had become well-known. It resolves to a website purporting to be the Complainant's own website. These circumstances, together with the Complainant's assertions, are sufficient to constitute a prima facie showing of absence of rights or legitimate interests in respect of the disputed domain name on the part of the Respondent. The evidentiary burden therefore shifts to the Respondent to show that it does have rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name. See *JUUL Labs, Inc. v. Dryx Emerson / KMF Events LTD*, FA1906001849706 (Forum July 17, 2019). The Respondent has made no attempt to do so.

The Panel finds that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the disputed domain name. The Complainant has established this element.

As to the third element, Paragraph 4(a)(iii) of the Policy is expressed in the conjunctive: “the domain name has been registered and is being used in bad faith” and Paragraph 4(b) sets out four illustrative circumstances, which, though not exclusive, shall be evidence of the registration and use of a domain name in bad faith for purposes of paragraph 4(a)(iii), including:

- (iv) by using the domain name, you have intentionally attempted to attract, for commercial gain, Internet users to your web site or other on-line location, by creating a likelihood of confusion with the complainant's mark as to the source, sponsorship, affiliation, or endorsement of your web site or location or of a product or service on your web site or location.

The circumstances set out above in relation to the second element satisfy the Panel that the Respondent was fully aware of the Complainant and its GEEK BAR mark when the Respondent registered the disputed domain name and that the Respondent has intentionally attempted to attract, for commercial gain, Internet users to the Respondent's 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 and of the products promoted on that website. This demonstrates registration and use in bad faith to attract users for commercial gain under Policy 4(b)(iv). The Complainant has established this element.

FOR ALL THE REASONS STATED ABOVE, THE COMPLAINT IS

Accepted

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

1. **geekbarsus.com**: Transferred

PANELLISTS

Name	Alan Limbury
------	--------------

DATE OF PANEL DECISION 2026-08-09

Publish the Decision