

Decision for dispute CAC-UDRP-108770

Case number	CAC-UDRP-108770
Time of filing	2026-07-01 12:11:46
Domain names	originalgeekbar.com

Case administrator

Name	Olga Slanařová (Case admin)
------	-----------------------------

Complainant

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

Complainant representative

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

Respondent

Organization	Geek Bar Company
--------------	------------------

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 inter alia owner of EU trademark registration no. 018225081 GEEK BAR, registered on August 26, 2020 in class 34 (hereinafter referred to as the "Trademark").

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

The Complainant was established in 2016 and manufactures and distributes disposable e-cigarette products. The Complainant's products have been distributed in multiple international markets, including Russia, the United States, the Middle East, and Europe.

The disputed domain name was registered on August 8, 2025, and was used in connection with a website headed "GEEK BAR DISPENSARY" that describes itself as a destination for "premium disposable vaping pens." The Complainant's GEEK BAR branding and product imagery are reproduced throughout the homepage, including product listings across multiple Geek Bar product lines, retail pricing, and add-to-cart functionality.

PARTIES CONTENTIONS

COMPLAINANT:

The Complainant contends that the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to the Trademark as it includes the Trademark in its entirety and as the addition of the generic term "original" does not reduce confusing similarity but intensifies the impression of affiliation by presenting the domain name as the source of the Complainant's authentic products.

Furthermore, the Complainant contends that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name. In this regard, the Complainant states that it has never licensed, authorised, or otherwise permitted the Respondent to use the Trademark in any capacity, that no evidence of independent entitlement, such as own trademark rights, has been identified, that the Respondent has identified itself as "Geek Bar Company" in the WHOIS record, which further indicates an attempt to falsely suggest an affiliation with the Complainant, and that the website is designed to simulate the infrastructure of an established authorised retailer and bears no disclaimer disclosing the absence of any relationship with the Complainant and is therefore does not meet the Oki Data criteria for the authorised use of a domain name by a reseller.

Finally, the Complainant contends that the disputed domain name was registered and is being used in bad faith. In this regard, the Complainant argues that the registration of the disputed domain name was a deliberate and targeted act, that the combination of the Trademark with the term "original" directly refers to the Complainant and its products, and that the Complainant's product imagery is reproduced throughout the website, with product listings including the Geek Bar Pulse Frozen Pina Colada, Geek Bar Pulse Frozen Strawberry, Geek Bar Alaskan Mint Meloso Mini, Geek Bar Watermelon Strawberry Coconut Meloso Ultra, and further variants. Therefore, it is inconceivable that the disputed domain name was registered in good faith without knowledge of the Trademark. With regard to bad faith use, the Complainant argues 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 therefore used the disputed domain name 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

Under paragraph 4(a) of the Policy, the Complainant must prove that each of the following three elements is present:

- (i) the disputed domain name is identical or confusingly similar to the Complainant's trademark; and
- (ii) the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the disputed domain name; and
- (iii) the disputed domain name has been registered and is being used in bad faith.

1. The Panel accepts that the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to the Trademark. It is well established that a domain name that wholly incorporates a trademark may be confusingly similar to such trademark for purposes of the Policy despite the addition of generic terms, such as "original".

2. The Complainant has substantiated that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name. The Panel finds that the Complainant has fulfilled its obligations under paragraph 4(a)(ii) of the Policy. The Respondent did not deny these assertions in any way and therefore failed to prove any rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name.

Based on the evidence on file, the Panel likewise cannot find any rights or legitimate interests of the Respondent, as the disputed domain name is not generic and the Respondent's use of the disputed domain name does not appear to indicate the existence of any rights or legitimate interests of its own. In particular, the Respondent's website does not include any kind of disclaimer to clarify that the website is not endorsed or sponsored by the Complainant and therefore does not meet the Oki Data criteria, even if the products offered at the disputed domain name are assumed to be original products. Accordingly, the Panel finds that the Complainant has proven that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the disputed domain name under paragraphs 4(a)(ii) and 4(c) of the Policy.

3. The Panel is convinced that the Respondent registered the disputed domain name with full knowledge of the Complainant and its rights in the Trademark. This finding is clearly supported by the fact that the Respondent used the disputed domain name for an online shop that prominently featured images of GEEK BAR-branded items. Regarding bad faith use, by using the disputed domain name in connection with an online store offering for sale products of the Complainant, the Respondent was, in all likelihood, trying to divert traffic intended for the Complainant's website to its own for commercial gain as set out under paragraph 4(b)(iv) of the Policy.

FOR ALL THE REASONS STATED ABOVE, THE COMPLAINT IS

Accepted

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

- 1. **originalgeekbar.com**: Transferred

PANELLISTS

Name	Peter Müller
------	--------------

DATE OF PANEL DECISION 2026-08-08

Publish the Decision