

Decision for dispute CAC-UDRP-108801

Case number	CAC-UDRP-108801
Time of filing	2026-07-09 10:50:49
Domain names	geekvape.org

Case administrator

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

Complainant

Organization	Shenzhen Geekvape Technology Co., Ltd.
--------------	--

Complainant representative

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

Respondent

Name	Susanto Song
------	--------------

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 proved to own the following trademarks:

1. China Registration Number 32379735 for GEEKVAPE, effective date April 14, 2019, designating goods and services in class 34;
2. China Registration Number 32417461 for GEEKVAPE, effective date April 07, 2019, designating goods and services in class 34;
3. UK Registration Number UK00917584368 for GEEKVAPE, effective date March 26, 2018, designating goods and services in class 34;
4. EU Registration Number 017584368 for GEEKVAPE, effective date March 26, 2018, designating goods and services in class 34;
5. U.S. Registration Number 5519058 for GEEKVAPE, effective date July 17, 2018, designating goods and services in class 34;
6. Canada Registration Number 1147429 for GEEKVAPE, effective date October 25, 2022, designating goods and services in class 34;
7. Swiss Registration Number 767620 for GEEKVAPE, effective date August 09, 2021, designating goods and services in

classes 34, 35.

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

I - The Complainant

The Complainant, Shenzhen Geekvape Technology Co., Ltd. ("Geekvape"), is a company incorporated in Shenzhen, China in 2015, active in the design, manufacture, and global distribution of electronic atomization devices and related accessories under the GEEKVAPE trademark.

II - The disputed domain name

<geekvape.org> was registered on 24/3/2026 by Susanto Song. The disputed domain name redirects to a website providing online gambling and betting services.

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

A. The Disputed Domain Name is identical or confusingly similar to a trademark or service mark in which the Complainant has rights.

The disputed domain name <geekvape.org> is identical to the <GEEKVAPE> trademarks owned by the Complainant.

The addition of the ".org" domain name extension does not prevent the likelihood of confusion between the disputed domain name and the Complainant's trademarks.

For the above-mentioned reasons, the disputed domain name is identical to the Complainant's trademark for the purposes of paragraph 4(a)(i) of the Policy.

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

Under paragraph 4(a)(ii) of the Policy, a complainant has the burden of establishing that a respondent lacks rights or legitimate interests in respect of a domain name, but this burden is light. It is sufficient in the first instance for the Complainant to allege a prima facie case, and if the evidence presented is persuasive or yields a positive inference that the Respondent lacks rights or legitimate interests, the burden shifts to the Respondent to rebut the allegations.

In this case, the Panel finds that the Complainant’s submitted evidence and allegations, to which the Respondent did not reply, are sufficient to establish a prima facie case of lack of rights and legitimate interests in the disputed domain name.

In particular, the Complainant denies that the Respondent has ever been authorized to use the GEEKVAPE trademark as a domain name. Moreover, the WHOIS information excludes that the Respondent is known by the sign GEEKVAPE.

Moreover, according to the evidence submitted by the Complainant, the disputed domain name is used to promote gambling services. As a matter of fact, the Respondent is using the Complainant's trademark to exploit its distinctiveness and consumer recognition in order to drive traffic towards an unrelated online gambling service. Such conduct falls within the category of illegitimate use addressed by prior UDRP panels, under which the exploitation of a trademark's reputation to attract Internet users to unrelated commercial content cannot give rise to rights or legitimate interests.

The requirements of paragraph 4(a)(ii) of the Policy are satisfied.

C. The disputed domain name was registered and is being used in bad faith

As far as registration in bad faith is concerned, the Panel finds particularly relevant the following circumstances:

- i) the Complainant's trademarks were filed long before the registration of the disputed domain name;
- ii) the disputed domain name is identical to the Complainant's trademark. Previous Panels confirmed that identical domain names carry a high risk of implied affiliation with the Complainant's trademark and such circumstance is relevant in order to assess registration in bad faith;
- iii) GEEKVAPE, according to the information provided by the Complainant, is a well-known trademark and it is a made-up word.

These circumstances, in the absence of a reasonable justification by the Respondent, suggest that the Respondent was perfectly aware of the Complainant's trademarks and business at the time of the registration of the disputed domain name and that the disputed domain name was registered in bad faith.

As regards use in bad faith, <geekvape.org> redirects to a website that provides online gambling platforms, including slot, casino, sports betting, and lottery services. The website reproduces, in its homepage, the GEEKVAPE trademark. The Panel agrees that such use is clearly in bad faith since the Complainant's trademark is associated with unrelated content (gambling services). In the absence of a reasonable explanation by the Respondent, the Panel agrees that such use appears to exploit the reputation of the GEEKVAPE trademark in order to attract internet users to a third party website. This conduct is considered in bad faith for the purpose of paragraph 4(b)(iv) of the Policy, under which the use of a domain name to intentionally attract, for commercial gain, Internet users by creating a likelihood of confusion with a complainant's mark as to source, sponsorship, affiliation, or endorsement constitutes evidence of bad faith.

FOR ALL THE REASONS STATED ABOVE, THE COMPLAINT IS

Accepted

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

- 1. **geekvape.org**: Transferred

PANELLISTS

Name **Andrea Mascetti**

DATE OF PANEL DECISION **2026-08-18**

Publish the Decision