Decision for dispute CAC-UDRP-108964

Case number	CAC-UDRP-108964
Time of filing	2026-09-04 14:23:06
Domain names	baseusindiastore.com

Case administrator

Name	Olga Slanařová (Case admin)

Complainant

Organization	Shenzhen Baseus Technology Co. Ltd.

Complainant representative

Organization	Chofn Intellectual Property

Respondent

Name	Huang baochuan

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 curently the owner of various trademark registrations for BASEUS, including the following:-

- European Union trademark no. 017656001 for BASEUS (stylized), registered on 7 June 2018;
- Australian trademark no. 1893826 for BASEUS (stylized), registered on 18 July 2018;
- Australian trademark no. 1893827 for BASEUS (stylized), registered on 18 July 2018; and
- International trademark no. 1109755 for BASEUS (stylized), registered on 8 November 2011.

The disputed domain name was registered on 27 May 2026.

The record does not contain evidence of the content of any website to which the disputed domain name resolves.

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

The Complainant is a Chinese consumer electronics company and the owner of the BASEUS brand, which was created in 2011. The Complainant was incorporated in 2019 under the laws of the People’s Republic of China.

The Complainant states that its BASEUS products, including mobile digital accessories and audio products, are sold in numerous countries and regions worldwide, and that the BASEUS brand has a presence in more than 100 countries. The Complainant also states that its BASEUS products have received design awards, including Red Dot and iF Design Awards.

PARTIES CONTENTIONS

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.

LANGUAGE OF PROCEEDINGS

The language of the Registration Agreement of the disputed domain name is Chinese. The Complaint has been submitted in English. The Complainant has requested that the language of the proceedings be English for the following reasons:

- The disputed domain name consists solely of characters from the Latin alphabet rather than Chinese script, and includes the English terms “india” and “store”;
- The Complainant contends that the website to which the disputed domain name resolves is presented in English, which indicates that the Respondent is familiar with English;
- Requiring the Complainant to translate the Complaint and supporting evidence into Chinese would result in additional costs and unnecessary procedural delay, whereas conducting the proceedings in English would not materially prejudice the Respondent.

The Panel notes that the website evidence relied upon in support of the second reason relates to a different domain name, and the Panel does not rely on that reason. The Panel further notes that the Written Notice of the Complaint was sent to the Respondent in both Chinese and English, and the Respondent did not object to the Complainant’s request or otherwise participate in the proceedings.

Taking into account the above and in an exercise of the Panel’s discretion under paragraph 11(a) of the Rules, the Panel has determined that the language of the proceedings be English.

PRINCIPAL REASONS FOR THE DECISION

A. Identical or Confusingly Similar

Paragraph 4(a)(i) of the Policy requires a complainant to show that a domain name is identical or confusingly similar to a trademark or service mark in which the complainant has rights.

A registered trademark provides a clear indication that the rights in the mark shown on the trademark certificate belong to its respective owner. The Complainant has provided evidence that it owns trademark registrations for the BASEUS mark, registered

before the disputed domain name was registered.

In this case, the disputed domain name contains the entirety of the Complainant's BASEUS trademark with the addition of the terms "india" and "store", which do not serve to distinguish the disputed domain name from the Complainant's trademark.

In addition, the disputed domain name is appended by the generic Top-Level Domain ("gTLD") ".com". The addition of the gTLD ".com" does not avoid confusing similarity between the Complainant's trademark and the disputed domain name.

Consequently, the Panel finds that the Complainant has shown that the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to a trademark in which the Complainant has rights.

B. Rights or Legitimate Interests

Once the complainant establishes a prima facie case that the respondent lacks rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name, the burden of production shifts to the respondent to show that it has rights or legitimate interests in respect of the disputed domain name.

In the present case, the Complainant has demonstrated prima facie that the Respondent lacks rights or legitimate interests in respect of the disputed domain name and the Respondent has failed to assert any such rights or legitimate interests.

The Complainant has provided evidence that it owns trademark registrations for the BASEUS mark long before the date that the disputed domain name was registered, and the Complainant states that it has not approved, licensed or otherwise permitted the Respondent to use the Complainant's trademark.

There is no evidence in the record that the Respondent is commonly known by the disputed domain name. The Registrar identified the Respondent by a name that bears no resemblance to the disputed domain name.

Further, the Respondent did not submit a Response in the present case and did not provide any explanation or evidence to show rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name which would be sufficient to rebut the Complainant's prima facie case.

Accordingly, the Panel finds that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the disputed domain name.

C. Registered and Used in Bad Faith

The Complainant must also show that the Respondent registered and is using the disputed domain name in bad faith (see Policy, paragraph 4(a)(iii)). Paragraph 4(b) of the Policy provides circumstances that may evidence bad faith under paragraph 4(a)(iii) of the Policy. The Complainant must prove both registration and use in bad faith.

The Complainant contends that the disputed domain name resolves to a website presenting itself as "Baseus India Store", displaying the Complainant's logo, offering products bearing the BASEUS mark and bearing a copyright notice in the name of "Baseus India". The Complainant relies on that website both to show that the Respondent was aware of and targeted the Complainant when registering the disputed domain name, and to show use in bad faith under paragraph 4(b)(iv) of the Policy.

However, the evidence submitted by the Complainant in support of these contentions does not relate to the disputed domain name. The website screenshot provided by the Complainant shows the homepage of a different domain name, <baseussouthafrica.com>, bearing a copyright notice in the name of "Baseus South Africa". The WHOIS record provided by the Complainant also relates to that other domain name. The record contains no evidence of the content of any website at the disputed domain name, or of any other use of the disputed domain name by the Respondent.

In the absence of any evidence of how the disputed domain name has been used, the Panel cannot find that the disputed domain name is being used in bad faith. Further, the Complainant's contention that the Respondent registered the disputed domain name with knowledge of the Complainant, and in order to target it, relies on the same website evidence. The composition of the disputed domain name and the evidence of the reputation of the BASEUS trademark, without any evidence of the Respondent's conduct, are not sufficient in this case to show that the disputed domain name was registered in bad faith. The Respondent's failure to submit a Response does not cure the lack of evidence.

Accordingly, having regard to the circumstances of this particular case, the Panel finds that the Complainant has not met its burden under paragraph 4(a)(iii) of the Policy.

FOR ALL THE REASONS STATED ABOVE, THE COMPLAINT IS

Rejected

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

1. **baseusindiastore.com**: Remaining with the Respondent

PANELLISTS

Name	**Jonathan Agmon**

DATE OF PANEL DECISION 2026-10-04

Publish the Decision