

Decision for dispute CAC-UDRP-108965

Case number	CAC-UDRP-108965
Time of filing	2026-09-04 14:15:46
Domain names	baseustech.com

Case administrator

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

Complainant

Organization	Shenzhen Baseus Technology Co. Ltd.
--------------	-------------------------------------

Complainant representative

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

Respondent

Name	Ammonia Dussek
------	----------------

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 bases its Complaint, among others, on the following trademarks:

- International trademark registration "BASEUS", no. 1109755, registered on 8 November 2011, for goods in class 9;
- Chinese national trademark "BASEUS", no. 14897443, registered on 14 September 2015, for services in class 35;
- European Union trademark "BASEUS", no. 017656001, registered on 7 June 2018, for goods and services in classes 9 and 35.

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

The Complainant is a Chinese consumer electronics company and the owner of the BASEUS brand, created in 2011. Its products are sold in numerous countries and regions worldwide.

The Complainant is the owner, among others, of the BASEUS trademarks cited above.

The disputed domain name <baseustech.com> was registered on 5 July 2026 and resolves to a website that has the mention "Shop – Baseus Official," offering for sale products bearing the BASEUS mark, and having a copyright notice "Copyright © 2026 baseustech.com".

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.

The Complainant's contentions are the following:

The disputed domain name <baseustech.com> is confusingly similar to the Complainant's trademark BASEUS, that the Respondent lacks rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name for a number of reasons and that the disputed domain name was registered and is being used in bad faith.

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

1. Confusing Similarity

The Panel agrees that the disputed domain name <baseustech.com> is confusingly similar to the Complainant's trademark BASEUS. The disputed domain name <baseustech.com> incorporates in its entirety the Complainant's BASEUS trademark, with the addition of the descriptive term "tech", which is not sufficient to escape the finding that the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to the Complainant's trademark and it does not change the overall impression of the designation as being connected to the trademark BASEUS (WIPO Overview of WIPO Panel Views on Select UDRP Questions ("WIPO Overview 3.1"), point 1.7).

Moreover, the extension ".com" is not to be taken into consideration when examining the similarity between the Complainant's trademark and the disputed domain name (WIPO Case No. D2005-0016, Accor v. Noldc Inc.). The mere adjunction of a gTLD such as ".com" is irrelevant as it is well established that the generic Top Level Domain is insufficient to avoid a finding of confusing similarity (WIPO Case No. 2013-0820, L'Oréal v Tina Smith, WIPO Case No. D2008-0820 Titoni AG v Runxin Wang and WIPO Case No. D2009-0877, Alstom v. Itete Peru S.A.).

Therefore, the Panel is satisfied that the first condition under the Policy is met.

2. Lack of Respondent's rights or legitimate interests

The Complainant is required to make out a prima facie case that the respondent lacks rights or legitimate interests. Once such prima facie case is made, the burden of proof shifts to the respondent to come forward with appropriate allegations or evidence demonstrating rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name. If the respondent fails to come forward with such

appropriate allegations or evidence, a complainant is generally deemed to have satisfied paragraph 4(a)(ii) of the UDRP.

Based on the available evidence, the Respondent does not appear to be known by the disputed domain name as such is not identified in the WHOIS database as "baseustech.com" or by the term "baseus". The Complainant has never licensed, authorized, or otherwise permitted the Respondent to use its BASEUS trademark, nor of a confusingly similar trademark in the disputed domain name.

Based on the available evidence in the file, there is no commercial relationship between the Respondent and the Complainant.

The disputed domain name resolves to a website that has the mention "Shop – Baseus Official," offering for sale products bearing the BASEUS mark, and having also a copyright notice "Copyright © 2026 baseustech.com", without disclosing in a clear and prominent manner its lack of relationship and the Complainant.

The above does not amount to a bona fide offering of goods or services, or to a legitimate noncommercial or fair use of the disputed domain name.

The Panel notes that the Respondent had an opportunity to comment on the Complainant’s allegations by filing a Response, which the Respondent failed to do.

Thus, the Panel is satisfied that the Complainant has at least established a prima facie case that the Respondent lacks rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name. Accordingly, the Panel takes the view that also the second requirement under the Policy is met.

3. Bad Faith

Based on the available evidence, the Complainant’s BASEUS marks predate the registration date of the disputed domain name. Thus, the Respondent has chosen to register the disputed domain name incorporating in its entirety the Complainant’s BASEUS trademark with the addition of the term "tech", which corresponds to the field of activity of the Complainant, in order to create confusion with such trademark. Therefore, the Panel concludes that at the time of registration of the disputed domain name, the Respondent was well aware of the Complainant’s BASEUS trademark and has intentionally registered one in order to create confusion with such trademark.

In the present case, the following factors should be considered:

- (i) the Complainant’s BASEUS marks predate the registration date of the disputed domain name;
- (ii) the Respondent failed to submit any response and has not provided any evidence of actual or contemplated good faith use of the disputed domain name;
- (iii) the Respondent registered the disputed domain name incorporating in its entirety the Complainant’s BASEUS trademark with the addition of the term "tech", which corresponds to the field of activity of the Complainant;
- (iv) the Respondent was not authorised to use a domain name similar to the Complainant’s trademark;
- (v) the disputed domain name resolves to a website that has the mention "Shop – Baseus Official," offering for sale products bearing the BASEUS mark, and having also a copyright notice "Copyright © 2026 baseustech.com", without disclosing in a clear and prominent manner its lack of relationship with the Complainant.

In light of the foregoing, the Panel concludes that the Respondent has registered and has been using the disputed domain name in bad faith. Thus, also the third and last condition under 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. baseustech.com: Transferred

PANELLISTS

Name	Delia-Mihaela Belciu
------	----------------------

DATE OF PANEL DECISION 2026-10-12

Publish the Decision