

Decision for dispute CAC-UDRP-108443

Case number	CAC-UDRP-108443
Time of filing	2026-09-08 12:06:25
Domain names	casetifiy.com

Case administrator

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

Complainant

Organization	Casetagram Limited ()
--------------	-----------------------

Respondent

Name	George Washere
------	----------------

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 several trademark registrations for the word mark “CASETIFY”, including:

- United States trademark registration for “CASETIFY”, No. 4707090, registered on March 24, 2015;
 - United Kingdom trademark registration for “CASETIFY”, No. 00801409914, registered on November 30, 2018;
 - Hong Kong trademark registration for “CASETIFY”, No. 303735667, registered on June 8, 2017;
- International trademark registration for “CASETIFY”, WIPO No. 1409914, registered on April 4, 2018;
- Chinese trademark registration for “CASETIFY”, No. 19614307, registered on August 21, 2017.

Furthermore, the Complainant’s primary domain name is <casetify.com>, which has been registered since November 22, 2013.

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

FACTS ASSERTED BY THE COMPLAINANT AND NOT CONTESTED BY THE RESPONDENT:

The Complainant trades under the CASETIFY brand. CASETIFY was founded by Wesley Ng in November 2011 and is headquartered in Hong Kong. The Complainant offers phone cases and other tech accessories, including watch bands, and has protected more than 20 million devices worldwide. It has collaborated with more than 500 global artists and offers approximately 30,000 designs.

The Complainant has a strong international presence and a substantial online following. Its website received 6.6 million individual visits in December 2025, and CASETIFY has approximately 2.7 million Instagram followers, 2.1 million Facebook followers, 777,000

TikTok followers, and 108,400 Twitter/X followers. The Complainant's primary website is operated at <casetify.com>, which has been registered since November 22, 2013.

The disputed domain name is a typographical variation of the Complainant's CASETIFY mark, adding an extra letter "i". It resolves to a page displaying a "DOMAIN SALE" banner. The disputed domain name redirects Internet users to Afternic, where it is offered for sale for USD 3,329.

The Complainant has not licensed or otherwise authorized the Respondent to use its CASETIFY mark or the disputed domain name.

The Respondent used a privacy service.

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

As the Respondent did not file an administratively compliant Response, pursuant to paragraph 14(b) of the Rules for Uniform Domain Name Dispute Resolution Policy (the "Rules"), the Panel may draw such inferences therefrom as it considers appropriate. Thus, the Panel accepts the contentions of the Complainant as admitted by the Respondent. Taking the statements and documents submitted by the Complainant under careful consideration, the Panel concludes that the Complainant has established all the elements entitling it to claim the transfer of the disputed domain name.

I. Identical or Confusingly Similar disputed domain name

The Complainant has, to the satisfaction of the Panel, shown the disputed domain name to be 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.

The Complainant has demonstrated that it owns valid trademark rights in “CASETIFY”, including the registrations identified above. The disputed domain name incorporates the CASETIFY trademark in its entirety, with the addition of one extra letter “i”, resulting in the misspelling “CASETIFIY”. This is confusingly similar to the Complainant’s mark. The addition of the generic Top-Level Domain “.com” is typically disregarded under the first element confusing similarity test. Accordingly, the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to the Complainant’s CASETIFY trademark.

II. Respondent’s Rights or Legitimate Interests in the disputed domain name

The Complainant has established a prima facie case that the Respondent lacks rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name. The Complainant has not licensed, authorized or permitted the Respondent to use its CASETIFY mark or the disputed domain name, and the Respondent is not commonly known by the disputed domain name.

The disputed domain name resolves to a page with a “DOMAIN SALE” banner and redirects to Afternic, where it is offered for sale for USD 3,329. The Respondent’s use of the domain name for this purpose is not a bona fide offering of goods or services or a legitimate non-commercial or fair use. An offer to sell a domain name incorporating a third party’s distinctive trademark, particularly for USD 3,329 and in circumstances indicating that the amount exceeds out-of-pocket costs by far, is not a bona fide offering of goods or services or a legitimate non-commercial or fair use.

There is no evidence of any bona fide offering of goods or services or other legitimate non-commercial or fair use. The Panel therefore finds that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name.

III. The disputed domain name has been registered and is being used in Bad Faith

The Respondent’s selection of the disputed domain name, which differs from <casetify.com> only by an additional letter “i”, is indicative of typosquatting and an intention to exploit typing errors by Internet users. The CASETIFY mark was used internationally long before the disputed domain name was registered, and the Complainant’s <casetify.com> domain name has been registered since November 22, 2013. Given the distinctiveness and online presence of CASETIFY, the Panel finds it more likely than not that the Respondent was aware of the Complainant and its mark.

CASETIFY has been used since 2011 in connection with phone cases and tech accessories, and the Complainant’s website attracted a high number of visits. These circumstances make it implausible that the Respondent selected the disputed domain name independently of the Complainant’s mark.

The disputed domain name is offered for sale through a “DOMAIN SALE” page and an Afternic listing for USD 3,329. This supports a finding under paragraph 4(b)(i) of the Policy that the domain name was registered primarily for the purpose of selling it for valuable consideration in excess of the Respondent’s documented out-of-pocket costs.

The disputed domain name is not being used for an active website or other legitimate purpose. In the circumstances of this case—namely, the confusing similarity, the deliberate typosquatting, the offer for sale, the Respondent’s privacy service, and the absence of any plausible good-faith use—the passive holding of the disputed domain name also supports a finding of bad faith.

The use of a privacy service further supports an inference of bad faith, as does the Respondent’s apparent knowledge of and targeting of the Complainant’s mark. The Panel therefore finds that the disputed domain name was registered and is being used in bad faith within the meaning of paragraph 4(a)(iii) of the Policy.

The Respondent has not provided any evidence of actual or contemplated good-faith registration or use of the disputed domain name that could refute this assessment.

For all the foregoing reasons, the Panel orders that the disputed domain name <casetifiy.com> be transferred to the Complainant.

FOR ALL THE REASONS STATED ABOVE, THE COMPLAINT IS

Accepted

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

- 1. casetifiy.com: Transferred

PANELLISTS

Name	Dominik Eickemeier
------	--------------------

DATE OF PANEL DECISION	2026-10-13
------------------------	------------

Publish the Decision