

## **ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION**

GrabTaxi Holdings Pte. Ltd. v. Phuoc Hieu Nguyen, Taxi Can Tho  
Case No. D2025-0964

### **1. The Parties**

The Complainant is GrabTaxi Holdings Pte. Ltd., Singapore, represented by BMVN International LLC, Viet Nam.

The Respondent is Phuoc Hieu Nguyen, Taxi Can Tho, Viet Nam.

### **2. The Domain Name and Registrar**

The disputed domain name <grabcamau.com> (the “Disputed Domain Name”) is registered with NameCheap, Inc. (the “Registrar”).

### **3. Procedural History**

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the “Center”) on March 10, 2025. On March 10, 2025, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On March 11, 2025, the Registrar transmitted by email to the Center its verification response disclosing registrant and contact information for the disputed domain name which differed from the named Respondent (XE GRAB CÀ MAU Dịch Vụ Grabbike, Grabcar / REDACTED FOR PRIVACY) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on March 12, 2025, providing the registrant and contact information disclosed by the Registrar, and inviting the Complainant to submit an amendment to the Complaint. The Complainant filed an amended Complaint on March 13, 2025.

The Center verified that the Complaint together with the amended Complaint satisfied the formal requirements of the Uniform Domain Name Dispute Resolution Policy (the “Policy” or “UDRP”), the Rules for Uniform Domain Name Dispute Resolution Policy (the “Rules”), and the WIPO Supplemental Rules for Uniform Domain Name Dispute Resolution Policy (the “Supplemental Rules”).

In accordance with the Rules, paragraphs 2 and 4, the Center formally notified the Respondent of the Complaint, and the proceedings commenced on March 21, 2025. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was April 10, 2025. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent’s default on April 17, 2025.

The Center appointed Rosita Li as the sole panelist in this matter on April 25, 2025. The Panel finds that it was properly constituted. The Panel has submitted the Statement of Acceptance and Declaration of Impartiality and Independence, as required by the Center to ensure compliance with the Rules, paragraph 7.

#### **4. Factual Background**

The Complainant is a company incorporated in Singapore on June 14, 2013. The Complainant is the intellectual property holding entity of Southeast Asia's leading technology company group that was founded in 2012 and headquartered in Singapore. The Complainant offers software platforms and mobile applications for various services, including ride-hailing, ride-sharing, food delivery, logistics services, and digital payment. This includes the mobile application named "Grab". Since October 2013, the Complainant has had a strong presence in Singapore and Malaysia, with its goods and services also offered in neighbouring Southeast Asian nations such as Viet Nam, Indonesia, Thailand, Philippines, Myanmar, and Cambodia.

The Complainant is the owner of an extensive portfolio of trademark registrations for GRAB throughout the world, including but not limited to the following in Viet Nam:

- 1) Registration No. 4-0318225-000 for GRAB registered on April 16, 2019;
- 2) Registration No. 4-0331702-000 for GRAB registered on September 30, 2019;
- 3) Registration No. 4-0368019-000 for GRAB registered on October 27, 2020; and
- 4) Registration No. 4-0368018-000 for GRAB registered on October 27, 2020;

(collectively, the "GRAB Trademarks").

The Complainant submits that it has invested a significant amount in marketing and promoting its goods and services under the GRAB Trademarks. The GRAB Trademarks and the Grab brand have been continuously used in online and offline advertising and promotional materials for the Complainant's goods and services. The Complainant has also been rewarded with public recognition and awards, including being ranked in CNBC's Disruptor 50 list of companies from 2017 to 2020, Fast Company's "Most Innovative Companies" in 2019, and Fast Company's Top 10 Most Innovative Companies in Asia-Pacific in 2023.

The Complainant also owns several domain names which contain the GRAB Trademarks, including <grab.com>, created on November 2, 1996.

The Disputed Domain Name was registered by the Respondent on November 16, 2023.

As of the date of filing this Complaint, the Disputed Domain Name resolved to a website displaying the GRAB Trademarks and offering services identical to those provided by the Complainant, including ride bookings, ride-hailing and ride-sharing, without authorization from the Complainant.

#### **5. Parties' Contentions**

##### **A. Complainant**

The Complainant contends that it has satisfied each of the elements required under the Policy for a transfer of the Disputed Domain Name. A summary of the Complainant's submission is as follows:

(i) The Disputed Domain Name is confusingly similar to a trademark in which the Complainant has rights. The Complainant contends that:

- The Disputed Domain Name consists of three components: (i) "grab", (ii) "camau", and (iii) ".com";

- The Disputed Domain Name incorporates the entirety of the GRAB Trademarks, as its dominant element compels the attention of potential customers;
- The GRAB Trademarks have been registered and widely used to the extent that they have been recognized as well known and strongly associated with the Complainant's business for many years;
- The incorporation of the GRAB Trademarks in the Disputed Domain Name increases the likelihood of consumer confusion about the origin and/or association between the Disputed Domain Name and the Complainant, as well as the services that the Complainant offers;
- The GRAB Trademarks have been considered distinctive in identifying and distinguishing products or services. As such, any use of the mark by other entities, especially those without the Complainant's authorization, will cause confusion;
- The inclusion of "camau", referring to a geographical location in Viet Nam, does not prevent the confusing similarity between the Disputed Domain Name and the GRAB Trademarks. Since the Complainant operates in Ca Mau Province/City, the confusing similarity is increased, potentially misleading users into thinking the Disputed Domain Name resolves to an official website of a subsidiary of the Complainant; and
- The ".com" part of the Disputed Domain Name is a standard domain indicator and does not reduce confusion for Internet users.

(ii) The Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the Disputed Domain Name. The Complainant contends that:

- Whois records indicate that the Respondent registered the Disputed Domain Name on November 16, 2023, which is well after the Complainant registered its GRAB Trademarks;
- The GRAB Trademarks have acquired significant recognition in many countries worldwide, especially in Viet Nam, after over 10 years of extensive use of the GRAB Trademarks;
- There is no prior or official relationship between the Complainant and the Respondent, and the Respondent has never been licensed or authorized to use the GRAB Trademarks;
- There is no evidence that the Respondent has become commonly known by reference to the Disputed Domain Name;
- There is no record showing that the Respondent has any rights, trademarks, or established legitimate interests in any domain name incorporating or similar to the GRAB Trademarks; and
- The Disputed Domain Name was registered to appropriate the fame and reputation of the GRAB Trademarks for commercial gain, rather than serving any legitimate purpose.

(iii) The Disputed Domain Name was registered and is being used in bad faith. The Complainant contends that:

- The Respondent's choice of the Disputed Domain Name was not accidental but an act of bad faith;
- Although "grab" is a common English term, it has been lawfully registered and extensively used by the Complainant, making it distinctive and strongly associated with the Complainant's mobile super-app and related services;
- The Disputed Domain Name fully and purposefully incorporates the Complainant's well-known, prior-registered GRAB Trademarks and was registered long after the GRAB Trademarks became widely recognized, indicating that the Respondent had prior knowledge of the Complainant's rights;
- The Respondent is using the Disputed Domain Name in bad faith for commercial gain by offering identical services (including ride bookings, ride-hailing, and ride-sharing) while the Respondent is not the Complainant's authorized agent to offer such services in Viet Nam or to use the GRAB Trademarks in any manner;
- The contact information displayed on the website resolved under the Disputed Domain Name belongs to the Respondent; and
- The Respondent has used a privacy protection service to conceal its true identity, which precludes the Complainant from providing definitive evidence showing the Respondent's pattern of registering domain names that include well-known trademarks. The use of such privacy protection services to conceal the identity of the Respondent, in and of itself, constitutes evidence of bad faith.

## **B. Respondent**

The Respondent did not reply to the Complainant's contentions.

## **6. Discussion and Findings**

Paragraph 4(a) of the Policy provides that a complainant must satisfy each of the following three elements in a complaint:

- (i) the disputed domain name is identical or confusingly similar to a trademark or service mark in which the complainant has rights;
- (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.

### **A. Identical or Confusingly Similar**

It is well accepted that the first element functions primarily as a standing requirement. The standing (or threshold) test for confusing similarity involves a reasoned but relatively straightforward comparison between the Complainant's trademark and the disputed domain name. WIPO Overview of WIPO Panel Views on Selected UDRP Questions, Third Edition ("[WIPO Overview 3.0](#)"), section 1.7.

Based on the available materials, the Panel finds the Complainant has shown rights in respect of a trademark or service mark for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 1.2.1.

The Panel finds that the entirety of the GRAB Trademarks is reproduced within the Disputed Domain Name. Accordingly, the Disputed Domain Name is confusingly similar to the GRAB Trademarks for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 1.7.

Although the addition of the term "camau" may bear on assessment of the second and third elements, the Panel finds the addition of such term does not prevent a finding of confusing similarity between the Disputed Domain Name and the GRAB Trademarks for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 1.8.

Based on the available materials, the Panel finds the first element of the Policy has been established.

### **B. Rights or Legitimate Interests**

Paragraph 4(c) of the Policy provides a list of circumstances in which the Respondent may demonstrate rights or legitimate interests in a disputed domain name.

Although the overall burden of proof in UDRP proceedings is on the complainant, panels have recognized that proving a respondent lacks rights or legitimate interests in a domain name may result in the difficult task of "proving a negative", requiring information that is often primarily within the knowledge or control of the respondent. As such, where a complainant makes out a prima facie case that the respondent lacks rights or legitimate interests, the burden of production on this element shifts to the respondent to come forward with relevant evidence demonstrating rights or legitimate interests in the domain name (although the burden of proof always remains on the complainant). If the respondent fails to come forward with such relevant evidence, the complainant is deemed to have satisfied the second element. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 2.1.

Having reviewed the available materials, the Panel finds the Complainant has established a prima facie case that the Respondent lacks rights or legitimate interests in the Disputed Domain Name. The Respondent has not rebutted the Complainant's prima facie showing and has not come forward with any relevant evidence demonstrating rights or legitimate interests in the Disputed Domain Name such as those enumerated in the Policy or otherwise.

In accordance with [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 2.5.1, where a domain name consists of a trademark plus an additional term (at the second or top level), UDRP panels have largely held that such composition cannot constitute fair use if it effectively impersonates or suggests sponsorship or endorsement by the trademark owner. Based on the available materials, the website resolved under the Disputed Domain Name displayed several references to the GRAB Trademarks. Further, the Disputed Domain Name includes the Complainant's GRAB Trademarks in its entirety, and the additional term "camau" would be easily interpreted as indicating that the website resolved under the Disputed Domain Name serves as the official online website for the Complainant's operations in Ca Mau Province/City of Viet Nam. Therefore, by using the term "camau", the Panel finds it apparent that the Respondent has the intention to create a false impression that the Disputed Domain Name is somehow associated with the Complainant.

Panels have held that the use of a domain name for illegal activity, where the Respondent attempted to impersonate the Complainant, can never confer rights or legitimate interests on a respondent. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 2.13.1. By displaying the GRAB Trademarks and offering services identical or similar to those of the Complainant on the website resolved under the Disputed Domain Name, the Respondent falsely associated itself with the Complainant and/or impersonated the Complainant. Using the Complainant's well-recognized GRAB Trademarks in the entirety of the Dispute Domain Name and failing to disclaim the relationship, or lack thereof, the Disputed Domain Name is free-riding on the reputation of the Complainant and creating an impression that the Respondent may be associated with the Complainant.

Given the above, the Panel finds it apparent that the Respondent has the intention to divert consumers seeking to find the Complainant, or to tarnish the Complainant's GRAB Trademarks. It is clear that the use of the Disputed Domain Name, which incorporates the GRAB Trademarks in its entirety, is an attempt by the Respondent to capitalize on the goodwill and reputation of the GRAB Trademarks, which the Panel considers not to be for a legitimate noncommercial or fair use of the Disputed Domain Name nor a bona fide offering of goods or services.

Based on the available materials, the Panel finds the second element of the Policy has been established.

### **C. Registered and Used in Bad Faith**

The Panel notes that, for the purposes of paragraph 4(a)(iii) of the Policy, paragraph 4(b) of the Policy establishes circumstances, in particular, but without limitation, that, if found by the Panel to be present, shall be evidence of the registration and use of a domain name in bad faith.

In the present case, the Panel notes that the Respondent's registration of the Disputed Domain Name incorporates the GRAB Trademarks in its entirety. The Panel also notes that the time of registration of the Disputed Domain Name on November 16, 2023 is well after the registration of the Complainant's GRAB Trademarks. The Complainant has provided supporting documents to show that the GRAB Trademarks are well known and reputable amongst the general public, including evidence showing the global rankings of the reputation for the GRAB Trademarks. The Panel accepts that the Complainant has been continuously using its GRAB Trademarks and finds that it would not be plausible for the Respondent to claim that it was unaware of the Complainant and the GRAB Trademarks, particularly considering the use of the GRAB Trademarks on the website at the Disputed Domain Name. The Panel is prepared to find that the Respondent knew that the registration of the Disputed Domain Name would be confusingly similar to the GRAB Trademarks. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 3.2.2. Accordingly, the Panel finds that the Respondent's registration of the Disputed Domain Name, which is confusingly similar to the well-known and earlier registered GRAB Trademarks, is a clear indication of bad faith.

In accordance with paragraph 4(b)(iv) of the Policy, by using the Disputed Domain Name, the Respondent has intentionally attempted to attract, for commercial gain, Internet users to its website or other online location, by creating a likelihood of confusion with the Complainant's GRAB Trademarks as to source, sponsorship, affiliation, or endorsement of the Respondent's website or location or of a product or service on the Respondent's website or location, which is an indicator of bad faith on the part of the Respondent. As elaborated in the previous section 6.B. and in the paragraph above, the Disputed Domain Name resolves to

a website offering services identical or similar to those of the Complainant. The website gives the false impression that it is operated by, or affiliated with, the Complainant. In view of this, the Panel is of the view that the Respondent has registered and used the Disputed Domain Name in bad faith.

Based on the available materials, the Panel finds that the Complainant has established the third element of the Policy.

## **7. Decision**

For the foregoing reasons, in accordance with paragraphs 4(i) of the Policy and 15 of the Rules, the Panel orders that the Disputed Domain Name <grabcamau.com> be transferred to the Complainant.

*/Rosita Li/*

**Rosita Li**

Sole Panelist

Date: May 9, 2025