

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

GrabTaxi Holdings Pte. Ltd. v. Le Tuan Anh, Tuan Anh
Case No. D2025-1088

1. The Parties

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

The Respondent is Le Tuan Anh, Tuan Anh, Viet Nam.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <grabxemaybienhoa.com> is registered with GMO Internet, Inc. d/b/a Discount-Domain.com and Onamae.com (the "Registrar").

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the "Center") on March 17, 2025. On March 17, 2025, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On March 18, 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 (GRAB XE MÁY TẠI BIÊN HÒA) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on March 20, 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 20, 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 April 2, 2025. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was April 22, 2025. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent's default on April 24, 2025.

The Center appointed Peter Burgstaller as the sole panelist in this matter on April 30, 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, established in 2013 and headquartered in Singapore with its principal activity in the field of software and applications development for inter alia, ride-hailing, ridesharing, food delivery, logistics services, and digital payment. The Complainant's services are well established under the mark GRAB (Annexes 1, 6, 9, and 10 to the Complaint).

The Complainant owns and/or has rights in various trademark registrations containing the mark GRAB, inter alia, in Singapore, Indonesia, Malaysia, Cambodia, Thailand, Philippines, Viet Nam, China, Qatar, UAE, or USA; the trademarks were registered from 2014 onwards, e.g., GRABTAXI on May 30, 2014 (Registration No. 1212250), GRAB INC on December 7, 2015 (Registration No. 1291169), or GRAB on April 4, 2019 (Registration No. 1483224) (Annexes 7 and 8 to the Complaint).

The Complainant has a strong online presence and owns several domain names containing the mark GRAB, inter alia, <grab.com>, which addresses its main business website, or <grab.careers> (Annex 12 of the Complaint).

The disputed domain name was registered on December 8, 2021 (Annex 2 to the Complaint).

At the time of filing, the Complaint the disputed domain name resolved to a website where the Complainant's logo  and mark GRAB were displayed and services were offered that directly related to the Complainant's business (Annex 5 to the Complaint).

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.

Notably, the Complainant contends that it has trademark rights in the well-known mark GRAB and the disputed domain name contains the GRAB trademark in its entirety, simply adding the terms "xemay" which is a Vietnamese word for "motorbike" and "bienhoa" which is the name of a Vietnamese City, as well as the generic Top-Level Domain ("gTLD") ".com". All these terms cannot prevent a finding of confusingly similarity of the disputed domain name with the Complainant's GRAB trademark.

The Complainant alleges, that it has never assigned, granted, licensed, sold, transferred, or in any way authorized the Respondent to register or use the GRAB trademark in any manner, and the Respondent has no other legitimate interests in the disputed domain name.

Further, the Complainant submits that it is inconceivable that the Respondent would not have been aware of the Complainant and its trademarks when registering the disputed domain name, because the Complainant's GRAB mark is distinctive and well-known especially in the field of the Complainant's business.

Finally, the Complainant contends that the Respondent is engaged in the same business as the Complainant and offered these services on its website, addressed by the disputed domain name together with the Complainant's logo  and registered trademark GRAB, which undoubtedly is an attempt to attract Internet users to the website under the disputed domain name for commercial gain.

B. Respondent

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

6. Discussion and Findings

According to paragraph 4(a) of the Policy, the Complainant must prove that:

- (i) the disputed domain name is identical or confusingly similar to a trademark or service mark in which the Complainant has rights; and
- (ii) the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests with respect to the disputed domain name; and
- (iii) the disputed domain name has been registered or 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 record, the Panel finds the Complainant has shown rights in respect of the mark GRAB for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 1.2.1.

The disputed domain name is confusingly similar to the trademark of the Complainant since the Complainant's mark GRAB is included in the disputed domain name in its entirety. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 1.7. Panel assessment of identity or confusing similarity involves comparing the (alpha-numeric) domain name and the textual components of the relevant mark. To the extent that design (or figurative/stylized) elements would be incapable of representation in domain names, these elements are largely disregarded for purposes of assessing identity or confusing similarity under the first element. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 1.10.

In the present case the disputed domain name consists of the Complainant's mark GRAB and the term "xemay" and "bienhoa"; "xe máy" means motorcycle in Vietnamese language and "Bien Hòa" is the name of a city in Vietnam.

It has long been established under UDRP decisions that the mere addition of other (descriptive and/or geographical) terms does not prevent a finding of confusing similarity under the first element of the Policy; where the relevant trademark is recognizable within the disputed domain name. This is specifically the case here. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 1.8.

Finally, it has also long been held that gTLDs (in this case ".com") are generally disregarded when evaluating the identity or confusing similarity of a disputed domain name. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 1.11.1.

Based on the available record, 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.

While the overall burden of proof in the 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 often impossible 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. 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 record, 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 Complainant's trademark GRAB is distinctive and it is inconceivable that the Respondent would not have been aware of it when registering the disputed domain name.

Further, the Complainant expressly denies there being any relationship between itself and the Respondent.

The Complainant also notes that the disputed domain name is not being used for a bona fide offering of goods or services – it resolves to an unauthorized website with services similar to those of the Complainant's business and displaying the Complainant's trademark GRAB and logo .

The composition of the disputed domain name carries a high risk of implied affiliation. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 2.5.1. In addition, the conditions for a legitimate use of the Complainant's trademark in a domain name under the Oki Data test are not met in the present case, since the Respondent must inter alia, accurately and prominently disclose the Respondent's relationship with the trademark holder to show a legitimate use of a trademark as a reseller, distributor, or service provider. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 2.8; *Oki Data Americas, Inc. v. ASD, Inc.*, WIPO Case No. [D2001-0903](#).

The evidence in the Complaint does not reveal any disclaimer that discloses the Respondent's relationship with the Complainant, and the Respondent has not introduced any evidence to the contrary. Rather, it appears the Respondent has purposely attempted to create a false association with the Complainant by prominently displaying the Complainant mark and logo. Accordingly, the Panel concludes that the Respondent clearly does not comply with the Oki Data test.

The Respondent did not reply to the Complainant's contentions and hence has not rebutted the Complainant's prima facie showing.

Based on the available record, 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 Complainant provided evidence which demonstrates that it has rights in the mark GRAB and it has used this mark in business for years, with a strong online presence and long before the disputed domain name was registered.

It is inconceivable for this Panel that the Respondent registered and used the disputed domain name without knowledge of the Complainant's rights, which leads to the necessary inference of bad faith. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 3.2.2.

This finding is supported by the fact that the Respondent's business is in the same field as that of the Complainant and a simple search and/or screen registrations against available online databases would have shown the Complainant and/or its mark. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 3.2.3. Such finding is reinforced by the fact that the disputed domain name resolved to a website prominently displaying the Complainant's mark and logo. Therefore, the Panel finds that the Respondent knew the Complainant's trademark and registered the disputed domain name targeting the Complainant.

The disputed domain name was also used in bad faith. In the present case, the Panel notes that the Respondent provided, without authorization by the Complainant, a website under the disputed domain name and offered services similar to those of the Complainant under the Complainant's GRAB mark and logo.

By doing this, the Respondent disrupted the Complainant's business and intentionally attempted to attract, for commercial gain, Internet users by creating a likelihood of confusion with the Complainant's mark which constitutes bad faith use.

Based on the available record, 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 <grabxemaybienhoa.com> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Peter Burgstaller/

Peter Burgstaller

Sole Panelist

Date: May 14, 2025