

## ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

GrabTaxi Holdings Pte. Ltd. v. Tran Tuan Kiet (Trần Tuấn Kiệt)  
Case No. D2025-1150

### 1. The Parties

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

The Respondent is Tran Tuan Kiet (Trần Tuấn Kiệt), Viet Nam.

### 2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <datxegrabbvrt.com> is registered with iNET Corporation (the “Registrar”).

### 3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed in English with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the “Center”) on March 20, 2025. On March 20, 2025, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On March 22, 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 (Redacted for Privacy) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication in Vietnamese and English to the Complainant on March 27, 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 in English on March 31, 2025.

On March 27, 2025, the Center informed the parties in Vietnamese and English, that the language of the Registration Agreement for the disputed domain name is Vietnamese. On March 31, 2025, the Complainant confirmed its request that English be the language of the proceeding. The Respondent did not submit any comment on the Complainant’s submission.

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 in Vietnamese and English of the Complaint, and the proceedings commenced on April 1, 2025. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was April 21, 2025. The Respondent sent email communications to the Center respectively on March 29, 2025, in English, and on April 1, 2, and 3, 2025 in Vietnamese.

The Center appointed Knud Wallberg as the sole panelist in this matter on May 2, 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 the intellectual property holding entity of a Southeast Asian technology company group that was founded in 2012 and is headquartered in Singapore. The Complainant's group offers software platforms and mobile applications for, among others, ride-hailing, ride-sharing, food delivery, logistics services, and digital payment. This includes without limitation the mobile application under the name "Grab", first launched in June 2012, and which according to the Complainant has "a strong presence in Singapore and Malaysia", while "also offered in neighboring Southeast Asian nations such as Vietnam, Indonesia, Thailand, the Philippines, Myanmar, and Cambodia".

On March 26, 2018, the Complainant's group acquired Uber's operations in Southeast Asia, including Viet Nam.

The Complainant owns numerous trademark registrations for GRAB including the Vietnamese trademark registration No. 4-0318225-000, GRAB, registered on April 16, 2019, for goods and services in international classes 9, 38 and 39.

The Complainant also owns the domain name <grab.com> registered on November 2, 1996.

The Respondent registered the disputed domain name <datxegrabbvrt.com> on November 10, 2022. The disputed domain name resolves to a website in Vietnamese that offers similar services to those offered by 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.

Notably, the Complainant contends that the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to the Complainant's trademark GRAB, since it contains the trademark with the addition of the generic terms "datxe" - which means "book a car/bike" or "car/bike booking" in Vietnamese - and "brvt" - which is an abbreviation of a geographical location in Vietnam namely the Ba Ria-Vung Tau Province.

The Complainant contends that the Respondent has no rights to or legitimate interests in respect of the disputed domain name, since the Respondent has not demonstrated to have any rights corresponding to the disputed domain name nor to have used the disputed domain name in connection with a bona fide offering of goods or services.

The Complainant finally contends that the Respondent has registered and used the disputed domain name in bad faith. The disputed domain name wholly thus incorporates the Complainant's well-known and prior-registered GRAB Trademark, and it was registered by the Respondent long after the Complainant's GRAB Trademarks became widely known to consumers and the relevant trade. The Respondent has used the disputed domain name for a website on which it passed itself off as "Grab Ba Ria Vung Tau", which can be easily confused as "Grab's representative / branch in Ba Ria Vung Tau Province", just as the Respondent was offering the exact same services as those that the Complainant has been providing to customers worldwide. However, the Respondent is not the Complainant's authorized agent to offer such services in Vietnamese market or use the Complainant's trademarks in any manner.

## **B. Respondent**

The Respondent did not file a formal response to the Complainant's contentions but has sent five emails to the Center some in Vietnamese, in which it, according to a translation into English using the Google Translate, inter alia was stated: "Previously, I used the brand name "Grab" in my business activities. However, after realizing the overlap with your company's brand, I proactively changed the brand name to "Grap" to avoid misunderstanding and respect Grab's intellectual property rights."

## **6. Discussion and Findings**

### **Language of the Proceeding**

The language of the Registration Agreement for the disputed domain name is Vietnamese. Pursuant to the Rules, paragraph 11(a), in the absence of an agreement between the parties, or unless specified otherwise in the registration agreement, the language of the administrative proceedings shall be the language of the registration agreement.

The Complaint was filed in English. The Complainant requested that the language of the proceeding be English for several reasons, including the fact that the website under the disputed domain name displays various contents and terms in English.

The Respondent did not comment on the Complainant's request for the language of the proceeding be English but sent email communications some in Vietnamese in which it demonstrated that it understood the content of the Complaint.

In exercising its discretion to use a language other than that of the registration agreement, the Panel has to exercise such discretion judicially in the spirit of fairness and justice to both parties, taking into account all relevant circumstances of the case, including matters such as the parties' ability to understand and use the proposed language, time and costs (see WIPO Overview of WIPO Panel Views on Selected UDRP Questions, Third Edition ("[WIPO Overview 3.0](#)"), section 4.5.1).

Having considered all the matters above, the Panel determines under paragraph 11(a) of the Rules that the language of the proceeding shall be English.

### **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 3.0](#), section 1.7.

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 entirety of the mark is reproduced within the disputed domain name. Accordingly, the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to the mark for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 1.7.

Although the addition of other terms here, “datxe” and “brvt”, may bear on assessment of the second and third elements, the Panel finds the addition of such terms does not prevent a finding of confusing similarity between the disputed domain name and the mark for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 1.8.

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 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 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.

Panels have held that the use of a domain name to pass off as the Complainant can never confer rights or legitimate interests on a respondent. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 2.13.1.

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 has used the disputed domain, which incorporates the Complainant’s trademark entirely plus additional words, to host a website that provides services that are similar to those offered by the Complainant and that appears falsely to be that of or endorsed by the Complainant.

The Panel therefore finds that the Respondent has registered and used the disputed domain name in bad faith ([WIPO Overview 3.0](#), sections 3.1.4 and 3.2.1), and 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 <datxegrabbvt.com> be transferred to the Complainant.

*/Knud Wallberg/*

**Knud Wallberg**

Sole Panelist

Date: May 23, 2025