

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

GrabTaxi Holdings Pte. Ltd. v. Huynh Thi Ngoc Duyen
Case No. D2025-1520

1. The Parties

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

The Respondent is Huynh Thi Ngoc Duyen, Viet Nam.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <grabtaximientay.com> is registered with P.A. Viet Nam Company Limited (the “Registrar”).

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the “Center”) on April 15, 2025. On April 15, 2025, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On April 17, 2025, the Registrar transmitted by email to the Center its verification response confirming that the Respondent is listed as the registrant and providing the contact details.

The Center verified that the 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 in both English and Vietnamese, and the proceedings commenced on April 29, 2025. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was May 19, 2025. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent’s default on May 23, 2025.

The Center appointed Andrea Mondini as the sole panelist in this matter on June 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 was founded in 2012, is headquartered in Singapore and offers software platforms and mobile applications for services including ride-hailing, ride-sharing, food delivery and digital payment, including the mobile application named “Grab”. Its services are offered in several Southeast Asian countries, including Viet Nam.

The Complainant owns numerous trademark registrations in several jurisdictions, including:

TRADEMARK	JURISDICTION	REGISTRATION NUMBER	REGISTRATION DATE	INTERNATIONAL CLASS
GRABTAXI	Viet Nam	1213411	May 20, 2014	39
GRAB	Viet Nam	368018	October 27, 2020	9, 12, 28, 35, 36, 38, and 42

The Complainant holds several domain names containing the term “grab”, among them <grab.com> which hosts its website.

Because the Respondent did not file a Response, not much is known about the Respondent.

The disputed domain name was registered on April 1, 2023.

According to the evidence submitted with the Complaint, the disputed domain name resolves to a website purporting to provide transportation services in Viet Nam under the brand “Grab Taxi Mien Tay”.

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 as follows:

The disputed domain name is confusingly similar to the GRAB trademark in which the Complainant has rights, because it incorporates this trademark in its entirety, and the addition of the descriptive terms “taxi” and “mientay” (which in Vietnamese means “Southwest” and commonly refers to the Mekong River Delta) is not sufficient to prevent a finding of confusing similarity.

The Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the disputed domain name. The trademark GRAB has been extensively used to identify the Complainant and its services. The Respondent has not been authorized by the Complainant to use its trademark, is not commonly known by the disputed domain name, and there is no evidence of the Respondent’s use, or demonstrable preparation to use, the disputed domain name in connection with a bona fide offering of goods and services. On the contrary, on the website posted under the disputed domain name, the Respondent refers to itself as “Grab Taxi Mien Tay” and purports to provide transportation services within the Southwest / Mekong River Delta region and nationwide in Viet Nam. Such a false reference creates an undue association with the Complainant.

The disputed domain name was registered in bad faith because it is obvious that the Respondent had knowledge of both the Complainant and its well-known trademark GRAB at the time it registered the disputed domain name.

The Respondent is using the disputed domain name in bad faith, by passing itself off as “Grab Taxi Mien Tay” and offering services that compete with those offered by the Complainant in order to attract Internet users to its website 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, in order to succeed, a complainant must establish each of the following elements:

- (i) the disputed domain name is identical or confusingly similar to the 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 Preliminary Issue: 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 proceeding 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 because the services offered on the website under the disputed domain names are related to the Complainant, which is a non-Vietnamese entity, the Respondent is likely familiar with using English in communications due to the fact that the website under the disputed domain name displays various contents and terms in English. Furthermore, the Complainant claims that a Vietnamese version of the complaint in this case will be unnecessary and as it will result in delay and considerable and unnecessary expenses because the Respondent may be familiar with using English in communications.

The Respondent did not make any submissions with respect to the language of the proceeding. This is despite the fact that the Center had sent the notification of the Complaint which includes instructions on the language of the proceeding to the Respondent in both Vietnamese and English.

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.

B. 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.

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 the entirety of the mark is reproduced within the disputed domain name.

Although the addition of other terms such as here “mientay” (which in Vietnamese means “Southwest” and commonly refers to the Mekong River Delta) and “taxi” may bear on assessment of the second and third elements, the Panel finds that in the present case 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 addition of the generic Top-Level Domain (“gTLD”) “.com” in the disputed domain name is a standard registration requirement and as such may be disregarded under the confusing similarity test under the Policy, paragraph 4(a)(i). [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 1.11.1.

The Panel finds the first element of the Policy has been established.

C. 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 for a complainant to prove that 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.

The website posted under the disputed domain name uses the Complainant’s trademark to offer services competing with those offered by the Complainant. Moreover, the disputed domain name itself suggests a connection or affiliation between the Complainant and the Respondent which in fact does not exist.

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.

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

D. 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.

Paragraph 4(b) of the Policy sets out a list of non-exhaustive circumstances that may indicate that a domain name was registered and used in bad faith, but other circumstances may be relevant in assessing whether a respondent’s registration and use of a domain name is in bad faith. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 3.2.1.

In the view of the Panel, noting that the Complainant’s trademark predates the registration of the disputed domain name and considering that the disputed domain name resolves to a website featuring the Complainant’s trademark and offering competing services, it is inconceivable that the Respondent could

have registered the disputed domain name without knowledge of the Complainant's well-known trademark. In the circumstances of this case, this is evidence of registration in bad faith.

The disputed domain name and the use of the Complainant's trademark on the Respondent's website would cause Internet users to believe that the Respondent is somehow associated with the Complainant when, in fact, it is not. The Panel holds that by using the disputed domain name, the Respondent has intentionally attempted to attract, for commercial gain, Internet users to its web site, by creating a likelihood of confusion with the Complainant's mark as to the source, sponsorship, affiliation, or endorsement of its web site in the sense of Policy, paragraph 4(b)(iv).

Based on the available record, the Panel finds that the Complainant has established the third element of the Policy with regard to the disputed domain name.

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 <grabtaximientay.com> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Andrea Mondini/

Andrea Mondini

Sole Panelist

Date: June 13, 2025