

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

GrabTaxi Holdings Pte. Ltd. v. PHAN VĂN NGỌ
Case No. D2025-1522

1. The Parties

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

The Respondent is PHAN VĂN NGỌ, Viet Nam.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <grapxemaygiare150.com> is registered with Nhan Hoa Software Company Ltd. (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 26, 2025, the Registrar transmitted by email to the Center its verification response disclosing registrant and contact information for the disputed domain name. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on April 28, 2025, providing the registrant and contact information disclosed by the Registrar, and inviting the Complainant to submit an amendment to the Complaint. In the same email, the Center informed the parties in Vietnamese and English, that the language of the registration agreement for the disputed domain name is Vietnamese. On May 1, 2025, the Complainant requested English to be the language of the proceeding and filed an amended Complaint on May 1, 2025. 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 of the Complaint, and the proceedings commenced on May 2, 2025. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was May 22, 2025. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent’s default on May 23, 2025.

The Center appointed Angelica Lodigiani as the sole panelist in this matter on May 28, 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 leading technology company group founded in 2012 and headquartered in Singapore. The Complainant offers software platforms and mobile applications for, inter alia, ride bookings, ride-hailing, ride-sharing, food delivery, logistics services, home cleaning, repair services, and digital payment. Through its Grab proprietary mobile app and platform, the Complainant connects consumers with drivers and merchants. Since October 2013, the Complainant has had a strong presence in Singapore and Malaysia, and its goods and services are also offered in other Southeast Asian nations such as Viet Nam, Indonesia, Thailand, the Philippines, Myanmar, and Cambodia. The Grab app was first launched in 2012, expanded to the Philippines, Singapore and Thailand in 2013, Viet Nam and Indonesia in 2014, and Myanmar and Cambodia in 2017.

During the years, the Complainant entered into several partnerships with, or acquired, other important players in the field, such as Didi Chuxing, Lyft and Ola in 2015 and Uber in 2018. The Complainant reached the milestone of 10 billion rides and deliveries in 2022.

Among the various recognitions and awards of the Complainant, the Complainant has consistently been ranked in CNBC's Disruptor 50 list of companies as one of the fastest growing and most innovative start-ups from 2017 to 2020. The Complainant has also been ranked as the top transportation company and second overall on Fast Company's "Most Innovative Companies" list for 2019 and listed in Fast Company's Top 10 Most Innovative Companies in Asia-Pacific in 2023.

The Complainant is the owner of various GRAB and GRAB formative trademarks registered in the Southeast Asian countries for a variety of goods and services. As far as Viet Nam is concerned, which is the Respondent's country disclosed by the Registrar in its verification, the Complainant is, inter alia, the owner of the following trademark registrations:

- GRAB (word), Vietnamese registration No. 318225, registered on April 16, 2019, for goods and services in classes 9, 38, and 39;
- GRAB (word), Vietnamese registration No. 368018, registered on October 27, 2020, for goods and services in classes 9, 12, 28, 35, 36, 38, and 42;
-  Vietnamese registration No. 368019, registered on October 27, 2020, for goods and services in classes 9, 12, 28, 35, 36, 38, and 42.

The Complainant is also the owner of a number of domain names featuring the GRAB trademark, among which <grab.com>, registered on November 2, 1996, through which the Complainant promotes its services and users can book their rides or the other services of the Complainant.

The disputed domain name was registered on July 3, 2023, in the name of a Vietnamese individual allegedly located in the Vietnamese province of Ha Tinh. The disputed domain name is used to access a Vietnamese website offering transportation services. The website depicts the Complainant's GRAB mark and uses photographs and promotional materials of the Complainant.

5. Parties' Contentions

A. Complainant

Change of Language

As the language of the Registration Agreement is Vietnamese, the Complainant requests the Panel to allow the change of language of this UDRP proceeding from Vietnamese to English, in accordance with paragraph 11 of the Rules. The Complainant bases its request on the following arguments. Being a Singaporean company, it cannot understand Vietnamese. Accordingly, the Complainant would have to make considerable economic efforts to translate the Complaint and the other documents of the proceeding into Vietnamese. Moreover, by doing so, the proceeding would be substantially delayed. In addition, the website associated with the disputed domain name contains some references in English, which show that the Respondent can communicate in English. Lastly, the Complainant points out that English is a common language in international business and is a popular language in Viet Nam, where the Respondent is located. Considering that the services provided by the Respondent are closely related to the Complainant's business, which requires the Respondent to be able to communicate in English, the Respondent is likely familiar with using English in communications.

Merits

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 GRAB trademark. The disputed domain name includes five components, (i) "grap", (ii) "xemay", (iii) "giare", (iv) "150", and (v) ".com". As far as "grap" is concerned, this element is very similar to the Complainant's GRAB mark, sharing the same number of letters and differing only by the final letter "p" in lieu of "b". The word "grap" is an obvious misspelling of the Complainant's mark and the slight difference between "grap" and "grab" is insufficient to distinguish the element "grap" of the disputed domain name from the Complainant's mark. As far as the other elements are concerned "xemay" is a Vietnamese word for "motorbike", "giare" can be translated in English as "cheap" or "low price", and "150" is only a plain numeral. Accordingly, these additional elements cannot prevent a finding of confusing similarity of the disputed domain name with the Complainant's mark.

The Complainant further contends that the Respondent lacks rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name. The disputed domain name has been registered multiple years after the registration of the Complainant's mark. After ten years of extensive use, the GRAB mark has acquired significant recognition in many countries, including in Viet Nam. The Complainant has no relationship with the Respondent and did not authorize the Respondent to make use of its GRAB mark, including as part of the disputed domain name. There is also no evidence of the fact that the Respondent has been commonly known by the disputed domain name. The Respondent does not appear to be the owner of any trademark coinciding with the disputed domain name.

Given the strong reputation of the Complainant's GRAB trademark, as well as the fact that the Respondent has no rights to this mark, it is plain that the Respondent did not register the disputed domain name for any legitimate purpose. Rather, the Respondent registered the disputed domain name to appropriate the fame and reputation of the Complainant and the GRAB mark for the Respondent's profit.

Lastly, the Complainant maintains that the Respondent registered and is being using the disputed domain name in bad faith.

The Respondent's choice of domain name was not a coincidence. The Respondent's bad faith in the registration of the disputed domain name is established by the fact that the disputed domain name wholly and purposefully incorporates the "grap" word, which is almost identical to the Complainant's well-known GRAB mark. Given the high level of fame and reputation that the Complainant enjoys, the Respondent, who runs its business in the same industry, must have had prior knowledge of the Complainant's GRAB mark at the time of registration of the disputed domain name. Awareness of another's rights in a mark at the time of registration of a domain name, amounts to registration in bad faith.

As far as use in bad faith is concerned, the Complainant notes that the website associated with the disputed domain name offers the same services of the Complainant and displays the GRAB mark in various parts of the website. Moreover, the Respondent's website uses the Complainant's advertising materials to create a false association between the disputed domain name and the Complainant. However, the contact information published on the website associated with the disputed domain name belongs to the Respondent and not to the Complainant. Accordingly, the Complainant maintains that the Respondent's sole interest in the disputed domain name is to unlawfully profit from the Complainant's trademark.

B. Respondent

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

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 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 for several reasons, including the fact that the Complainant does not know Vietnamese and would need to bear high translation costs if the UDRP proceeding was to be conducted in Vietnamese. Moreover, the Respondent's website associated with the disputed domain name includes some English words, which is an indication of the fact that the Respondent is able to communicate in English. The Complainant also points out that English is a business language and that for the type of activity offered through the Respondent's website, which is the same activity of the Complainant, knowledge of English is essential.

The Respondent did not make any submissions with respect to the language of the proceeding.

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. More specifically, the Complainant has shown that it owns registered trademark rights over the GRAB mark in several countries, predating the date of registration of the disputed domain name.

The disputed domain name consists of the term “grap”, which is misspelling of the Complainant’s GRAB mark, followed by the words “xemay” and “giare”, and the number “150”. The word “xemay” is a Vietnamese word for “motorbike”, while “giare” is also in Vietnamese and can be translated in English as “cheap” or “low price”.

The Panel finds the mark is recognizable 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](#), sections 1.7 and 1.9.

Although the addition of other terms here, “xemay” and “giare” may bear on assessment of the second and third elements, the Panel finds the addition of such terms, and of the number “150” 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.

In light of the above, 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.

In particular, the Complainant indicates that it has no relationship with the Respondent and that it did not authorize the Respondent to make use of its GRAB mark in any manner, including as part of the disputed domain name. Moreover, the Respondent does not appear to be the owner of any trademark for the disputed domain name and there is no other evidence that the Respondent might have been known by the disputed domain name.

Furthermore, the Respondent is not making a fair use of the disputed domain name, nor a bona fide offering of goods or services. The nature of the disputed domain name, containing a misspelling of the Complainant’s mark along with the word “motorbike” in Vietnamese, which makes direct reference to the Complainant’s activity, impersonates or suggests sponsorship or endorsement by the trademark owner. The addition of the Vietnamese word “giare” in the disputed domain name adds to the confusion, as the Internet user facing the disputed domain name could easily believe that it resolves to a website where the Complainant’s offers its motorbike transportation services at reduced prices.

The disputed domain name resolves to a website in Vietnamese, offering transportation services. The website contains several references to the Complainant's GRAB mark and includes advertising materials of the Complainant. The website shows photographs of the Complainant's taxis displaying the Complainant's stylized GRAB mark. Accordingly, the Panel finds that the website under the disputed domain name is highly misleading and that the Respondent had a clear intention to trade off the Complainant's trademark rights in the GRAB mark and take unfair advantage of the likelihood of confusion between the disputed domain name and the Complainant as to the origin or affiliation of the website at the dispute domain name.

Panels have held that the use of a domain name for illegitimate activity, such as impersonation/passing off 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 rapid growth and expansion of the Complainant's activity under the GRAB trademark and the numerous recognitions and awards that the Complainant has gained in the years are strong indications of a high recognition and reputation of the GRAB mark in the Southeast Asian countries, including in Viet Nam, where the Respondent is allegedly located and operates. Moreover, the nature of the disputed domain name, which incorporates a misspelling of the GRAB mark, followed by the Vietnamese equivalents of "motorbike" and "low/cheap price", appears to the Panel as clear evidence of the fact that the Respondent was well aware of the Complainant's mark when it registered the disputed domain name. The registration of a disputed domain name almost identical to the Complainant's well-known mark with knowledge of the Complainant and without rights or legitimate interests amounts to registration in bad faith.

The disputed domain name is used to promote services in direct competition with the Complainant's services in the same geographical area where the Complainant's operates at allegedly reduced prices. The lack of a disclaimer and the constant use of the GRAB mark within the website, along with the same advertising material adopted by the Complainant, show a clear intention of the Respondent to disrupt the business of a competitor and to attempt to attract, for commercial gain, Internet users to its website, by creating a likelihood of confusion with the Complainant's mark and activity.

Panels have held that the use of a domain name for illegitimate activity, such as the one indicated above, constitutes bad faith. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 3.4. Having reviewed the record, the Panel finds the Respondent's registration and use of the disputed domain name constitutes bad faith under the Policy.

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 <grapxemaygiare150.com> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Angelica Lodigiani/
Angelica Lodigiani
Sole Panelist
Date: June 11, 2025