

## **ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION**

GrabTaxi Holdings Pte. Ltd. v. Tran Tuan Kiet  
Case No. D2025-1523

### **1. The Parties**

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

The Respondent is Tran Tuan Kiet, Viet Nam.

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

The disputed domain name <grabbinhduonggiare.click> is registered with Mat Bao Corporation (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 18, 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, and the proceedings commenced on May 1, 2025. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was May 21, 2025. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent’s default on May 22, 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;
- GRABTAXI (word), International registration No. 1213411, registered on May 20, 2014, designating China, India and Viet Nam, for services in class 39.

Moreover, the Complainant is the owner of the trademark GRABBIKE, registered in 2019 in Viet Nam.

The Complainant is also the owner of 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 access the other services of the Complainant.

The disputed domain name was registered on September 2, 2023, in the name of a Vietnamese individual allegedly located in Ho Chi Minh. The disputed domain name is used to access a website offering transportation and goods delivery services in the Binh Duong Province of Viet Nam.

#### **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 GRAB trademark as it fully incorporates this mark followed by the words "binhduong" and "giare". The word "binhduong" designates the Binh Duong Province in Viet Nam, while the word "giare" is the word "già rẻ" written without space and accents, which means "cheap price" or "low price" in Vietnamese. Accordingly, the disputed domain name consists of the Complainant's mark, a geographical location, and a descriptive word. As the Complainant's mark is well recognizable within the disputed domain name, the addition of "binhduonggiare" 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 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. The Respondent is not using the disputed domain name in connection with a bona fide offering of goods or services but is attempting to use the GRAB trademarks and the disputed domain name to redirect consumers to the Respondent's website for commercial gain. Indeed, on the Respondent's website, the Respondent refers to itself as "grab xe may binh duong", which can be interpreted as "grab bike [in] binh duong" [province] in English, and expresses its purpose to provide transportation and goods delivery services within Binh Duong Province and neighboring provinces and cities. Moreover, the website under the disputed domain name fails to represent that the Respondent is an independent business entity and that there is no relationship between the Complainant and the Respondent.

Lastly, the Complainant maintains that the disputed domain name has been registered and is being used in bad faith. The Respondent's choice of domain name was not a coincidence, but rather an act of bad faith. Albeit the word "grab" has a common meaning in English (i.e., to take hold of something or someone suddenly and roughly), it has been lawfully registered and used for unrelated goods or services by the Complainant. The GRAB trademark, therefore, has been perceived by the public as distinctive and highly associated with the Complainant's services and mobile application and platform. Given the high level of fame and well-established wholesome reputation that the GRAB trademarks enjoys, the Respondent must have had prior knowledge of the Complainant's GRAB marks before registering the disputed domain name. Awareness of the Complainant's rights in the GRAB mark at the time of the disputed domain name registration is evidence of bad faith registration.

The Complainant further notes that the Respondent passed itself off as "grab xe may binh duong", which can be easily confused as "Grab's representative / branch in Binh Duong Province". Furthermore, the Respondent has been offering the same services (i.e., transportation and goods delivery) of the Complainant. Meanwhile, the Respondent is not the Complainant's authorized agent to offer such services in the Vietnamese market or use the Complainant's trademarks in any manner. While providing the above services, the Respondent used the Complainant's trademarks (especially GRAB and GRABTAXI trademark) and trade name on the website under the disputed domain name without the Complainant's authorization. This is undoubtedly an attempt to attract Internet users to the Respondent's website for commercial gain, which is evidence of use in bad faith.

## **B. Respondent**

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

## **6. Discussion and Findings**

### **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.

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 Panel finds the mark is recognizable within the disputed domain name as it is placed at the beginning of the disputed domain name and is followed by a geographical term, "binhduong", and a word "giare", which the Vietnamese Internet users would perceive as "già ré", and can be translated in English as "cheap" or "low price".

Although the addition of other terms, such as the one reported above, 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.

Accordingly, 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.

The disputed domain name resolves to a website in Vietnamese, promoting discounted motorbike transportation and goods delivery services under the Complainant's marks GRAB and GRABTAXI. On its website, the Respondent refers to itself as "grab xe may binh duong", which in English could be translated as "grab bike binh duong". The Respondent's website does not contain a disclaimer indicating the lack of association with the Complainant. The Complainant is also the owner of the trademark GRABBIKE and offers, among various means of transportation, motorbike transportation services. Moreover, the Complainant offers its services throughout Viet Nam, including in the province of Binh Duong, which is the province where the Respondent allegedly operates. Accordingly, the Panel finds that the website under the

disputed domain name is highly misleading as Internet users can easily believe that it is a website belonging to the Complainant where the Complainant offers some of its services at a lower price. Therefore, the Panel finds that the Respondent has a clear intention to trade off the Complainant's trademark rights in the GRAB and GRABTAXI marks 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. This use of the disputed domain name cannot amount to a bona fide offering of goods or services, or to a legitimate or fair use.

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.

Accordingly, 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 the GRAB mark entirely, followed by a geographical indication and a descriptive word that could be translated as 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 confusingly similar 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 and at discounted prices. The lack of a disclaimer and the constant use of the GRAB mark within the website show a clear intention of the Respondent to disrupt the business of a competitor by attempting to attract, for commercial gain, Internet users to the Respondent's 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 <grabbinhduonggiare.click> be transferred to the Complainant.

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