

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

GrabTaxi Holdings Pte. Ltd. v. Nguyen Dac Cong (Mr)
Case No. D2025-2831

1. The Parties

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

The Respondent is Nguyen Dac Cong (Mr), Viet Nam.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <grab-dangky.com> is registered with iNET Software Company Limited (the "Registrar").

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the "Center") on July 17, 2025. On July 18, 2025, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On July 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 and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on July 25, 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 July 28, 2025.

On July 25, 2025, the Center informed the parties that the language of the registration agreement for the disputed domain name is Vietnamese. On July 28, 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 of the Complaint, and the proceedings commenced on August 6, 2025. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was August 26, 2025. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent's default on August 29, 2025.

The Center appointed Iris Quadrio as the sole panelist in this matter on September 4, 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 leading provider of everyday services through technological innovations across Southeast Asia. As of January 2023, the Complainant has offered its goods and services in more than 480 cities in eight countries in Southeast Asia.

The Complainant launched the Grab App in June 2012, which connects millions of consumers with millions of drivers and merchants across Viet Nam, Singapore, Malaysia, Thailand, Indonesia, Philippines, Cambodia, and Myanmar. In December 2015, the Complainant entered into a global rideshare agreement with Didi Chuxing, Lyft, and Ola, enabling two-way integration of services across Southeast Asia, the United States of America, China, and India. On March 26, 2018, the Complainant acquired Uber's operations in Southeast Asia, including Viet Nam, integrating Uber's ridesharing and food delivery business into its own platform. This transaction was the largest of its kind in Southeast Asia.

The Complainant is the owner of the following trademarks:

Intellectual Property Office of Viet Nam: GRAB, Reg. No. 318225 registered on April 16, 2019, for classes 9, 38 and 39, Reg. No. 368018 registered on October 27, 2020, for classes 9, 12, 28, 35, 36, 38 and 42; Reg. No. 331702 registered on September 30, 2019, for classes 9, 38 and 39; Reg. No. 368019 registered on October 27, 2020, for classes 9, 12, 28, 35, 36, 38 and 42; GRABCAR, Reg. No. 339168 registered on December 9, 2019, for classes 9, 38 and 39; GRABFOOD, Reg. No. 339167 registered on December 9, 2019, for classes 9, 38 and 39; Reg. No. 362152 registered on September 7, 2020, for classes 9, 35, 38, 42 and 43; GRABEXPRESS, Reg. No. 391033 registered on June 28, 2021, for classes 9, 35, 38, 39 and 42; (ii) International registrations: GRABTAXI, Reg. No. 1213411 registered on May 20, 2014, for class 39; GRAB INC, Reg. No. 1291169 registered on December 7, 2015, for classes 9, 39 and 42.

The Complainant has invested significantly in marketing and promoting its goods and services under the GRAB trademarks, which have been continuously used in advertising and promotional materials, both online and offline. The Complainant has received wide public recognition and numerous awards. It was consistently ranked in CNBC's "Disruptor 50" list from 2017 to 2020, ranked as the top transportation company and second overall on Fast Company's "Most Innovative Companies" list in 2019, and featured in Fast Company's "Top 10 Most Innovative Companies in Asia-Pacific" in 2023. The Complainant has also been the recipient of various international, regional, and domestic awards.

The Complainant claims to own an important domain name portfolio, including the domain name <grab.com>, registered on November 2, 1996.

Lastly, the disputed domain name was registered on June 13, 2025, and it resolves to a website that mimics the Complainant's official webpage. In particular, the website reproduces the overall look and feel of the Complainant's official site, displaying the Complainant's trademarks and logos and appears to offer a portal for registration to be the Complainant's driver partner.

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.

The Complainant states that the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to its trademark GRAB, and its official domain name.

The Complainant contends that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interest in respect of the disputed domain name, nor is he related in any way to the Complainant. Neither license nor authorization has been granted to the Respondent to make any use of the Complainant's trademark GRAB or apply for registration of the disputed domain name.

More specifically, the Complainant alleges that the Respondent has not used and/or has no demonstrable intention to use the disputed domain name except to create a likelihood of confusion with the Complainant's trademark. In fact, the Complainant claims that the Respondent has selected the disputed domain name only to intentionally lead Internet users to believe they are accessing the Complainant's website.

Finally, the Complainant has requested the Panel to issue a decision ordering the transfer of the disputed domain name to the Complainant.

B. Respondent

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

6. Discussion and Findings

6.1. Language of the Proceeding

Pursuant to paragraph 11 of the Rules, unless otherwise agreed by the parties, the default language of the proceeding is the language of the registration agreement, subject to the authority of the panel to determine otherwise.

As indicated above, the Center has informed the parties that the language of the registration agreement for the disputed domain name is Vietnamese. Nevertheless, the Complainant has filed the Complaint in English and has confirmed its request for the language of the proceeding to be English.

The Respondent did not oppose the Complainant's language request when asked by the Center to comment thereon.

Noting the aim of conducting the proceedings with due expedition, paragraph 10 of the Rules vests a panel with authority to conduct the proceedings in a manner it considers appropriate while also ensuring both that the parties are treated with equality and, that each party is given a fair opportunity to present its case.

The Panel finds that ordering the Complainant to translate the Complaint, in view of the costs involved, would imply a significant burden to the Complainant, in addition to an unwarranted delay in the proceeding.

The Respondent did not file a response to the Complaint, and also did not oppose the Complainant's language request when it was given the opportunity to do so.

In view of the foregoing, the Panel decides that English will be the language of the proceeding.

6.2. Substantive matter

According to paragraph 4(a) of the Policy, for this Complaint to succeed in relation to the disputed domain name, the Complainant must prove each of the following, namely that:

- (i) the disputed domain name is identical or confusingly similar with a trademark or service mark in which the Complainant has rights; and
- (ii) the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interest in respect of the disputed domain name; and
- (iii) the disputed domain name was registered and 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.

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 Complainant's trademark GRAB 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, "dangky" (which means "register" or "apply" in English) may bear on assessment of the second and third elements, the Panel finds the addition of such term 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.

Moreover, the ".com" generic Top-Level Domain ("gTLD") is viewed as a standard registration requirement and is generally disregarded under the first element of the confusing similarity test, as set forth in section 1.11.1 of [WIPO Overview 3.0](#).

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.

The Complainant has claimed not to have authorized, licensed, or permitted the Respondent to register or use the disputed domain name or to use the trademark GRAB nor is there any other evidence in the file suggesting that the Respondent has or could have rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name.

Also, the Complainant has prior rights in the GRAB trademark which clearly precede the Respondent's registration of the disputed domain name.

Likewise, it does not seem that the Respondent is making any legitimate noncommercial or fair use of the disputed domain name. On the contrary, the Respondent's use of the disputed domain name is intended to benefit from Complainant's reputation by confusing Internet users, incorporating Complainant's trademark and leading them to believe that the site to which the disputed domain name relates is an official site of the Complainant. Hence, as established in section 2.5 of [WIPO Overview 3.0](#): "Fundamentally, a respondent's use of a domain name will not be considered 'fair' if it falsely suggests affiliation with the trademark owner; the correlation between a domain name and the complainant's mark is often central to this inquiry."

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

C. Registered and Used in Bad Faith

In such connection, the Complainant has submitted evidence to support that the trademark GRAB is widely known and was registered and used many years before the Respondent registered the disputed domain name. When registering the domain name, the Respondent has targeted the Complainant's trademark GRAB to generate confusion among the Internet users and benefit from the Complainant's reputation.

Therefore, the Panel is satisfied that the Respondent must have been aware of the Complainant and the Complainant's trademark GRAB when it registered the disputed domain name. Consequently, and in accordance with section 3.1.4 of [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), the Panel considers that the inclusion of the Complainant's trademark with the term "dangky" creates a presumption that the disputed domain name was registered on a bad faith basis.

In addition, the disputed domain name resolves to a website that displays the Complainant's trademarks and logos and reproduces the overall look and feel of the Complainant's official site, including its main features. The website appears to provide a portal for registration to be a driver for the Complainant's services. It is possible that the platform is being used to collect potential drivers' information as the platform is asking for certain registration information such as ID Card and criminal records. The Panel finds that the Respondent's use of the disputed domain name was intended to attract and mislead Internet users when searching for the Complainant's website and to redirect them to a website from which the Respondent derives commercial revenue by creating a likelihood of confusion with the Complainant's trademark.

Panels have held that the use of a domain name for illegitimate activity as impersonation/passing off or phishing 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 <grab-dangky.com> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Iris Quadrio/

Iris Quadrio

Sole Panelist

Date: September 18, 2025