

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

Casetagram Limited v. Domain Admin, SEO WEB RECOVERY PTY LTD
Case No. DAU2025-0028

1. The Parties

The Complainant is Casetagram Limited, Hong Kong, China, represented by CSC Digital Brand Services Group AB, Sweden.

The Respondent is Domain Admin, SEO WEB RECOVERY PTY LTD, Australia.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain names <casetify.au> and <casetify.com.au> are registered with Above.au Pty Ltd. (the "Registrar").

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the "Center") on July 17, 2025. On July 30, 2025, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain names. On July 31, 2025, the Registrar transmitted by email to the Center its verification response confirming that the Respondent is listed as the registrant and providing contact information.

The Center verified that the Complaint satisfied the formal requirements of the .au Dispute Resolution Policy (the "Policy" or "auDRP"), the Rules for .au Dispute Resolution Policy (the "Rules"), and the WIPO Supplemental Rules for the .au Domain Name Dispute Resolution Policy (the "Supplemental Rules").

In accordance with the Rules, paragraphs 2(a) and 4(a), the Center formally notified the Respondent of the Complaint, and the proceedings commenced on August 5, 2025. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5(a), the due date for Response was August 25, 2025. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent's default on August 26, 2025. Thereafter, on August 28 and 29, 2025, the Center received email communications from the Respondent and the Registrar.

The Center appointed Douglas Clark as the sole panelist in this matter on August 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 in the business of producing customizable phone cases, and electronic accessories. The Complainant's CASETiFY brand was founded in November 2011. CASETiFY has a strong international presence, with offices in Hong Kong, Los Angeles, Seoul and Tokyo, with employees from over 30 countries. Across its 14-year history, CASETiFY has protected over 20 million devices worldwide, as well as collaborating with over 500 global artists and offering 30,000 different designs.

The Complainant is the owner of international trademark registrations for CASETiFY across various jurisdictions, demonstrating that the Complainant has spent a considerable amount of time and expenses protecting its intellectual property rights.

The Respondent is a company that focuses on the domain name industry, specifically registering expired Australian domain names.

The disputed domain names <casetify.au> and <casetify.com.au> were registered on October 3, 2022, and on December 24, 2023 respectively.

5. Parties' Contentions

A. Complainant

Identical or confusingly similar

The Complainant contends that the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to the trademarks and service marks of CASETiFY. According to the Overview of Panel Views on Selected auDRP Questions, Second Edition (the "auDRP Overview 2.0") at section 1.11.1, when comparing a disputed domain name to a trademark, the extension of suffix such as ".au" or ".com.au" are disregarded when assessing identity or confusing similarity. Further, the disputed domain names consist solely of the Complainant's CASETiFY trademarks, meeting the requirements under paragraph 4(a)(i) of the auDRP Policy being identical or confusingly similar.

See *Veolia Environnement SA v. Mark Scotto Di Perta*, WIPO Case No. [DAU2023-0051](#), where the panel found the disputed domain name <veolia.au> identical confusingly similar to the complainant's VEOLIA trademark.

No rights or legitimate interests

The Complainant contends that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the disputed domain names. Specifically, the Respondent has not been commonly known by the disputed domain names. According to paragraph 4(c)(ii) of the auDRP Policy and *World Natural Bodybuilding Federation, Inc. v. Daniel Jones TheDotCafe*, WIPO Case No. [D2008-0642](#), a respondent must have been commonly known by at the time of registration in order to have a legitimate interest in the domain name.

The Respondent does not use, and has not made demonstrable preparations to use, the disputed domain names in connection with a bona fide offering of goods or services. For instance, the Respondent used the disputed domain names to redirect Internet users to a website featuring pay-per-click advertising links to third party sites, some of which directly compete with the Complainant's business of phone cases. As such, the Respondent utilising the disputed domain names is not for a bona fide offering of goods or services under paragraph 4(c)(i) of the auDRP Policy nor for a legitimate noncommercial or fair use as under paragraph 4(c)(iii) of the auDRP Policy.

Registered and used in bad faith

The Complainant contends that the Respondent has registered and is using the disputed domain names in bad faith in full knowledge of the Complainant's rights. According to *Parfums Christian Dior v. Javier Garcia Quintas*, WIPO Case No. [D2000-0226](#), where domain names are so obviously connected with such a well-known name and products, such as CAsETiFY with its international presence, their very use by someone with no connection with the products suggests opportunistic bad faith. Additionally, paragraph 4(b)(iv) of the auDRP Policy and previous panels found that bad faith can be established where a respondent uses a confusingly similar domain name to resolve to a website featuring links to third-party websites that create revenue for the respondent.

B. Respondent

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

However, after the proceedings were commenced the Respondent informed on August 28, 2025 the Center that they would not like to contest the disputed domain names and that the Respondent was "freely offering to transfer to the domain to the complainant."

6. Discussion and Findings

Consent to Transfer

The Panel takes the Respondent's communication to the Center as a clear consent to transfer.

According to the auDRP Overview 2.0 at section 4.10, where a respondent has stated or communicated to the panel that it consents to a transfer of a domain name, the panel is to give effect to this by ordering transfer.

7. Decision

For foregoing reasons, in accordance with paragraphs 4(i) of the Policy and 15 of the Rules, the Panel orders that the disputed domain names, <casetify.au> and <casetify.com.au> shall be transferred to the Complainant.

/Douglas Clark/

Douglas Clark

Sole Panelist

Date: September 11, 2025