

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

GrabTaxi Holdings Pte. Ltd. v. Tran Bao Toan
Case No. D2023-2830

1. The Parties

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

The Respondent is Tran Bao Toan, Viet Nam.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <taxibinhduonggrab.com> (the “Domain Name”) 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 July 3, 2023. On the same day, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the Domain Name. On July 4, 2023, 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 (Domain Admin, Domain Whois Protection Service) and contact information in the Complaint.

The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on July 5, 2023 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 also on July 5, 2023.

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 July 6, 2023. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was July 26, 2023. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent’s default on August 2, 2023.

The Center appointed Nicholas Smith as the sole panelist in this matter on August 7, 2023. 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 Singapore company, incorporated in 2013, that is the intellectual property holding company for broader group of companies that offer services under the GRAB brand (“Grab Group”). The Grab Group, founded in 2012, offers software platforms and mobile applications for services including ride hailing, ride sharing, food delivery and digital payment, including a mobile phone application that operates under the trademark GRAB (the “GRAB Mark”). The Grab application is available and has a considerable reputation across South-East Asia, including in Singapore, Malaysia, Indonesia, Viet Nam (the location of the Respondent), and Thailand.

The Complainant has held a trademark registration for the GRAB Mark in various jurisdictions since 2013, including a registration for the GRAB Mark in Viet Nam since April 16, 2019 (no. 318225, for goods and services in classes 9, 38 and 39).

The Domain Name was registered on October 18, 2022. The Domain Name resolves to a website (the “Respondent’s Website”) that reproduces the GRAB Mark, and offers taxi and transport services in direct competition with the services offered through the Complainant’s Grab application.

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 Domain Name.

Notably, the Complainant contends that:

- a) It is the owner of the GRAB Mark, having registered the GRAB Mark in various jurisdictions including Viet Nam. The Domain Name is confusingly similar to the GRAB Mark as it reproduces the GRAB Mark in its entirety, and adds the descriptive term “taxi”, and the geographical term “binh duong”.
- b) There are no rights or legitimate interests held by the Respondent in respect of the Domain Name. The Complainant has not granted any license or authorization for the Respondent to use the GRAB Mark. The Respondent is not commonly known by the GRAB Mark, nor does it use the Domain Name for a *bona fide* purpose or legitimate noncommercial purpose. Rather, the Respondent is using the Domain Name for commercial gain by offering taxi and transport services in direct competition with the Complainant. Such use is not a legitimate use of the Domain Name.
- c) The Domain Name was registered and is being used in bad faith. The Respondent is using the Domain Name to divert Internet users searching for the Complainant to the Respondent’s Website for commercial gain. Such conduct amounts to registration and use of the Domain Name 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 domain Name. WIPO Overview of WIPO Panel Views on Selected UDRP Questions, Third Edition, ("[WIPO Overview 3.0](#)"), section 1.7.

Based on the available record, the Panel finds 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 GRAB mark is reproduced within the Domain Name. Accordingly, the Domain Name is identical or confusingly similar to the mark for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 1.7.

While the addition of other terms, here "taxi" and "binh duong", 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 Domain Name and the mark for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 1.8.

Based on the available record, 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.

While 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 often impossible 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. 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 record, the Panel finds the Complainant has established a *prima facie* case that the Respondent lacks rights or legitimate interests in the 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 Domain Name.

The Panel considers that the record of this case reflects that:

- before any notice to the Respondent of the dispute, the Respondent did not use, nor has it made demonstrable preparations to use, the Domain Name or a name corresponding to the Domain Name in connection with a *bona fide* offering of goods or services. Paragraph 4(c)(i) of the Policy, and [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 2.2.
- the Respondent (as an individual, business, or other organization) has not been commonly known by the Domain Name. Paragraph 4(c)(ii) of the Policy, and [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 2.3.
- the Respondent is not making a legitimate noncommercial or fair use of the Domain Name, without intent for commercial gain to misleadingly divert consumers or to tarnish the trademark or service mark at issue. Paragraph 4(c)(iii) of the Policy, and [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 2.4.

- the record contains no other factors demonstrating rights or legitimate interests of the Respondent in the Domain Name.

The Respondent's use of the Domain Name to resolve to a webpage reproducing the Complainant's GRAB Mark, and offering taxi and transport services in direct competition with the services offered through the Grab Group's Grab application does not amount to use for a *bona fide* offering of goods and services. Rather, it appears that the purpose behind the Respondent's conduct is to appropriate the fame and reputation of the Grab Group and its GRAB Mark to increase the number of visitors to the Respondent's Website for its commercial gain, such conduct not being *bona fide*.

Based on the available record, 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.

The Panel considers that the record of this case reflects that the Respondent has intentionally attempted to attract, for commercial gain, Internet users to its website or other on-line location, by creating a likelihood of confusion with the Complainant's mark as to the source, sponsorship, affiliation, or endorsement of the Respondent's website or location or of a product or service on the Respondent's website or location. Paragraph 4(b)(iv) of the Policy, and [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 3.1.4.

The Panel finds that the Respondent must have been aware of the Grab Group and its reputation in the GRAB Mark at the time the Respondent registered the Domain Name. The Grab Group has offered services under the GRAB Mark in Viet Nam since 2014 and has developed a considerable reputation in the field of taxi and ride share services. The Respondent has provided no explanation, and neither it is immediately obvious, why an entity would register a domain name incorporating the GRAB Mark, and redirect it to a website offering competing taxi services in unless there was an awareness of and an intention to create a likelihood of confusion with the Complainant, its GRAB Mark and the broader Grab Group.

The Respondent's Website purports to offer taxi and transport services in direct competition with the Grab Group. Noting the absence of any explanation for the registration, the Panel considers that the most likely explanation is that the Respondent is using the Domain Name to intentionally attempt to attract, for commercial gain, Internet users to its website by creating a likelihood of confusion with the GRAB Mark as to the source, sponsorship, affiliation, or endorsement of the Respondent's Website.

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

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 Domain Name, <taxibinhduonggrab.com> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Nicholas Smith/

Nicholas Smith

Sole Panelist

Date: August 16, 2023