

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

Granturo Platform Ltd v. Shafiq Ramazani
Case No. D2025-4146

1. The Parties

The Complainant is Granturo Platform Ltd, Malta, represented by Wilmark Oy, Finland.

The Respondent is Shafiq Ramazani, Denmark.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain names <flamez-casino.online>, <flamez-casino.org> and <flamez.online> are registered with Gandi SAS (the “Registrar”).

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the “Center”) on October 9, 2025. On October 10, 2025, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain names. On October 13, 2025, the Registrar transmitted by email to the Center its verification response, disclosing registrant and contact information for the disputed domain names which differed from the named Respondent (Not available / REDACTED FOR PRIVACY) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on October 13, 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 amendment to the Complaint on October 13, 2025.

The Center verified that the Complaint together with the amendment to 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 October 16, 2025. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was November 5, 2025. The Respondent sent an email communication to the Center on October 13, 2025. On November 11, 2025, the Center informed the Parties that it would proceed to panel appointment.

The Center appointed Evan D. Brown as the sole panelist in this matter on November 17, 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 operating online casinos. One of its online casinos is branded using the mark FLAMEZ. The Complainant owns that mark and enjoys the benefits of its registration in the European Union (Trade mark no. 019137596, registered on May 23, 2025).

According to the Whois records, the disputed domain names were registered on September 6, 2025. According to the Complainant, the Respondent has used the disputed domain names to link to an online casino that is competitive to those offered by the Complainant. At the time of this Decision, the disputed domain names resolve to sites discussing the Complainant's casino offering, while displaying a logo similar to the Complainant's, links "Play Now", and offering welcome bonuses.

5. Parties' Contentions

A. Complainant

The Complainant contends that the disputed domain names are identical or confusingly similar to the Complainant's trademark; that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the disputed domain names; and that the disputed domain names were registered and are being used in bad faith.

B. Respondent

The Respondent did not formally respond to the Complainant's contentions. It did, however, send an email communication to the Center on October 13, 2025, in which it questioned why counsel for the Complainant was sending correspondence about the disputed domain names and what relevance those domain names have to his area of responsibility. The Respondent asserted (without any supporting evidence) that the disputed domain names were merely placeholders for a forthcoming fully licensed gambling platform, asserted that all website content was AI-generated and temporary, and claimed that no third-party trademarks or protected materials had been used. The Respondent also linked to an article concerning alleged copyright-related abuse within the online-gaming sector, using the article to help the Respondent characterize this action as part of a broader pattern of abuse. The Respondent further warned that continued pursuit of the matter without what it called "hard evidence" would result in litigation for business interference and reputational harm.

6. Discussion and Findings

To succeed, the Complainant must demonstrate that all of the elements listed in paragraph 4(a) of the Policy have been satisfied: (i) the disputed domain names are identical or confusingly similar to a trademark or service mark in which the Complainant has rights, (ii) the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the disputed domain names, and (iii) the disputed domain names have been registered and are being used in bad faith. The Panel finds that all three of these elements have been met in this case. To the extent the Respondent's bare-bones email communication makes any arguments against the assertions of the Complaint, the Panel finds them unavailing.

A. Identical or Confusingly Similar

This first element functions primarily as a standing requirement. WIPO Overview of WIPO Panel Views on Selected UDRP Questions, Third Edition (“[WIPO Overview 3.0](#)”), section 1.7. 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. *Id.* This element requires the Panel to consider two issues: first, whether the Complainant has rights in a relevant mark; and second, whether the disputed domain name is identical or confusingly similar to that mark.

A registered trademark provides a clear indication that the rights in the mark shown on the trademark certificate belong to its respective owner. See *Advance Magazine Publishers Inc., Les Publications Conde Nast S.A. v. Voguechen*, WIPO Case No. [D2014-0657](#). The Complainant has demonstrated its rights in the FLAMEZ mark by providing evidence of its trademark registration. See [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 1.2.1. Each of the disputed domain names incorporates the FLAMEZ mark in its entirety. The additional term “casino” in two of the disputed domain names does not prevent a finding of confusing similarity between the disputed domain names and the Complainant’s FLAMEZ mark. See [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 1.8. The FLAMEZ mark remains recognizable for a showing of confusing similarity under the Policy.

It is standard practice when comparing a disputed domain name to a complainant’s trademarks, to not take the extension into account. See [WIPO Overview 3.0](#) at 1.11.1 (“The applicable Top Level Domain (“TLD”) in a domain name (e.g., “.com”, “.club”, “.nyc”) is viewed as a standard registration requirement and as such is disregarded under the first element confusing similarity test.”).

The Panel finds that the Complainant has established this first element under the Policy.

B. Rights or Legitimate Interests

The Panel evaluates this element of the Policy by first looking to see whether the Complainant has made a prima facie showing that the Respondent lacks rights or legitimate interests in respect of the disputed domain name. If the Complainant makes that showing, the burden of production of demonstrating rights or legitimate interests shifts to the Respondent (with the burden of proof always remaining with the Complainant). See [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 2.1; *AXA SA v. Huade Wang*, WIPO Case No. [D2022-1289](#).

On this point, the Complainant asserts, among other things, that (1) the Respondent has not received permission or authorization to use the Complainant’s mark, (2) there is no evidence that the Respondent is commonly known by the disputed domain names, (3) the Respondent is not making a legitimate noncommercial or fair use of the disputed domain names, and (4) the Respondent is not using the disputed domain names for bona fide business purposes. Instead, according to the Complainant, the Respondent is using the disputed domain names to link to a competitive online casino, the purpose for which the Complainant asserts, is to mislead Internet users. At the time of this Decision, the disputed domain names link to sites discussing the Complainant’s casino offering, while displaying “Flamez Casino” or FLAMEZ together with a logo similar to the Complainant’s, links “Play Now”, and offering welcome bonuses.

Noting the Panel’s findings below, the Panel finds that the Complainant has made the required prima facie showing. The Respondent has not introduced any credible evidence to overcome this prima facie showing. And nothing in the record otherwise tips the balance in the Respondent’s favor.

Accordingly, the Panel finds that the Complainant has established this second element under the Policy.

C. Bad Faith

The Policy requires a complainant to establish that the disputed domain name was registered and is being used in bad faith.

The Complainant's trademark rights predate the registration of the disputed domain names and the Complainant claims that these are being used to link to an online casino that is competitive to the ones offered by the Complainant. The Panel notes that the Respondent has offered no explanation for its selection of the term "flamez" for intended use in connection with a gambling platform, while the Complainant uses this trademark in precisely the same field. The Panel finds that it is more likely than not that the Respondent targeted the Complainant when it registered the disputed domain names. This shows bad faith registration under the Policy.

As to bad faith use, at the time of this Decision, the disputed domain names resolve to the sites discussing the Complainant's casino offering, while displaying "Flamez Casino" or FLAMEZ together with a logo similar to the Complainant's, a copyright notice that reads "Flamez Casino", links "Play Now", and offering welcome bonuses. Even if those sites are placeholders generated by AI, the Panel cannot disregard that it is ultimately the Respondent's responsibility to control content exhibited at the websites at the domain names. Further, the Respondent's claims that the websites content was generated by AI and would be replaced later at launch do not alter the fact that, as per the Respondent's own communication, the intended use is for a forthcoming "gambling platform". If so, the registration of the disputed domain names – each reproducing the Complainant's trademark and intended for use in the same business segment as that of the Complainant – amounts to bad faith under the Policy. The Panel finds that the Respondent has used the disputed domain names to intentionally attempt to attract, for commercial gain, Internet users to its websites by creating a likelihood of confusion with the Complainant's mark as to the source, sponsorship, affiliation, or endorsement of the Respondent's websites. This conduct supports a finding of bad faith use under the Policy.

Accordingly, the Panel finds that the Complainant has established this third element under 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 names <flamez-casino.online>, <flamez-casino.org>, and <flamez.online> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Evan D. Brown/

Evan D. Brown

Sole Panelist

Date: December 1, 2025