

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

Can Saygun v. Gene M Bleich, seo
Case No. D2025-5396

1. The Parties

The Complainant is Can Saygun, United Kingdom, self-represented.

The Respondent is Gene M Bleich, seo, United States of America.

2. The Domain Names and Registrar

The disputed domain names <netbahisadresi.com>, <netbahisgirisi.net>, and <netbahissikayet.com> are registered with NameCheap, Inc. (the “Registrar”).

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the “Center”) on December 23, 2025. On December 24, 2025, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain names. On December 24, 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 (Privacy service provided by Withheld for Privacy ehf) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on December 26, 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 December 27, 2025.

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 December 30, 2025. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was January 19, 2026. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent’s default on January 22, 2026.

The Center appointed Jeremy Speres as the sole panelist in this matter on January 26, 2026. 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.

The Panel issued Procedural Order No. 1 on January 27, 2026, inviting the Complainant to substantiate its claimed trademark rights with evidence by February 1, 2026, and giving the Respondent an opportunity to comment by February 6, 2026. The Complainant responded on the same day. The Panel issued Procedural Order No. 2 on January 28, 2026, querying various aspects of the Complainant's response to Procedural Order No. 1 and giving the Complainant a further opportunity to substantiate its trademark rights by February 2, 2026, inviting the Respondent to comment by February 7, 2026. The Complainant filed its response on January 29, 2026. No response was received from the Respondent to either procedural order.

4. Factual Background

The Complainant does not provide much detail about its business or its trademark, and very little is supported by evidence. As far as the Panel can glean, the Complainant owns the domain name <netbahis.com>, which redirects to the website "www.343netbahis.com", which in turn appears to be an online betting and gaming website operating under the NETBAHIS brand.

The Complainant claims to own United Kingdom Trademark Application No. UK00004313564 NETBAHIS in class 41, filed on December 19, 2025, in the name of TM Enfield Ltd.

The Complainant claims common law rights in the NETBAHIS mark.

The disputed domain names were registered on May 26, 2025. The evidence in the record establishes that the disputed domain names all previously resolved to betting and gaming websites using NETBAHIS logos that are highly similar if not identical to the logo employed on the Complainant's website referenced above. Presently, <netbahisadresi.com> does not resolve to any website, whilst the remaining two disputed domain names continue to resolve to the website advertising online betting and gaming services bearing a similar NETBAHIS logo.

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 names.

Notably, the Complainant contends as follows.

He is the owner of the NETBAHIS trademark, which was acquired by assignment prior to the filing of the Complaint.

The NETBAHIS mark has been continuously and exclusively used in commerce in connection with online betting and gaming services for a substantial period of time prior to the registration of the disputed domain names, and thus enjoys common law rights and is well known.

The Respondent makes prominent and repeated textual use of the NETBAHIS trademark on the disputed domain name's websites, including through buttons that redirect users to the Complainant's official website, while the surrounding pages are filled with advertisements and promotional links to competing online betting services. As such, the disputed domain names are used in bad faith to attract Internet users for commercial gain by misleading them into believing that the websites are operated by, affiliated with, or endorsed by the Complainant.

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 first claimed, in the amended Complaint, that he is the "registered owner of the trademark 'NETBAHIS', which is registered and used in connection with online betting and gaming services." In support of this, he provided a "Certificate of Filing" issued by the United Kingdom Intellectual Property Office for the trademark application referenced in the Factual Background section above. The Panel viewed the online records for this trademark application and found that the application was still pending, and was, furthermore, filed in the name of "TM Enfield Ltd".¹

In Procedural Order No. 1, the Panel pointed out that a pending trademark application does not establish trademark rights. The Panel also noted that the Complainant had not explained why the applicant for the trademark is named differently to the Complainant, and noted that no evidence had been provided supporting the Complainant's contention that its mark was well known and enjoyed common law rights. The Panel specifically referred the Complainant to relevant sections of the [WIPO Overview 3.0](#) in these regards. The Panel invited the Complainant and the Respondent to comment on these issues.

In his response to Procedural Order No. 1, the Complainant stated as follows:

"The Complainant confirms that it is the owner of the NETBAHIS trademark, which was acquired by assignment prior to the filing of the Complaint.

At the time of filing, the trademark registration process was ongoing, and the Complainant had already submitted the official provisional / temporary ownership documentation evidencing the acquisition of trademark rights. The final registration certificate is expected to be issued shortly (within approximately one month), as confirmed by the trademark authority."

No evidence was supplied in support of these contentions. No assignment agreement or any other documentary evidence was provided.

He also stated:

"The NETBAHIS mark has been continuously and exclusively used in commerce in connection with online betting and gaming services for a substantial period of time prior to the registration of the disputed domain names."

He based this claim on his ownership and operation of <netbahis.com>.

The only evidence provided in this respect was a screenshot from his Registrar account page showing the validity period for the <netbahis.com> domain name for "Sep 20 2024 - Sep 20 2026". No further evidence was provided in support of his claimed longstanding usage of that domain name, nor the Complainant's contentions that his NETBAHIS mark is well known and enjoys common law rights.

¹In accordance with its powers articulated inter alia in paragraphs 10 and 12 of the Rules, the Panel is entitled to conduct limited independent research into matters of public record. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 4.8.

Noting that the Complainant is unrepresented and noting that the disputed domain names' websites have all made use of a logo that is highly similar if not identical to the logo employed on the website to which the Complainant's <netbahis.com> domain name redirects, the Panel again gave the Complainant an opportunity to substantiate its trademark rights with evidence in Procedural Order No. 2. The Panel specifically encouraged the Complainant to seek representation from counsel experienced in matters under the Policy. The Complainant's response was to make the same claims, and to refer to the same evidence, that he supplied in his response to Procedural Order No. 1.

In the circumstances, there is insufficient evidence before the Panel supporting the Complainant's claims of registered and unregistered trademark rights.

The Complainant was given three opportunities to properly set out his case, and was specifically encouraged to seek representation from counsel, which the Complainant failed to do.

The Panel finds the first element of the Policy has not been established.

7. Decision

For the foregoing reasons, the Complaint is denied.

/Jeremy Speres/

Jeremy Speres

Sole Panelist

Date: February 10, 2026