

PANEL DECISION

Fergal Investments Limited v. Lead Total Limited Case No. DEU2025-0036

1. The Parties

The Complainant is Fergal Investments Limited, Cyprus, represented by REVERA Law Firm, Poland.

The Respondent is Lead Total Limited, Hong Kong, China.

2. The Domain Name, Registry and Registrar

The Registry of the disputed domain name <lets-lucky.eu> (the “Disputed Domain Name”) is the European Registry for Internet Domains (“EURid” or the “Registry”). The Registrar of the Disputed Domain Name is Registrar.eu.

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 Registry a request for registrar verification in connection with the Disputed Domain Name. On December 29, 2025, the Registry 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 (Lead Total Limited) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on January 6, 2026, providing the registrant and contact information disclosed by the Registry, and inviting the Complainant to submit an amendment to the Complaint. The Complainant filed an amended Complaint on January 14, 2026.

The Center verified that the Complaint together with the amended Complaint satisfied the formal requirements of the .eu Alternative Dispute Resolution Rules (the “ADR Rules”) and the World Intellectual Property Organization Supplemental Rules for .eu Alternative Dispute Resolution Rules (the “Supplemental Rules”).

In accordance with the ADR Rules, Paragraph B(2), the Center formally notified the Respondent of the Complaint, and the proceedings commenced on January 16, 2026. In accordance with the ADR Rules, Paragraph B(3), the due date for Response was February 5, 2026. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent’s default on February 6, 2026.

The Center appointed Nick J. Gardner as the sole panelist in this matter on February 11, 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 ADR Rules, Paragraph B(5).

4. Factual Background

In the absence of a Response the Panel accepts the following matters to be factually correct. The Complainant is a company incorporated under the laws of Cyprus. It operates, together with its partner Just Entertainment B.V., an online casino platform under the brand name “Let’s Lucky” at the domain name <www.lets lucky.com> (the “Original Website”), which was launched in May 2022. Just Entertainment B.V. holds a Curaçao E-gaming licence (No. OGL/2024/164/0246) under which the Let’s Lucky casino operates.

The Complainant registered the combined figurative/word mark LET’S LUCKY! as a European Union trade mark (EUTM No. 018768899) on February 4, 2023. The mark is registered in Classes 9, 28, 35, 38, 41, and 42, covering inter alia computer programs, slot machine games, provision of online games (including gambling and online casino services), and software as a service for gaming. This trademark is referred to as the LET’S LUCKY! Trademark in this decision.

The Disputed Domain Name was registered on July 16, 2025, by the Respondent which is a company incorporated in Hong Kong, China.

The website resolving from the Disputed Domain Name (the “Respondent’s Website”) has been used intermittently to display content that closely mimics the Original Website and which redirects users to third-party competing websites. At other times, the Respondent’s Website displays what appears to be a geo-blocking page claiming that the site is restricted in Australia pursuant to the Interactive Gambling Act 2001 and citing the Australian Communications and Media Authority (“ACMA”). In fact this is not a genuine geo-blocking page at all, but an imitation of such a page generated by the Respondent. When displayed it appears whenever an attempt is made by a user to access the Respondent’s Website irrespective of the geographic location of the user concerned. The ACMA has confirmed in correspondence that it has not requested any such block in respect of the Disputed Domain Name and that the blocking notice is not an official ACMA notification.

5. Parties’ Contentions

A. Complainant

The Complainant contends that the Disputed Domain Name is confusingly similar to the LET’S LUCKY! Trademark and to its common law rights in the LET’S LUCKY mark, which it has used continuously since May 2022 in connection with online casino and gaming services. The Complainant says that the addition of a hyphen between “lets” and “lucky” and the appending of the “.eu” country code Top-Level Domain (“ccTLD”) does not distinguish the Disputed Domain Name from its trademark. The ccTLD is disregarded for purposes of comparison as a standard technical requirement.

The Complainant contends that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in the Disputed Domain Name. It says the Respondent is not commonly known by the name “Let’s Lucky”, has not been authorised or licensed by the Complainant to use the LET’S LUCKY! Trademark, and has made no bona fide use of the Disputed Domain Name in connection with the offering of goods or services. Instead, the Disputed Domain Name has been used either to display a fraudulent geo-blocking page or to host a copy of the Complainant’s website that redirects users to competing online casino services.

The Complainant contends that the Disputed Domain Name was registered and is being used in bad faith. It says the Respondent, having registered the Disputed Domain Name at the height of the Complainant's growth in popularity (July 2025) and three years after the Complainant began using the mark, must have been aware of the LET'S LUCKY! Trademark. The Complainant relies upon the evidence of the Respondent's mirroring of its website in Google Search results as proof of actual knowledge. The Complainant says the Respondent's conduct constitutes bad faith under ADR Rules Paragraph B11(f)(4), in that the Disputed Domain Name was intentionally used to attract Internet users for commercial gain by creating a likelihood of confusion as to source, sponsorship, affiliation or endorsement.

B. Respondent

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

6. Discussion and Findings

Under Paragraph B(11)(d)(1) of the ADR Rules, the Panel shall issue a decision granting the remedy requested by the Complainant if the latter proves in the ADR proceeding that:

- (i) The Disputed Domain Name is identical or confusingly similar to a name in respect of which a right is recognized or established by the national law of a Member State and/or European Union law and; either
- (ii) The Disputed Domain Name has been registered by the Respondent without rights or legitimate interests in the name; or
- (iii) The Disputed Domain Name has been registered or is being used in bad faith.

The Panel notes that the ADR Rules list the issues under points (ii) and (iii) in the alternative, but nevertheless the Panel will examine both of these issues in order to reach its decision in the present ADR proceeding.

A. Identical or Confusingly Similar to a name in respect of which a right or rights are recognized or established by national law of a Member State and/or European Union law

The Complainant holds European Union Trade Mark No. 018768899 for the combined mark LET'S LUCKY!, registered on February 4, 2023. This registration constitutes a right established by European Union law for the purposes of Paragraph B11(d)(1)(i) of the ADR Rules. The Disputed Domain Name consists of the textual components "lets" and "lucky", separated by a hyphen, combined with the ".eu" ccTLD. Disregarding the ccTLD as a standard technical requirement (see e.g. *Lidl Stiftung & Co. KG v. Name Redacted*, WIPO Case No. [DEU2018-0012](#)), the Disputed Domain Name reproduces the textual elements of the LET'S LUCKY! Trademark in their entirety. The addition of a hyphen between "lets" and "lucky" is a minor typographical variation that does not prevent a finding of confusing similarity. It also does not matter that the LET'S LUCKY! Trademark is a device mark as the words "let's lucky" feature prominently and stylistic design elements can be ignored for the purposes of the comparison – see *Eiyolab v. Yave Fernandez Perez, Ayolabs S.L.*, WIPO Case No. [DEU2020-0015](#). The Panel finds the Disputed Domain Name is confusingly similar to the Complainant's LET'S LUCKY! Trademark.

In addition to its registered trademark rights, the Complainant asserts common law rights in the mark LET'S LUCKY arising from its continuous use of the mark in connection with online gaming services since May 2022. The Panel accepts that the evidence submitted — including website screenshots, third-party reviews, and Google Trends data showing a marked increase in searches for "Let's Lucky" following the platform's launch — is sufficient to establish unregistered trademark rights in the mark in the context of these proceedings.

Accordingly, the Panel finds that the first condition of Paragraph B11(d)(1)(i) of the ADR Rules has been satisfied.

B. Rights or Legitimate Interests

Paragraph B11(e) of the ADR Rules sets out circumstances that, if demonstrated, would establish the Respondent's rights or legitimate interests in the Disputed Domain Name. These are: (1) prior bona fide use of the domain name or demonstrable preparation for such use before notice of the dispute; (2) the Respondent being commonly known by the domain name; and (3) legitimate noncommercial or fair use of the domain name without intent to mislead consumers or harm the Complainant's reputation.

The Complainant has not authorised, licensed or permitted the Respondent to register or use the Disputed Domain Name or to use its LET'S LUCKY! Trademark. The Complainant has prior rights in the mark which predate the Respondent's registration of the Disputed Domain Name in July 2025. The Complainant has accordingly established a prima facie case that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in the Disputed Domain Name, and the burden of production accordingly shifts to the Respondent. The Respondent has not filed a Response. There is no evidence before the Panel that the Respondent has used the Disputed Domain Name in connection with a bona fide offering of goods or services. On the contrary, the evidence demonstrates that the Respondent's Website has displayed content that either fraudulently mimics an official blocking notice, or copies the Original Website and redirects users to competing services. Neither constitutes a bona fide offering of goods or services. There is no evidence that the Respondent is commonly known by the name "let's lucky", and the use is manifestly not legitimate noncommercial or fair use.

Accordingly, the Panel finds that the second condition of Paragraph B11(d)(1)(ii) of the ADR Rules has been satisfied.

C. Registered or Used in Bad Faith

Although the Panel has already found that the second condition of Paragraph B11(d)(1) of the ADR Rules has been satisfied, the Panel will also address bad faith, as the Complainant has made submissions on this ground and the ADR Rules present the second and third conditions in the alternative.

Paragraph B11(f)(4) of the ADR Rules provides that evidence of bad faith may be found where a domain name was intentionally used to attract Internet users, for commercial gain, to the Respondent's website by creating a likelihood of confusion with a name in respect of which a right is recognised or established by national or European Union law.

The Panel finds that the Respondent must have been aware of the Complainant's LET'S LUCKY! Trademark at the time it registered the Disputed Domain Name. The mark had been in active use since May 2022 in connection with a high-profile online casino platform targeting European Union consumers. The Disputed Domain Name was registered in July 2025, by which time the "Let's Lucky" brand had attracted considerable public attention, as evidenced by the Google Trends data submitted by the Complainant. The incorporation of the LET'S LUCKY! Trademark in its entirety into the Disputed Domain Name in circumstances where the Respondent has no conceivable legitimate use for the name is compelling evidence of registration in bad faith.

As to use in bad faith, the evidence demonstrates that the Respondent has used the Disputed Domain Name to host content that closely mimics the Complainant's website and which redirects users to competing online casino services, activities from which the Respondent plainly derives commercial gain. This conduct falls squarely within the circumstances described in Paragraph B11(f)(4) of the ADR Rules. The bogus nature of the intermittently displayed geo-blocking notice appears to be a further attempt by the Respondent to mislead consumers, although the Panel cannot discern the Respondent's motives in relation to the intermittent use of this bogus geo-blocking page. It does not however alter the Panel's analysis (above) as to the general position arising out of the Respondent's impersonation activities.

Accordingly, the Panel finds that the third condition of Paragraph B11(d)(1)(iii) of the ADR Rules has been satisfied.

7. Decision

For the foregoing reasons, in accordance with Paragraph B11 of the ADR Rules, the Panel orders that the disputed domain name <lets-lucky.eu> be transferred to the Complainant.¹ The Complainant, Fergal Investments Limited, being incorporated under the laws of Cyprus, satisfies the general eligibility criteria for registration of .eu domain names as an undertaking established in the European Union pursuant to Article 3(c) of Regulation (EU) 2019/517.

/Nick J. Gardner/

Nick J. Gardner

Sole Panelist

Date: February 25, 2026

¹The decision shall be implemented by the Registry within thirty (30) days after the notification of the decision to the Parties, unless the Respondent initiates court proceedings in a Mutual Jurisdiction, as defined in Paragraph A(1) of the ADR Rules.