

## **ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION**

Navasard Limited v. Manfred Jansson  
Case No. DSN2025-0001

### **1. The Parties**

The Complainant is Navasard Limited, Cyprus, represented by Šindelka & Lachmannová advokáti s.r.o., Czech Republic.

The Respondent is Manfred Jansson, Sweden.

### **2. The Domain Name and Registrar**

The disputed domain name <1xbets.sn> is registered with INWX GmbH & Co. KG (the “Registrar”).

### **3. Procedural History**

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the “Center”) on February 25, 2025. On February 26, 2025, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On February 27, 2025, the Registrar transmitted by email to the Center its verification response confirming that the Respondent is listed as the registrant and providing the contact details.

The Center verified that 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 March 6, 2025. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was March 26, 2025. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent’s default on March 27, 2025.



The Center appointed Simone Huser as the sole panelist in this matter on March 31, 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.

On April 3, 2025, the Complainant submitted an unsolicited supplemental filing.

#### 4. Factual Background

The Complainant is a company established in 2015 and organized under the laws of Cyprus. It belongs to a group of companies operating under the brand name 1XBET, an online gaming platform with worldwide reach. This platform is notably available through the <1xbet.com> domain name.

The Complainant currently owns different trademark registrations in several jurisdictions, including:

-  International trademark registration n° 1672896, registered on April 6, 2022, in international classes 41, 42 protected in Mexico;
-  United Kingdom (“UK”) trademark registration n° 00917517327, registered on March 7, 2018, in international classes 41, 42;
- 1XBET, UK trademark registration no. 00914227681, registered on September 21, 2015, in international classes 35, 41, 42.

Because the Respondent did not file a Response, not much is known about the Respondent.

The disputed domain name was registered on May 16, 2023.

According to the evidence submitted with the Complaint, the disputed domain name resolves to a website reproducing the 1XBET trademark, the Senegal flag and purporting offering online betting and gambling services, including purporting offering bonuses for the 1XBET online gaming platform for users from Senegal.

#### 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 name.

Notably, the Complainant contends as follows:

The disputed domain name is confusingly similar to the 1XBET trademark in which the Complainant has rights, because it incorporates this trademark in its entirety, and the addition of the letter “s” is not sufficient to avoid confusing similarity.

The Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the disputed domain name. The Respondent has not been authorized by the Complainant to use this trademark, is not commonly known by the disputed domain name, and there is no evidence of the Respondent’s use, or demonstrable preparation to use, the disputed domain name in connection with a bona fide offering of goods and services.

The disputed domain name was registered in bad faith because it is obvious that the Respondent had knowledge of both the Complainant and its widely-known 1XBET trademark at the time it registered the disputed domain name.

The Respondent is using the disputed domain name in bad faith, as the disputed domain name resolves to a website repeatedly displaying the 1XBET trademark. The reference to the 1XBET trademark aims at attracting the Internet users’ attention and infer that the website is affiliated to the Complainant, which is not the case.

## **B. Respondent**

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

## **6. Discussion and Findings**

### **6.1. Procedural Issues: Unsolicited Supplemental Filing**

The Complainant submitted an unsolicited supplemental filing on April 3, 2025.

The Rules, paragraphs 10 and 12, grant the Panel sole discretion to determine the admissibility of unsolicited supplemental filings. While paragraph 10(d) states that: "The Panel shall determine the admissibility, relevance, materiality and weight of the evidence", paragraph 12 provides that: "In addition to the complaint and the response, the Panel may request, in its sole discretion, further statements or documents from either of the Parties."

The principles which the Panel should apply in deciding whether or not to admit unsolicited supplemental filings have been considered in many cases under the Policy and have meanwhile been widely agreed among UDRP panels, in that such supplemental filings should be generally discouraged and only be accepted in "exceptional circumstances" (WIPO Overview of WIPO Panel Views on Selected UDRP Questions, Third Edition (["WIPO Overview 3.0"](#)), section 4.6).

In the case at hand, the Complainant's supplemental filing provides further explanation in relation to the Complainant's rights to the sign "1XBET" as some of the registered trademarks mentioned in the Complaint have been transferred to a third party before the filing of the Complaint. The Panel notes that nothing in the submission would have been unavailable to the Complainant at the time the Complaint was filed. The Panel does not find here exceptional circumstances that would allow the Panel to accept the supplemental filing.

In these circumstances, the Complainant's supplemental filing will not be taken into consideration.

### **6.2. Substantive Issues**

According to paragraph 4(a) of the Policy, in order to succeed, a complainant must establish each of the following elements:

- (i) the disputed domain name is identical or confusingly similar to the 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 name; and
- (iii) the disputed domain name has been registered and is being used in bad faith.

#### **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 3.0](#), section 1.7.

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 mark is reproduced within the disputed domain name.

The addition of the letter "s" to the disputed domain name does not prevent a finding of confusing similarity under the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 1.8.

The addition of the country code Top-Level Domain “.sn” in the disputed domain name is a standard registration requirement and as such may be disregarded under the confusing similarity test under the Policy, paragraph 4(a)(i). See [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 1.11.1.

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.

Although the overall burden of proof in UDRP proceedings is on the complainant, panels have recognized that for a complainant to prove that a respondent lacks rights or legitimate interests in a domain name may result in the difficult 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 (although the burden of proof always remains on the complainant). 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 available record, the Panel finds the Complainant has established a prima facie case that the Respondent lacks rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name. In particular, the Complainant has shown that the Respondent has used the disputed domain name to host a website featuring prominently the 1XBET trademark and purporting to offer bonuses for the 1XBET online gaming platform, mainly for users from Senegal, which does not qualify as a legitimate use of the disputed domain name. The Complainant contends that it has not given its consent for the Respondent to use its 1XBET trademark in a domain name registration or in any other manner. The website does not indicate any clear explanation on its (lack of) relationship with the Complainant.

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 disputed domain name such as those enumerated in the Policy or otherwise.

All the above taken together supports a conclusion that the Respondent has targeted the Complainant’s trademark with the registration and use of the disputed domain name in an attempt to attract Internet users to its website to create an improper commercial advantage.

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.

Paragraph 4(b) of the Policy sets out a list of non-exhaustive circumstances that may indicate that a domain name was registered and used in bad faith, but other circumstances may be relevant in assessing whether a respondent’s registration and use of a domain name is in bad faith. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 3.2.1.

In the view of the Panel, noting that that the Complainant’s trademark predates the registration of the disputed domain name and considering that the Complainant’s trademark is widely known and that the disputed domain name resolves to a website featuring the Complainant’s trademark and services, it is inconceivable that the Respondent could have registered the disputed domain name without knowledge of the Complainant’s trademark. In the circumstances of this case, this is evidence of registration in bad faith.

As described above, the disputed domain name resolves to a website purportedly offering bonuses for the 1XBET online gaming platform, mainly for users from Senegal. The impression given by this website would cause Internet users to believe that the Respondent is somehow associated with the Complainant and the 1XBET online gaming platform when, in fact, it is not. The Panel holds that by using the disputed domain name, the Respondent has intentionally attempted to attract, for commercial gain, Internet users to its website, by creating a likelihood of confusion with the Complainant's mark as to the source, sponsorship, affiliation, or endorsement of its website in the sense of Policy, paragraph 4(b)(iv).

Based on the available record, the Panel finds that the Complainant has established the third element of the Policy with regard to the disputed domain name.

## **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 name <1xbets.sn> be transferred to the Complainant.

*/Simone Huser/*

**Simone Huser**

Sole Panelist

Date: April 14, 2025