

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

Aplus Limited v. Supaporn Somarri, dollars
Case No. D2026-0008

1. The Parties

The Complainant is Aplus Limited, Marshall Islands, represented by JusTec Brand Protection, United States of America.

The Respondent is Supaporn Somarri, dollars, Thailand.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <8xbetpp.com> is registered with Name.com, Inc. (the “Registrar”).

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the “Center”) on January 2, 2026. On January 5, 2026, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On January 6, 2026, 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 (Redacted for Privacy) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on January 12, 2026, 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 January 12, 2026.

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 January 16, 2026. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, 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 11, 2026.

The Center appointed Iris Quadrio as the sole panelist in this matter on February 24, 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.

4. Factual Background

The Complainant is Aplus Limited, which operates an online gambling platform under its trademark 8XBET through its website at “www.8xbet.com”, which was created on January 19, 2020. The platform provides online betting and gambling services to users via the Internet.

The 8XBET brand has been used in commerce since at least January 1, 2022, in connection with online gambling and related entertainment services. According to the record, the 8XBET designation has obtained widespread consumer recognition and functions as an identifier associated with the Complainant’s services.

The Complainant promotes its 8XBET brand internationally, including through sponsorship and partnership arrangements with professional football clubs. These partnerships include, among others, Manchester City Football Club, Chelsea Football Club, AFC Bournemouth, Sunderland AFC, and Leicester City Football Club.

The Complainant is the owner of the trademark 8XBET in the following jurisdictions: (i) United Kingdom: Reg. No. UK00004069425, registered since September 27, 2024, for class 41; and (ii) European Union: Reg. No. 019047807, registered since October 12, 2024, for class 41.

The Complainant is also owner of the following trademarks in the United States of America: (i) 8XBET (stylized mark): Reg. No. 7734929, registered since March 25, 2025, for class 41; and (ii) 8XBET word mark): Reg. No. 7485266, registered since August 27, 2024, for class 41.

The record indicates that the Complainant began using the 8XBET designation in connection with its online gambling services as early as January 1, 2022. The Complainant also relies on trademark registrations for 8XBET, including a registration with the United States Patent and Trademark Office (“USPTO”), Registration No. 7485266, registered on August 8, 2024, which postdates the registration of the disputed domain name.

The Complainant also states that it owns copyright in the content published on its official website, including graphical elements, branding, and other promotional materials associated with the 8XBET platform.

The disputed domain name <8xbetpp.com> was registered on July 4, 2024.

According to the evidence submitted with the Complaint, the disputed domain name previously resolved to a website that purported to offer gambling services similar to those provided by the Complainant. Further evidence indicates that the website displayed elements resembling the Complainant’s branding, including the 8XBET mark, a logo and color scheme similar to that used by the Complainant. The website appeared to present services comparable to those offered through the Complainant’s platform, although the record does not establish whether such services were in fact operational.

At the time of this Decision, however, the disputed domain name does not resolve to an active website. Attempts to access the disputed domain name result in a browser error message indicating that the server cannot be found.

The Respondent is identified as Supaporn Somarri, dollars, located in Thailand. The record does not indicate any relationship between the Complainant and the Respondent, nor does it indicate that the Complainant has authorized the Respondent to register or use any domain name incorporating the 8XBET mark.

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 that the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to its trademarks, on which the Complainant claims rights. The Complainant asserts that the disputed domain name incorporates the trademark 8XBET in its entirety, thereby creating a likelihood of confusion among Internet users as to the source, sponsorship, affiliation, or endorsement of the disputed domain name.

The Complainant further contends that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the disputed domain name and that the Respondent is not related in any way to the Complainant. The Complainant states that it has not authorized, licensed, or otherwise permitted the Respondent to use the trademarks or to register any domain name incorporating these.

Moreover, the Complainant contends that the disputed domain name was registered and used in bad faith. In particular, the Complainant asserts that the website associated with the disputed domain name reproduced the Complainant's branding and purported to offer gambling services similar to those provided by the Complainant. According to the Complainant, this conduct is intended to mislead Internet users into believing that the website is owned by or affiliated with the Complainant.

B. Respondent

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

6. Discussion and Findings

According to paragraph 4(a) of the Policy, for this Complaint to succeed in relation to the disputed domain name, the Complainant must prove each of the following, namely that:

- the disputed domain name is identical or confusingly similar with a trademark or service mark in which the Complainant has rights; and
- the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interest in respect of the disputed domain name; and
- the disputed domain name was 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 of WIPO Panel Views on Select UDRP Questions ("[WIPO Overview 3.1](#)"), section 1.7.

As noted in [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), the term "trademark or service mark" as used in paragraph 4(a)(i) of the Policy encompasses both registered and unregistered (also referred to as common law) marks. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.1.1.

The Complainant has shown rights in respect of a trademark or service mark for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.2.1.

The Complainant asserts that it has used the designation 8XBET in connection with its online gambling services since at least January 2022 and that the mark has acquired consumer recognition through its online activities and commercial partnerships with professional football clubs. The Panel notes that the evidence submitted with the Complaint includes references to such commercial activities and promotional partnerships associated with the 8XBET brand.

The Panel finds the mark is recognizable within the disputed domain name. Accordingly, the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to the mark for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.7.

Disregarding the generic Top-Level Domain (“gTLD”) “.com”, which is viewed as a standard registration requirement and as such is typically ignored in the confusing similarity test, the disputed domain name incorporates the Complainant’s 8XBET mark in its entirety. The disputed domain name differs from the mark only by the addition of “pp”.

Although the addition of other terms, here “pp”, may bear on assessment of the second and third elements, the Panel finds the addition of such term does not prevent a finding of confusing similarity between the disputed domain name and the mark for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.8.

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 proving 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 3.1](#), 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. 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.

The Complainant asserts that it has not authorized, licensed, or otherwise permitted the Respondent to use the trademarks or to register any domain name incorporating these. There is no evidence in the record suggesting that the Respondent has been commonly known by the disputed domain name or that the Respondent holds any trademark or other rights corresponding to the disputed domain name. The available Registrar verification identifies the registrant as Supaporn Somarri, dollars, which does not correspond to the disputed domain name.

Furthermore, the evidence submitted with the Complaint indicates that the disputed domain name previously resolved to a website that purported to offer gambling services similar to those provided by the Complainant and displayed elements reproducing the Complainant’s branding, including the 8XBET name and visual design elements. According to the Complaint, this presentation was likely intended to give Internet users the impression that the website was affiliated with or endorsed by the Complainant.

Panels have held that the use of a domain name for illegitimate activity, here claimed as impersonation/passing off, can never confer rights or legitimate interests on a respondent. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 2.13.1.

In light of the above circumstances, the Panel finds that the Respondent has not demonstrated any rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name.

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.

In the present case, the Panel notes that the circumstances of paragraph 4(b)(iv) of the Policy are applicable. Under this provision, bad faith may be found where a respondent, by using a domain name, intentionally attempts to attract, for commercial gain, Internet users to a website or other online location by creating a likelihood of confusion with the complainant's mark as to the source, sponsorship, affiliation, or endorsement of the website or of a product or service on the website.

The Panel notes that the disputed domain name was registered on July 4, 2024, whereas the Complainant's trademark registration for 8XBET was obtained subsequently. The USPTO record indicates, however, that the Complainant's trademark application had been filed prior to the registration of the disputed domain name and reflects a claimed first use in commerce dating from January 1, 2022. In addition, the Complainant's domain name was created on January 19, 2020. While the evidence on record does not necessarily demonstrate that the Complainant's mark had become widely known at the time of the disputed domain name's registration, the Panel considers the Respondent's use of the disputed domain name to be highly relevant in assessing the Respondent's intent.

As noted in the [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), panels have in certain circumstances found bad faith where a domain name is registered in anticipation of a complainant's nascent trademark rights, particularly where the surrounding facts indicate that the respondent sought to unfairly capitalize on the complainant's emerging mark. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 3.8.2.

In the present case, the Panel considers that the Respondent's use of the disputed domain name in connection with a website reproducing the Complainant's branding, logo, and visual presentation strongly suggests awareness of the Complainant's activities and supports the conclusion that the Respondent sought to capitalize on the Complainant's developing trademark rights.

The evidence submitted with the Complaint indicates that the disputed domain name previously resolved to a website that reproduced elements associated with the Complainant's branding, including the 8XBET mark, logo, and characteristic visual design. The website also purported to offer gambling services similar to those provided by the Complainant. In the Panel's view, the reproduction of the Complainant's mark, logo, color scheme, and overall visual presentation strongly suggests that the Respondent was aware of the Complainant and intentionally sought to create an impression of affiliation with the Complainant's services.

In these circumstances, the Panel considers it more likely than not that the Respondent registered and used the disputed domain name with the intention of attracting Internet users by creating a likelihood of confusion with the Complainant's mark as to the source, sponsorship, affiliation, or endorsement of the website and the services offered on it.

Panels have held that the use of a domain name for illegitimate activity, here claimed as impersonation/passing off, constitutes bad faith. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 3.4. Having reviewed the record, the Panel finds the Respondent's registration and use of the disputed domain name constitutes bad faith under the Policy.

The Panel further notes that the disputed domain name currently resolves to an inactive page and does not host an active website. Panels have found that the non-use of a domain name does not prevent a finding of bad faith under the doctrine of passive holding, particularly where the surrounding circumstances indicate that the domain name was registered with a misleading purpose. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 3.3.

Having reviewed the totality of the circumstances in this case, the Panel finds that the Respondent registered and used the disputed domain name in bad faith.

The Panel finds that the Complainant has established the third element of 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 name <8xbetpp.com> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Iris Quadrio/

Iris Quadrio

Sole Panelist

Date: March 11, 2026