

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

BoyleSports 2 Unlimited Company v. Host Master, Njalla Okta LLC
Case No. D2026-0622

1. The Parties

The Complainant is BoyleSports 2 Unlimited Company, Ireland, represented by FRKelly, Ireland.

The Respondent is Host Master, Njalla Okta LLC, Saint Kitts and Nevis.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <boylesportsapp.com> is registered with Tucows Domains Inc. (the "Registrar").

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the "Center") on February 13, 2026. On February 13, 2026, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On February 13, 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 ("Registrant of www.boylesportsapp.com") and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on February 16, 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 February 18, 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 February 23, 2026. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was March 15, 2026. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent's default on March 16, 2026.

The Center appointed Andrew F. Christie as the sole panelist in this matter on March 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.

4. Factual Background

The Complainant is a provider of bookmaking and betting services and has been operating in the industry for over 40 years. Established in Ireland since its founding, its services are available both locally and internationally through its network of retail betting outlets and its online platforms, making them readily accessible to consumers in Ireland, and the United Kingdom. The Complainant has grown extensively and is now one of the largest bookmakers operating on the island of Ireland. As of 2025, the Complainant operates over 390 retail betting shops across Ireland, and the United Kingdom. In addition, it has provided online betting services for many years through its official website at “www.boylesports.com”.

The Complainant owns a number of registrations in the European Union, and the United Kingdom for word trademarks and figurative trademarks consisting of, or containing, the string “boyle”, including: United Kingdom Trade Mark No. 00004252081 (registered on November 7, 2025) for the word trademark BOYLE; United Kingdom Trade Mark No. 00003673446 (registered on December 10, 2021), and European Union Trade Mark No. 18522682 (registered on January 18, 2022), both for the word trademark BOYLEXTRA; and United Kingdom Trade Mark No. 00004199962 (registered on August 8, 2025) and European Union Trade Mark No. 019183634 (registered September 14, 2025), both for the figurative trademark **BOYLE**^{SPORTS} (the “BOYLESports figurative trademark”).

The disputed domain name was registered on July 29, 2024. The Complainant provided screenshots of Internet Archive WayBack Machine captures of the website to which the disputed domain name resolved on September 27, 2024, and October 16, 2024. The website was headed “BoyleSports”, with the homepage offering for download the “BoyleSports App”, which was said to provide “an optimized sports betting experience ... featuring live streaming and real time odds”. The “About Us” page of the website stated, among other things, “Established in 1982, BoyleSports has grown from a single betting shop to the largest independent bookmaker in Ireland”.

As at the date of this Decision, the disputed domain name does not resolve to an active website.

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.

The Complainant contends that the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to a trademark in which it has rights, on the following grounds, among others. The disputed domain name incorporates the dominant and distinctive element “boyle”, which is the first and most prominent component of the Complainant’s trademarks. It merely adds the element “sports”, which is a generic and descriptive term that directly relates to the Complainant’s core field of business. The disputed domain name includes in its entirety the Complainant’s BOYLESports trademark, which is inherently distinctive and is recognizable in the disputed domain name.

The Complainant contends that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name on the following grounds, among others. The Complainant has no affiliation with the Respondent, and has not authorized the Respondent to register or use a domain name that includes the Complainant’s trademarks. The Respondent clearly knew of Complainant’s rights when acquiring the disputed domain name and setting up its website. There is no commercial advantage in setting up such website other than to

trade on the Complainant's reputation or to sell the disputed domain name to the Complainant or a competitor.

The Complainant contends that the Respondent has registered and is using the disputed domain name in bad faith on the following grounds, among others. The registration of a domain name that is identical or confusingly similar to a well-known trademark by an unaffiliated entity can, in itself, give rise to a presumption of bad faith. This is particularly the case where the trademark is highly distinctive and widely known, such that it is inconceivable that the respondent was unaware of the complainant's rights at the time of registration. In the present case, this presumption is clearly applicable. Given the longstanding and well-established reputation of the BOYLE and BOYLESports trademarks in the United Kingdom, and Ireland, the Respondent's registration of the disputed domain name could only have been made with knowledge of the Complainant and with the intention of capitalizing on the Complainant's goodwill and reputation. The Respondent is clearly seeking to cause confusion for their own commercial benefit. The Respondent has not only incorporated the Complainant's trademarks into the disputed domain name, but also has historically presented its website in a manner that closely imitates the Complainant's branding. The Respondent expressly held itself out as the Complainant, including references to the Complainant's longstanding history and established reputation under the BOYLE and BOYLESports brands. The Respondent falsely suggested an affiliation with, or endorsement by, the Complainant. The Complainant is the only established and reputable Irish gambling operator associated with the BOYLE and BOYLESports trademarks. The Respondent's use of the Complainant's trademarks constitutes a clear attempt to deceive consumers and exploit the Complainant's established goodwill. Internet users are likely to be misled into believing that the disputed domain name is associated with the Complainant, demonstrating that the Respondent has registered and is using the disputed domain name in bad faith.

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 Select UDRP Questions ("[WIPO Overview 3.1](#)"), section 1.7.

The Complainant has shown rights in respect of a trademark or service mark for the purposes of the Policy. It is the owner of registrations for the BOYLESports figurative trademark.

The entirety of the textual component of the Complainant's BOYLESports figurative trademark is reproduced within the disputed domain name, succeeded by the word "app". As stated in [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.8: "Where the relevant trademark is recognizable within the disputed domain name, the addition of other terms (whether descriptive, geographical, pejorative, meaningless, or otherwise) would not prevent a finding of confusing similarity under the first element." In this case, the textual component of the Complainant's figurative trademark is recognizable within the disputed domain name, and the addition of the word "app" does not prevent a finding of confusing similarity under the first element.

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.

The Respondent is not a licensee of the Complainant, is not otherwise affiliated with the Complainant, and has not been authorized by the Complainant to use its BOYLE, or BOYLESports trademarks. The Respondent has not provided any evidence that it has been commonly known by, or has made a bona fide use of, the disputed domain name, or that it has, for any other reason, rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name. The composition of the disputed domain name carries a risk of implied affiliation with the Complainant. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 2.5.1.

The evidence establishes that the Respondent has used the disputed domain name to resolve to a website which reproduces the Complainant’s BOYLE word trademark and the textual component of the Complainant’s BOYLESports figurative trademark, purports to offer for download an app for sports betting, and falsely claims to be a website of the Complainant. Panels have held that the use of a domain name to imply a commercial affiliation that does not exist can never confer rights or legitimate interests on a respondent.

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 Panel finds the second element of the Policy has been established.

C. Registered and Used in Bad Faith

In the present case, the Panel notes that: (i) the Respondent registered the disputed domain name many decades after the Complainant first used its BOYLE trademark for betting; (ii) the disputed domain name incorporates the entirety of the textual component of the Complainant’s BOYLESports figurative trademark, and merely adds the word “app”; and (iii) the Respondent has used the disputed domain name to resolve to a website that contains the Complainant’s BOYLE word trademark and the textual component of the Complainant’s BOYLESports figurative trademark, and which claims to be a website of the Complainant. It is clear the Respondent registered the disputed domain name with knowledge of the Complainant, its betting operations, and its BOYLE trademark.

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. The evidence shows that the Respondent has used the disputed domain name in an intentional attempt to attract, apparently for commercial gain, Internet users to a website by creating a likelihood of confusion with the Complainant’s trademarks.

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 <boylesportsapp.com> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Andrew F. Christie/

Andrew F. Christie

Sole Panelist

Date: April 9, 2026