

## **ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION**

BoyleSports 2 Unlimited Company v. Sofia Ramirez  
Case No. D2026-0624

### **1. The Parties**

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

The Respondent is Sofia Ramirez, Ukraine.

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

The disputed domain name <boylesports-ireland.com> (the “Domain Name”) is registered with Dynadot 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 Domain Name. On February 18, 2026, the Registrar transmitted by email to the Center its verification response disclosing registrant and contact information for the Domain Name which differed from the named Respondent (Super Privacy Service LTD c/o Dynadot) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on February 19, 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 19, 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 18, 2026.

The Center appointed Wolter Wefers Bettink 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.

#### **4. Further Procedural Considerations**

Under paragraph 10 of the Rules, the Panel is required to ensure that the Parties are treated with equality and that each Party is given a fair opportunity to present its case, and also that the administrative proceeding takes place with due expedition.

Since the Respondent's mailing address is stated to be in Ukraine, which is subject to an international conflict at the date of this Decision that may impact case notification, it is appropriate for the Panel to consider, in accordance with its discretion under paragraph 10 of the Rules, whether the proceeding should continue.

Having considered all the circumstances of the case, the Panel is of the view that it should. The Panel notes that the notification of the Complaint was delivered to the email address of the Respondent, provided by the Registrar. In addition, the Center sent the same communication to the Registrar, together with the Domain Holder Contact Request Form provided by the Registrar. The Panel understands that the Registrar uses this form to send a communication to the Respondent if, as in this case, the email address of the Respondent has been shielded for privacy reasons. It is moreover noted that, for the reasons which are set out later in this Decision, the Panel has no doubt that the Respondent registered and has used the Domain Name in bad faith and with the intention of unfairly targeting the Complainant's goodwill in its trademarks and misleading consumers.

The Panel concludes that the Parties have been given a fair opportunity to present their case, and so that the administrative proceeding takes place with due expedition the Panel will proceed to a Decision accordingly.

#### **5. Factual Background**

The Complainant is a provider of bookmaking and betting services, founded in 1982. The Complainant has been established in Ireland since its founding and 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. As of 2025, the Complainant operates over 390 retail betting shops across Ireland and the United Kingdom.

The Complainant has rights in a number of registered trade marks containing the element BOYLE including (hereinafter "the Trade Marks"):

- United Kingdom Trade Mark BOYLECASINO registered under No. UK00004252091 as of November 7, 2025;
- United Kingdom Trade Mark BOYLELIVECASINO registered under No. UK00004252102 as of November 7, 2025;
- United Kingdom Trade Mark BOYLE registered under No. UK00004252081 as of November 7, 2025;
- European Union Trade Mark BOYLESPOUNTS THIS IS BETTING (figurative) registered under No. 18522676 as of January 18, 2022;
- European Union Trade Mark BOYLEXTRA registered under No. 018522682 as of January 18, 2022;
- European Union Trade Mark BOYLELOTTO registered under No. 018522696 as of September 13, 2022;
- United Kingdom Trade Mark BOYLESPOUNTS (figurative) registered under No. UK00004199962 (series of 2 marks) as of August 8, 2025;
- European Union Trade Mark BOYLESPOUNTS (figurative) registered under No. 019183634 as of

September 14, 2025;

The Domain Name was registered on December 15, 2025 and resolves to a website containing the figurative Trade Mark BOYLESports and featuring the same blue background color as used on the Complainant's website under the domain name <boylesports.com> (the "Complainant Website"). At the bottom of the Respondent's website (the "Website") is written "BoyleSports - Ireland's Premier Gaming Entertainment". Under the FAQ section on the home page of the Website it is stated that the company was founded in 1982 in Ireland and has a licence from the "UK Gambling Commission and the Gibraltar Gambling Commissioner". When the Panelist visited the Website and activated buttons, such as "Play Now", "Get Bonus," or "Registration", he was redirected to a website under the domain name <legionbet.com>, with a logo "Legionbet", a competitor of the Complainant.

## **6. Parties' Contentions**

### **A. Complainant**

The Complainant contends that it has satisfied each of the elements required under the Policy for a transfer of the Domain Name.

Notably, the Complainant contends that the Domain Name is confusingly similar to the Trade Marks, as it incorporates the Trade Mark BOYLESports in its entirety, as well as the dominant and distinctive element BOYLE of the Trade Marks. The additional element "Ireland" in the Domain Name is a non-distinctive term that will be understood as an indication of geographical origin. It is widely established that domain names that incorporate a generic or non-distinctive word alongside the dominant elements of the marks involved are considered to be confusingly similar to the earlier registered mark.

Use of the Domain Name is causing or will continue to cause damage to the Complainant's goodwill and reputation. Where the Domain Name is identical or virtually identical to the Trade Marks, a likelihood of damage may be inferred. The Website further reinforces this confusion as the content, presentation, and overall impression closely resembles the branding and services on the Complainant Website, demonstrating that the Respondent is intentionally seeking to capitalise on the reputation and goodwill attached to the Trade Marks. The use of the BOYLESports Trade Mark in connection with betting-related services makes clear that the Respondent is attempting to pass itself off as the Complainant or to create a false association with the Complainant.

Furthermore, on the Website the Respondent is presenting itself as the Complainant which, together with the promotion of online betting services, clearly demonstrates that the Respondent was aware of the Complainant and deliberately sought to exploit the goodwill associated with the Trade Marks. Such use is inherently misleading and serves to heighten the likelihood of confusion among Internet users. Such conduct is a clear act of intentional confusion on the consumer and visitors of the Website and the resulting confusion is likely to divert Internet traffic away from the Complainant and cause reputational harm.

The Complainant submits that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the Domain Name. The Complainant has no affiliation with the Respondent, nor has it authorized the Respondent to register or use the Domain Name, or any other domain name including the Trade Marks. The Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in the registration and use of the Domain Name. Furthermore, the Respondent has acted in bad faith in acquiring the Domain Name and setting up the Website, when the Respondent clearly knew of the Trade Marks. There is no commercial advantage in setting up such website other than to trade on the Complainant's reputation or to sell the Domain Name to the Complainant or a competitor. By setting up the Website under the Domain Name, the Respondent is clearly seeking to cause confusion for their own commercial benefit.

Moreover, throughout the Website the Respondent falsely suggests an affiliation with the Complainant, mentioning the longstanding reputation of the Trade Marks in the United Kingdom and Ireland and referring to the Website as "Ireland's Premier Gaming Entertainment". Additionally, redirecting users to unrelated

betting sites demonstrates that the Respondent's intent is not to operate a legitimate website under the Domain Name, but rather to exploit the Complainant's reputation and goodwill for commercial gain in bad faith.

In conclusion, the Respondent's use of the Trade Marks, combined with the imitation of branding and the redirection of users to a different commercial online betting site, 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 Domain Name is associated with the Complainant, demonstrating that the Respondent has registered and is using the Domain Name in bad faith.

## **B. Respondent**

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

## **7. Discussion and Findings**

### **A. Identical or Confusingly Similar**

The Complainant has shown that it has registered rights in the Trade Marks. The Domain Name is confusingly similar to the Trade Marks as it incorporates the BOYLESports Trade Mark in its entirety. The addition of the term "ireland" in the Domain Name does not avoid a finding of confusing similarity between the Domain Name and the Trade Marks (see WIPO Overview of WIPO Panel Views on Select UDRP Questions ("[WIPO Overview 3.1](#)"), section 1.8; see also, inter alia, *Playboy Enterprises International, Inc. v. Zeynel Demirtas*, WIPO Case No. [D2007-0768](#) and *Allianz SE v. IP Legal, Allianz Bank Limited*, WIPO Case No. [D2017-0287](#). The generic Top-Level-Domain ("gTLD") ".com" is typically disregarded under the confusing similarity test, since it is a technical registration requirement ([WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.11.1). Therefore, the Panel finds that the Domain Name is confusingly similar to the Trade Marks in which the Complainant has rights.

### **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 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. See [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 2.1.

Based on the evidence and the undisputed submissions of the Complainant, the Panel concludes that the Respondent has not received the Complainant's authorization or consent to use the Trade Marks as part of the Domain Name, is not commonly known by the Domain Name, and has not acquired trade mark rights in the Domain Name. In addition, the Respondent's use of the Domain Name does not constitute a bona fide offering of goods or services, nor a legitimate noncommercial or fair use of the Trade Marks. First, the Website uses the BOYLESports Trade Mark and the blue background color of the Complainant Website, while offering services identical to those offered on the Complainant Website. This creates the false impression of being operated by the Complainant. Furthermore, when the user clicks a button on the Website, it is redirected to the website of a competitor of the Complainant.

In view of the above, the Panel concludes that the Complainant has established that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in the Domain Name.

### **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. This list of non-exhaustive circumstances that may indicate that a domain name was registered and used in bad faith, leaves open that other circumstances may be relevant in assessing whether a respondent's registration and use of a domain name is in bad faith. See [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 3.2.1.

Based on the undisputed information and the evidence provided by the Complainant, the Panel finds that at the time of registration of the Domain Name the Respondent was or should have been aware of the Trade Marks, since:

- the Respondent's registration of the Domain Name occurred some five years after the registration of the earliest of the Trade Marks;
- the Website willfully creates confusion with the Complainant Website, by using the BOYLESports Trade Mark and the same blue background color, while offering identical services and referring to the Complainant's company history.

Since the Respondent has no authorization from or other affiliation with the Complainant, and was or should have been aware of the Complainant's rights at the time of registration, the Domain Name was registered in bad faith.

With regard to bad faith use, the Panel finds that the use of the Trade Mark on the Website for offering services identical as the Complainant, while redirecting users who activate a button on the Website to the website of a competitor of the Complainant, indicates that the Respondent has intentionally attempted to attract, for commercial gain, Internet users to its website, by creating a likelihood of confusion with the Trade Marks and the Complainant as to the source, sponsorship, affiliation, or endorsement of the Website and the services offered. In addition, the following circumstances taken together warrant a finding of bad faith use of the Domain Name:

- the probability that the Respondent was aware or should have been aware of the Complainant's rights in the Trade Marks;
- the lack of a formal Response of the Respondent;
- the use upon registration of the Domain Name of a proxy service and, as disclosed by the Registrar, an incomplete or non-existing address, apparently to hide the identity of the Respondent.

Therefore, the Panel concludes that the Domain Name has been registered and is being used in bad faith.

### **8. 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 <boylesports-ireland.com> be transferred to the Complainant.

*/Wolter Wefers Bettink/*

**Wolter Wefers Bettink**

Sole Panelist

Date: April 9, 2026