

## **ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION**

**Kaizen Gaming International Limited v. Bruno Pierre**  
**Case No. D2026-0665**

### **1. The Parties**

The Complainant is Kaizen Gaming International Limited, Malta, represented by Ubilibet, S.L., Spain.

The Respondent is Bruno Pierre, France.

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

The disputed domain name <betano-casino.org> is registered with NameCheap, Inc. (the “Registrar”).

### **3. Procedural History**

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the “Center”) on February 12, 2026. On February 16, 2026, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On February 16, 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 and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on February 17, 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 17, 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 March 2, 2026. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was March 22, 2026. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent’s default on March 24, 2026.

The Center appointed David Stone as the sole panelist in this matter on March 30, 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 was established in 2012 and provides online gaming products and services.

The Complainant owns, among others, the following trademarks for BETANO (the "Mark"):

- European Union trademark registration no. 014893671 registered on March 23, 2016 in international classes 9, 41 and 42; and
- International registration no. 1797844 registered on April 24, 2024 in international class 41.

The Complainant owns, among others, the following domain names: <betanocasino.com>, <betano-casino.net>, <betano-casino.eu> and <betanocasino.net>.

On April 14, 2025, the Respondent registered the disputed domain name. At the filing of the Complaint and at the date of this Decision, the disputed domain name resolves to a website that displays prominently the Mark together with the Complainant's logo device and states in the webpage title "Betano Casino Official Site in Greece 2025". The website hosted at the disputed domain name also encourages user registration and lists various methods of making monetary transactions.

#### **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.

Under the first element, the Complainant contends that the disputed domain name displays the Mark in full. It also contends that the addition of the term "casino" only increases the risk of confusion as the term is descriptive of the Complainant's activity.

Under the second element, the Complainant contends that it has not authorized, licensed or permitted the Respondent or any third party to use the Mark in the disputed domain name. The Complainant also contends that there is no evidence of any prior use by the Respondent of the disputed domain name, or a name corresponding thereto, in connection with a bona fide offering of goods or services.

Under the third element, the Complainant contends that the Mark is well-known and the term "betano" has no meaning as such. It contends that the Respondent was aware of the Mark and that mere coincidence in the choice of the disputed domain name is highly unlikely. The Respondent chose a domain name structure very similar to those used by the Complainant. In the alternative, the Complainant contends that the Respondent should have known of the Complainant's rights in the Mark at the time of registration. The Complainant also contends that the website at the disputed domain name operates as an online gaming and betting platform, offering real-money casino services such as slots, table games, and related promotions, targeting an adult audience. The disputed domain name is not only being used for commercial gain, but the Respondent is also taking unfair advantage of the Complainant's reputation and renown by reproducing the Mark.

## **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. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.2.1.

The entirety of the Mark is reproduced 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.

Although the addition of other terms, here "casino", 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.

Further, panels have held that the use of a domain name for illegitimate activity, here claimed passing off (albeit not claimed in terms), can never confer rights or legitimate interests on a respondent. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 2.13.1.

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 (i) the Respondent registered the disputed domain name, which is confusingly similar to the Mark for the reasons already given; (ii) the disputed domain name is also highly similar in nature to <betano-casino.net>, a domain name owned and used by the Complainant that differs only in generic top-level domain; (iii) the website hosted at the disputed domain name displays prominently the Mark together with the Complainant's logo device and states in the webpage title "Betano Casino Official Site in Greece 2025"; and (iv) the website hosted at the disputed domain name encourages user registration and lists various methods of making monetary transactions.

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 3.1](#), section 3.2.1.

Panels have found that evidence of a respondent seeking to cause confusion supports a finding that a respondent has registered a domain name to attract, for commercial gain, Internet users to its website by creating a likelihood of confusion with the complainant's mark. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 3.1.4.

The Panel finds that the composition of the disputed domain name and the content of the website hosted at the disputed domain name is strongly suggestive of bad faith because it is evidence of the Respondent seeking to cause confusion, including via the false statement that it is the Complainant's "Official Site in Greece". The registration function and financial information displayed on the website also suggests an intention of the Respondent to confuse and thereby attract users to its website for commercial gain.

Further, Panels have held that the use of a domain name for illegitimate activity, here claimed passing off (albeit not claimed in terms), constitutes bad faith. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 3.4.

Furthermore, the Respondent has not attempted to refute any of the Complainant's contentions, which casts additional doubt on the nature of its conduct. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 3.2.1.

Having reviewed the record, the Panel concludes that the actions of the Respondent in choosing the disputed domain name were aimed at attracting, for commercial gain, Internet users by creating a likelihood of confusion with the Complainant's Mark. The Panel therefore concludes that the disputed domain name was registered and used 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 <betano-casino.org> be transferred to the Complainant.

*/David Stone/*

**David Stone**

Sole Panelist

Date: April 12, 2026