ARBITRATION
AND
MEDIATION CENTER

WIPO
WORLD
INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY
ORGANIZATION

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION
Sunwin Information Technology LLC v. Vo Gia Cu, thuong ha, VINH TRAN VAN
Case No. D2026-0993

1. The Parties

The Complainant is Sunwin Information Technology LLC, United Arab Emirates, internally represented.

The Respondents are Vo Gia Cu, thuong ha, and VINH TRAN VAN, Viet Nam.

2. The Domain Names and Registrars

The disputed domain names <sunpwin.com>, <sunwin2009.com>, <sunxwin.mobi>, and <sun2026.com> are registered with Spaceship, Inc. The disputed domain names <sunwinz.guru>, <sunwin-2026.xyz>, and <2026sunwin.com> are registered with NameCheap, Inc. (collectively as the "Registrars").

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the "Center") on March 7, 2026. On March 9, 2026, the Center transmitted by emails to the Registrars requests for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain names. On March 9, 2026 and March 10, 2026, the Registrars transmitted by emails to the Center their verification disclosing registrant and contact information for the disputed domain names which differed from the named Respondent (Unknown Registrant/ Privacy service provided by Withheld for Privacy ehf) and contact information in the Complaint.

The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on March 10, 2026 with the registrant and contact information of nominally multiple underlying registrants revealed by the Registrar(s), requesting the Complainant to either file separate complaint(s) for the disputed domain names associated with different underlying registrants or alternatively, demonstrate that the underlying registrants are in fact the same entity and/or that all the disputed domain names are under common control. The Complainant filed an amended Complaint on March 14, 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 Respondents of the Complaint, and the proceedings commenced on March 31, 2026. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was April 20, 2026. The Respondents did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent's default on April 21, 2026.

The Center appointed Áron László as the sole panelist in this matter on April 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 Sunwin Information Technology LLC, a limited liability company registered and existing under the laws of the United Arab Emirates.

The Complainant is a company with a portfolio of trademarks and logos (together the "SUN WIN Trademarks") detailed below. The Complainant has licensed its trademarks and rights connected to them, including domain names, copyrights, and UI designs, for operations of online gaming through its website to SW Holdings Ltd, an Anjouan-based company, for operating an entertainment gaming platform and mobile application. Through its licensee, the Complainant operates an online gaming platform. Since 2019, the Complainant has offered a premier online gaming experience, beginning in Viet Nam and expanding its operations to the European Union and other territories under relevant licenses. The Complainant maintains a social media presence, including on Facebook, where the SUN WIN Trademarks are prominently displayed and promoted globally. The Sunwin Facebook page has 93,000 followers.

The Complainant is the owner of the following trademark registrations for SUN WIN:

- United States of America trademark A A A SUN.WIN (figurative), Reg. No.7913235, registered on August 26, 2025
- Cambodia Trademark SUN WIN (figurative), Reg. No. MOC KH/116944/25, Class 38, registered on June 26, 2025
- Cambodia Trademark SUN WIN (word), Reg. No. KH/2025/100380, Classes 9, 38, 41, 42, granted on September 17, 2025.

The Complainant has many pending trademark applications for signs including the words SUN WIN in many jurisdictions worldwide.

The SUN WIN Trademarks have a unique design, structure, and colour combination of golden, orange, red, and purple, with two arbitrary words "Sun" and "Win".

The disputed domain names were registered by the Respondents between December 26, 2025 and February 21, 2026:

- <sunwinz.guru> on December 26, 2025 with NameCheap, Inc. by thuong ha;
- <sunwin-2026.xyz> on January 13, 2026 with NameCheap, Inc. by VINH TRAN VAN;
- <2026sunwin.com> on February 9, 2026 with NameCheap, Inc. by VINH TRAN VAN;
- <sunxwin.mobi> on February 13, 2026 with Spaceship, Inc. by Vo Gia Cu;
- <sun2026.com> on February 16, 2026 with Spaceship, Inc. by Vo Gia Cu;
- <sunpwin.com> on February 16, 2026 with Spaceship, Inc. by Vo Gia Cu;
- <sunwin2009.com> on February 21, 2026 with Spaceship, Inc. by Vo Gia Cu.

According to the screenshots filed by the Complainant, the disputed domain names resolve to websites offering gambling services and heavily using the Complainant's registered logos. At the time of this Decision, the Panel could not open the websites due to security measures.

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 names.

Concerning the first element, the Complainant contends that it owns a large portfolio of registered trademarks and logos in numerous jurisdictions, including the United States of America, United Arab Emirates, and Cambodia, all in Class 41. The SUN WIN Trademarks have a unique design, structure, and colour combination of golden, orange, red, and purple, with two arbitrary words "Sun" and "Win", and have been used since 2019 on the Complainant's online platforms. The disputed domain names are almost identical or confusingly similar to the Complainant's SUN WIN Trademarks, differing only by a miniscule suffix, digit, or the Top-Level Domain portion, which remain insignificant and non-substantial. The presence of generic Top-Level domains such as ".com", ".guru", or ".mobi" does nothing to diminish the resemblance between the Complainant's trademarks and the disputed domain names. Internet users would naturally assume that the element "Sunwin" in the disputed domain names was invoking the Complainant's trademarks to suggest an official association with the Complainant.

Concerning the second element, the Complainant contends that the Respondents have not been commonly known by the disputed domain names, and have not been authorized or licensed by the Complainant to use the trademarks or to register any domain names that are identical or confusingly similar thereto. The Complainant submits that a prima facie case has been established that the Respondents lack rights or legitimate interests, shifting the burden to the Respondents to demonstrate otherwise. There is substantial prima facie evidence that the Respondents are engaged in typosquatting and phishing activities, having registered multiple identical or confusingly similar domain names to take advantage of typographical errors made by Internet users seeking the Complainant's commercial website. The Respondents are not making a legitimate, noncommercial, or fair use of the disputed domain names without intent for commercial gain to misleadingly divert consumers.

Concerning the third element, the Complainant contends that its SUN WIN Trademarks constitute a unique combination of two arbitrary words "Sun" and "Win" first coined, adopted, and used by the Complainant, and that the registration of identical or confusingly similar domain names cannot be a mere coincidence. The disputed domain names use fake names for their companies, fake photographs as CEOs, and fake license numbers; on <sunxwin.mobi>, the picture of the chairman of ACB bank is used as CEO of a non-existent entity called "SUNWIN International Holdings", and on <sunwin2009.com>, the picture of a celebrity actor is used as CEO. The Complainant previously initiated UDRP proceedings and obtained a transfer order in its favour (*Sunwin Information Technology LLC v. Srdan Andelkovic, Sunwin Vibes Limitada, Sunwin Vibes, Sunwin Vibes Content Writing Service, Srdan Andelkoic, Sunwin Vibes Limitada,* WIPO Case No. D2025-5040, dated February 3, 2026). While the Complainant may not have direct evidence establishing a link between the present Respondents and the respondent in WIPO Case No. D2025-5040, the Complainant asserts that the similarity of structure and layout of the websites strongly suggests that the disputed domain names and the previously transferred domain names are controlled by one or a common entity. The Respondents have engaged in a pattern of wrongful conduct of registering domain names incorporating well-known trademarks, especially online gaming brands, preventing the Complainant from reflecting its trademarks in corresponding domain names, in violation of paragraph 4(b)(ii) of the Policy. The Complainant further contends that the Respondents have intentionally attempted to attract Internet users for commercial gain by creating a likelihood of confusion with the Complainant's marks, in violation of paragraph 4(b)(iv) of the Policy. The Respondents intentionally registered these disputed domain names to opportunistically exploit the Complainant's reputation and divert Internet users away from the Complainant's website to competing sites, thereby depriving the Complainant of gambling revenue.

B. Respondents

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

6. Discussion and Findings

Paragraph 15(a) of the Rules instructs this Panel to "decide a complaint on the basis of the statements and documents submitted in accordance with the Policy, these Rules and any rules and principles of law that it deems applicable".

Paragraph 4(a) of the Policy requires that a complainant must prove each of the following three elements to obtain an order that a domain name should be cancelled or transferred:

i. the domain name registered by the respondent is identical or confusingly similar to a trademark or service mark in which the complainant has rights; and
ii. the respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the domain name; and
iii. the domain name has been registered and is being used in bad faith.

In view of the Respondents' failure to submit a Response, the Panel shall decide this dispute on the basis of the Complainant's undisputed representations pursuant to paragraphs 5(f), 14(a) and 15(a) of the Rules and draw such inferences as it considers appropriate pursuant to paragraph 14(b) of the Rules.

The Panel is entitled to accept all reasonable allegations set forth in a complaint. However, the Panel may deny relief where a complaint contains mere conclusory or unsubstantiated arguments. WIPO Overview of WIPO Panel Views on Select UDRP Questions ("WIPO Overview 3.1"), section 4.3.

6.1 Consolidation: Multiple Respondents

The amended Complaint was filed in relation to nominally different domain name registrants. The Complainant alleges that the domain name registrants are the same entity or mere alter egos of each other, or under common control. The Complainant requests the consolidation of the Complaint against the multiple disputed domain name registrants pursuant to paragraph 10(e) of the Rules.

The disputed domain name registrants did not comment on the Complainant's request.

Paragraph 3(c) of the Rules states that a complaint may relate to more than one domain name, provided that the domain names are registered by the same domain name holder.

In addressing the Complainant's request, the Panel will consider whether (i) the disputed domain names or corresponding websites are subject to common control; and (ii) the consolidation would be fair and equitable to all Parties. See WIPO Overview 3.1, section 4.11.2.

With regard to common control, the Panel notes that the disputed domain names were registered within a short period of time, have a similar structure and resolve to websites with very similar content. The Panel therefore concludes that the disputed domain names are more likely than not under common control.

As regards fairness and equity, the Panel sees no reason why consolidation of the disputes would be unfair or inequitable to any Party.

Accordingly, the Panel decides to consolidate the disputes regarding the nominally different disputed domain name registrants in a single proceeding.

6.2 Substantive Issues

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 names. 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 Panel finds the mark is recognizable within the disputed domain names. Accordingly, the disputed domain names are 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, "2026", "2009" and the single letters "z", "x" and "p" may bear on assessment of the second and third elements, the Panel finds the addition of such terms and letters does not prevent a finding of confusing similarity between the disputed domain names 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 Respondents 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 Respondents lack rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain names. The Respondents have 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 names such as those enumerated in the Policy or otherwise.

The disputed domain names do not correspond to the names of any of the Respondents. In lack of further information, the Panel finds that the Respondents are not commonly known by the disputed domain names.

Panels have held that the use of a domain name for illegitimate activity, here, impersonation and passing off 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 this case, the Panel notes that the Respondents must have been aware of the Complainant's SUN WIN Trademarks when they registered the disputed domain names, given the composition of the disputed domain names and that the disputed domain names resolve to websites that make heavy use of the Complainant's trademarks, including their figurative marks, without the Complainant's consent. Most of the disputed domain names resolve to betting websites, and the Complainant is active in the betting industry. The Panel therefore concludes that the Respondents intentionally attempted to attract Internet users for commercial

gain by creating a likelihood of confusion with the Complainant's mark. In addition, the non-use of the disputed domain names <sun2026.com> and <2026sunwin.com> does not prevent a finding of bad faith.

Two of listed Respondents VINH TRAN VAN and Vo Gia Cu have registered two and four similar disputed domain names, respectively. UDRP panels have held that establishing a pattern of bad faith conduct requires more than one, but as few as two, instances of abusive domain name registration. This may include a scenario where a respondent, on separate occasions, has registered trademark-abusive domain names, even where directed at the same brand owner; these separate registrations may be brought in a single case. WIPO Overview 3.1, section 3.1.2. In the present case, a pattern of bad faith conduct can be established regarding the Respondents VINH TRAN VAN and Vo Gia Cu due to the similar build-up of the disputed domain names and the short period during which they were registered.

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 held that the use of a domain name for illegitimate activity, here, impersonation and 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 names constitutes bad faith under the Policy.

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 names <sunpwin.com>, <sunwinz.guru>, <sunwin2009.com>, <sunwin-2026.xyz>, <sunxwin.mobi>, <sun2026.com> and <2026sunwin.com> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Áron László/
Áron László
Sole Panelist
Date: May 8, 2026