

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

Guruflow Team Ltd v. Albertt Seo

Case No. D2026-1285

1. The Parties

The Complainant is Guruflow Team Ltd, Cyprus, represented by IG Lawyers Limited, United Kingdom.

The Respondent is Albertt Seo, Romania.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <pinup.agency> is registered with GoDaddy.com, LLC (the “Registrar”).

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the “Center”) on March 25, 2026. On March 26, 2026, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On March 27, 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 (Domains By Proxy, LLC) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on March 27, 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 March 27, 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 April 8, 2026. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was April 28, 2026. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent’s default on April 29, 2026.

The Center appointed Pablo A. Palazzi as the sole panelist in this matter on May 1, 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 operates as a Cyprus-registered technology and licensing company in the online gambling (iGaming) sector.

The Complainant holds a portfolio of trademarks in different jurisdictions. As such and before the National Service of Intellectual Rights of Ecuador, the Complainant holds PIN-UP trademark dated March 24, 2022 in class 41 and 42.

The disputed domain name March 25, 2024. The disputed domain name is currently not active. However, at the time of filing the Complaint, the disputed domain name was offering gambling services under PIN-UP branding and redirecting users through a registration flow that redirects to a third-party (Ukrainian) online casino. The website also had a bonus offer for users of Ecuador and Chile (according to Annex 5 of the Complaint).

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.

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 identical to the mark for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.7.

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.

Panels have held that the use of a domain name for illegitimate activity here, claimed as applicable to this case: 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.

The evidence on record demonstrates bad faith in both the registration and use of the disputed domain name within the meaning of Policy paragraph 4(a)(iii).

The disputed domain name is currently not active. According to the evidence submitted by the Complainant, the disputed domain name was offering gambling services under PIN-UP branding and redirecting users through a registration flow that redirects to a third-party online casino in Ukrainian. In conducting its assessment of the circumstances of the case, and consistent with the practice recognized in [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 4.8, which confirms that panels may undertake limited factual research into matters of public record, including consulting the Internet Archive's Wayback Machine to obtain evidence of a respondent's website content at relevant points in time, the Panel consulted the Internet Archive (archive.org) and was able to verify that as of September 2024,¹ the website to which the disputed domain name resolves was active and displayed content related to casino and online gaming services. Specifically, the archived page contained the following legend: “Pin up Casino and betting company appeared on October 1, 2020. The brand belongs to William Hill. The official website offers a large selection of games, the number of which increases every day. In Pin Up Casino, you can play slot games and choose any genre: ancient world, fantasy, mysticism, space and many others.”

¹ “<https://web.archive.org/web/20240923041722/https://pinup.agency/>”

With respect to bad faith registration, the Panel finds that the Respondent was aware of the Complainant and its PIN-UP marks at the time of registration. The disputed domain name incorporates the Complainant's mark in its entirety, and the website to which it resolves was actively offering gambling and casino services under the PIN-UP mark — the very sector in which the Complainant operates and for which its marks are registered. It is inconceivable that the Respondent registered a domain name identical to the Complainant's well-known mark and immediately populated it with casino-related content bearing that same branding without prior knowledge of the Complainant and its marks. Such conduct is a strong indicator that the registration was made in bad faith with the Complainant in mind.

With respect to bad faith use, the Panelist notes that the disputed domain name was being used to offer gambling services under PIN-UP branding and to redirect users through a registration flow leading to a third-party Ukrainian online casino. This use creates a likelihood of confusion with the Complainant's marks as to the source, sponsorship, affiliation, or endorsement of the Respondent's website, and falls squarely within the circumstances described in Policy paragraph 4(b)(iv). By exploiting the Complainant's mark to attract Internet users and divert them to a competing commercial platform, the Respondent has demonstrated bad faith use of the disputed domain name.

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 <pinup.agency> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Pablo A. Palazzi/

Pablo A. Palazzi

Sole Panelist

Date: May 15, 2026