

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

Granturo Platform Ltd v. Irina Pavlyuk
Case No. D2026-1835

1. The Parties

The Complainant is Granturo Platform Ltd, Malta, represented by Wilmark Oy, Finland.

The Respondent is Irina Pavlyuk, Ukraine.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

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

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the “Center”) on April 29, 2026. On April 30, 2026, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On April 30, 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 (*Not available*) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on May 1, 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 amendment to the Complaint on May 11, 2026.

The Center verified that the Complaint together with the amendment to the 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 May 15, 2026. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was June 4, 2026. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent’s default on June 12, 2026.

The Center appointed Gonçalo M. C. Da Cunha Ferreira as the sole panelist in this matter on June 16, 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 an iGaming company based in Malta and licensed and regulated by the Malta Gaming Authority under license MGA/B2C/599/2018. The Complainant operates online casino services, including under the BEAZT brand, through websites at “www.beaztcasino.com” and “www.beazt.com”.

The Complainant is the owner of European Union Trade Mark registration No. 019261732 for BEAZT, registered on February 5, 2026. The Complainant’s trademark registration predates the registration of the disputed domain name. The disputed domain name was registered on February 12, 2026.

The record further indicates that, at the time of the Center’s verification on May 15, 2026, the disputed domain name resolved to a website headed “Beazt Casino” and containing promotional and informational content concerning online casino and gambling services. The website displayed “SIGN UP” and “LOGIN” links and referred, inter alia, to a welcome bonus of 100 free spins, weekly loyalty cashback, and a library of more than 4,400 games. The screenshots in the record did not display any disclaimer concerning the absence of a relationship with the Complainant.

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.

Notably, the Complainant contends that:

1. the Complainant is an established iGaming company based in Malta, licensed and regulated by the Malta Gaming Authority, and operates online casino services, including under the BEAZT brand through “www.beaztcasino.com” and “www.beazt.com”;
2. the Complainant is the owner of European Union Trade Mark registration No. 019261732 for BEAZT, covering services in class 41, including casino services, online betting and gaming services, and gambling services;
3. the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to the Complainant’s BEAZT trademark, as it reproduces the trademark in its entirety, while the “.casino” suffix increases the likelihood that Internet users will believe that the disputed domain name is connected to the Complainant;
4. the Respondent has not received permission or authorization to use the Complainant’s trademark, does not hold any registered or unregistered rights in the term “beazt”, and is not commonly known by the disputed domain name;
5. the Respondent is opportunistically using the Complainant’s BEAZT mark to attract Internet users to its website and to divert Internet traffic to the disputed domain name;
6. the Complainant’s trademark predates the registration of the disputed domain name, and there seems no question that the Respondent was aware of the Complainant’s BEAZT casino at the time of registration;
7. the Respondent is not using the disputed domain name for a bona fide offering of goods or services or for a legitimate noncommercial or fair use, and the associated website is used in respect of online casino services identical to those covered by the Complainant’s trademark;
8. the Respondent registered the disputed domain name with the intent to capitalize on the goodwill of the Complainant, and the complete reproduction of the BEAZT trademark in connection with identical services indicates an intention to confuse and mislead Internet users; and

9. the Respondent is intentionally using the disputed domain name to attract, for commercial gain, Internet users to its website by creating a likelihood of confusion with the BEAZT trademark as to source, sponsorship, affiliation, or endorsement, thereby negatively affecting the Complainant's online presence and disrupting its business.

B. Respondent

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

6. Discussion and Findings

Procedural Issue – Location of the Respondent

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 proceedings take place with due expedition.

The location of the Respondent disclosed by the Registrar appears to be in Ukraine, which is subject to an international conflict at the date of this Decision that may impact case notification. It is therefore appropriate for the Panel to consider, in accordance with its discretion under paragraph 10 of the Rules, whether the proceedings should continue.

Having considered all the circumstances of the case, the Panel is of the view that it should.

The Panel notes that the disputed domain name was registered by the Respondent during the abovereferenced international conflict. This suggests that the Respondent maintained access to the Internet and has control over the disputed domain name.

The Panel also notes that everything required was done to notify the Respondent, with documents and communications to the Respondent's physical address in Ukraine and to its email address as registered with the Registrar, as well as to a postmaster email address as specified by the Rules.

Having considered all the circumstances of the case, the Panel will proceed to a Decision accordingly.

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

The Complainant has shown rights in respect of the BEAZT trademark for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.2.1.

The disputed domain name incorporates the Complainant's BEAZT trademark in its entirety. Disregarding the generic Top-Level Domain ("gTLD") ".casino", the disputed domain name is identical to the Complainant's trademark.

The addition of the gTLD ".casino" is viewed as a standard registration requirement and as such is disregarded under the first element confusing similarity test. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.11.1.

Accordingly, the Panel finds that 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 disputed 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 disputed 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 that the Complainant has established a prima facie case that the Respondent lacks rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name. The Complainant has not licensed, permitted, or otherwise authorized the Respondent to use the BEAZT trademark. There is no evidence that the Respondent is commonly known by the disputed domain name or that the Respondent holds any corresponding trademark rights.

The record indicates that the disputed domain name resolved to a website headed “Beazt Casino”, displaying “Sign Up” and “Login” links and containing detailed promotional content relating to online casino and gambling services.

The use of a disputed domain name incorporating the Complainant’s trademark for a website presenting itself under the same name and promoting services in the Complainant’s field of activity, without any disclaimer of non-affiliation, creates a false impression that the website is operated by, authorized by, or otherwise affiliated with the Complainant.

Such use cannot constitute a bona fide offering of goods or services or a legitimate noncommercial or fair use of the disputed domain name. Panels have consistently held that the use of a disputed domain name for impersonation or other conduct falsely suggesting affiliation with a complainant can never confer rights or legitimate interests on a respondent. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 2.13.1.

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.

Accordingly, the Panel finds that 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 disputed domain name in bad faith.

The disputed domain name incorporates the Complainant’s BEAZT trademark in its entirety under the sector-specific “.casino” gTLD.

The disputed domain name resolved to a website headed “Beazt Casino”, displaying “Sign Up” and “Login” links and containing promotional content specifically concerning casino and gambling services.

The exact reproduction of the Complainant's trademark, the selection of the ".casino" gTLD, and the content of the associated website demonstrate that the Respondent was aware of and deliberately targeted the Complainant and its BEAZT trademark when registering the disputed domain name. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 3.2.1.

The commercial presentation of the website and its promotion of casino-related services support the conclusion that the Respondent intentionally attempted to attract, for commercial gain, Internet users to the website by creating a likelihood of confusion with the Complainant's trademark as to the source, sponsorship, affiliation, or endorsement of the website.

The Panel therefore finds that the circumstances fall within paragraph 4(b)(iv) of the Policy.

Panels have further held that the use of a disputed domain name to impersonate a complainant or otherwise falsely suggest affiliation may constitute bad faith under the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 3.4.

Accordingly, the Panel finds that the disputed domain name was registered and is being used in bad faith.

The Panel finds that the third element of the Policy has been established.

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 <bezt.casino> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Gonçalo M. C. Da Cunha Ferreira/

Gonçalo M. C. Da Cunha Ferreira

Sole Panelist

Date: June 26, 2026