

## **ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION**

Quickspace Marketing Management LLC v. Srdan Andelkovic, Sunwin Vibes Limitada, Tran Hoang Thai, Thai Hoang Nguyen  
Case No. D2026-2219

### **1. The Parties**

The Complainant is Quickspace Marketing Management LLC, United Arab Emirates (“UAE”), internally represented.

The Respondents are Srdan Andelkovic, Sunwin Vibes Limitada, Costa Rica; Tran Hoang Thai, Viet Nam; and Thai Hoang Nguyen, Viet Nam.

### **2. The Domain Names and Registrars**

The disputed domain names <hit-club.bz>, and <hitclub2026.net> are registered with NameCheap, Inc.

The disputed domain names <hit-club.co>, <hitclub.inc>, <hitclub.com>, <789club.inc>, <789clubz.biz>, and <789club.co> are registered with Spaceship, Inc.

The disputed domain name <789clubh.win> is registered with Nicenic International Group Co., Limited.

The disputed domain name <789club2026.co> is registered with Key-Systems GmbH (the “Registrar(s)”).

### **3. Procedural History**

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the “Center”) on May 22, 2026. On May 22, 2026, the Center transmitted by emails to the Registrars a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain names. On May 23, 25, and 26, 2026, the Registrars transmitted by emails to the Center their verification responses disclosing registrant and contact information for the disputed domain names which partially differed from the named Respondent (Sunwin Vibes Limitada, Srdan Andelkovic) and contact information in the Complaint.

The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on May 30, 2026 with the registrant and contact information of nominally multiple underlying registrants revealed by the Registrars, 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 domain names are under common control. The Complainant filed amended Complaints on June 4 and 10, 2026.

The Center verified that the Complaint together with the amended Complaints 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 June 12, 2026. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was July 2, 2026. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent's default on July 3, 2026.

The Center appointed Peter Burgstaller as the sole panelist in this matter on July 14, 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 a Dubai, UAE, incorporated company which provides a diverse portfolio of entertainment gaming platforms, mobile application games, and associated services.

The Complainant owns several trademark registrations containing and/or consisting of the mark HIT CLUB and 789 CLUB, inter alia:

- European Union Trade Mark registration for HIT CLUB (word), Reg. No. 019188206, registered on August 31, 2025;
- European Union Trade Mark registration for HITCLUB (word), Reg. No. 019188318, registered on August 31, 2025;
- European Union Trade Mark registration for HIT-CLUB (word), Reg. No. 019188391, registered on August 31, 2025;
- United States of America trademark registration for HITCLUB (word), Reg. No. 8,151,630, registered on February 24, 2026;
- European Union Trade Mark registration for 789.CLUB (word), Reg. No. 019211565, registered on November 14, 2025;
- German trademark registration for 789 CLUB (word), Reg. No. 302025110857, registered on June 17, 2025 (Annex A6 to the Complaint).

The Complainant moreover owns the domain names <789.club> registered on May 7, 2014, and <hit.club> registered on June 12, 2020 (Annexes A4 and A5 to the Complaint).

The disputed domain names were registered between February 7, 2026 and May 7, 2026 (Annex 13 to the Complaint).

According to the Complaint, the disputed domain names <789club.inc>, <789clubz.biz>, <hit-club.co>, <hitclub.inc>, <hitclub.com>, <789clubh.win>, and <789club.co> referred to websites where similar services under similar layout and visual appearances than those of the Complainant's website were offered to Internet users (Annex A2 to the Complaint). The disputed domain names <hit-club.bz>, <hitclub2026.net>, and <789club2026.co> did not refer to websites with material content. However, according to a report generated

from a phishing monitoring platform, these disputed domain names previously resolved to similar gambling websites (Annex A3 to the Complaint).

## **5. Parties' Contentions**

### **A. Complainant**

The Complainant asks for consolidating the disputes against different disputed domain name registrants in a single proceeding since there is a set of indicators that suggest that the disputed domain names were registered by the same entity.

The Complainant contends that it has satisfied each of the elements required under the Policy for a transfer of the disputed domain names.

Notably, the Complainant contends that the disputed domain names are confusingly similar to its registered trademarks HIT CLUB and 789 CLUB. The only differences are additional numbers like "2026", letters like "h" or "z" and obvious typos and misspellings like "clud" instead of "club" or "hlt" instead of "hit".

The Complainant alleges that its trademarks are distinctive, well-known and reproduced in their entirety and are immediately recognizable since the addition of general numbers and letters or obvious typos and misspellings cannot prevent the finding of confusing similarity towards the Complainant's HIT CLUB and 789 CLUB marks.

Furthermore, the Complainant notes that the Respondents do not have any rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain names. The Respondents are not linked to the Complainant in any way whatsoever and have never been authorized by the Complainant to register domain names that are similar to its trademark. The Respondents are moreover not commonly known by or associated with the disputed domain names and do not use them for any bona fide offering of goods or services.

The Complainant alleges that the disputed domain names were registered and used in bad faith by the Respondents. The disputed domain names were registered after the Complainant has established rights in the mark HIT CLUB and 789 CLUB; hence, the Respondents must have been aware of the Complainant and its rights when registering the disputed domain names.

In addition, the Complainant alleges that the Respondents chose the disputed domain names because of their similarity or identity with a trademark in which the Complainant has rights and legitimate interests. The Complainant thus states that the Respondents acquired and are using the disputed domain names to attract Internet users by creating a likelihood of confusion with the Complainant's marks and services even some of the disputed domain names are not actively used.

With regard to the disputed domain names which resolved to websites with content, the Complainant contends that the addressed websites prominently feature the Complainant's trademarks in connection with services that compete directly with the Complainant, without any explanation of the lack of a relationship. Such use, which intentionally leverages the Complainant's branding and trademarks, is designed to create a direct likelihood of confusion as to source, sponsorship, or affiliation.

Finally, the Respondents have a history of adverse UDRP findings in bad faith registration of domain names targeting other trademark owners, establishing a pattern of conduct that is directly relevant to the current dispute.

## **B. Respondents**

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

## **6. Discussion and Findings**

### **6.1. Preliminary Procedural Issue: Consolidation of 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 disputes 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 of WIPO Panel Views on Select UDRP Questions ("[WIPO Overview 3.1](#)"), section 4.11.2.

As regards common control, the Panel notes that:

- all ten disputed domain names were registered within a short period of time (February 2026 until May 2026);
- the disputed domain names have a very similar naming pattern: all of them using the Complainant's marks HIT CLUB, HITCLUB, or 789 CLUB with minor modifications or obvious misspellings;
- two of the nominally different registrants are all reportedly located in the same city, with the same address;
- the disputed domain names referred to websites with very similar content; and
- finally, the Respondents did not react in any way to the proceedings – the Respondents neither objected to the consolidation request nor filed any Response.

Therefore, 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 (referred to below as "the Respondent") in a single proceeding.

### **6.2. Substantive Issues**

According to paragraph 4(a) of the Policy, the Complainant must prove that:

- (i) the disputed domain names are 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 with respect to the disputed domain names; and
- (iii) the disputed domain names have been registered and are being used in bad faith.

#### **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 trademarks and the disputed domain names. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.7.

Based on the available record, the Panel finds the Complainant has shown rights in respect of the marks HIT CLUB and 789 CLUB for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.2.1.

In the present case, the disputed domain names are confusingly similar to these marks in which the Complainant has rights since they incorporate the mark HIT CLUB or 789 CLUB and only add numbers, or single letters or obvious misspellings, namely “2026”, “z”, “h” or “clud” instead of “club” or “hit” instead of “hit”, or a hyphen between “hit” and “club”.

It has long been established under UDRP decisions that where the relevant trademark is recognizable within the disputed domain names, the mere addition of other terms does not prevent a finding of confusing similarity under the first element of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.8. A domain name which consists of a variation of a trademark (typically a common, obvious, or intentional misspelling, referred to as typosquatting) is considered by panels to be confusingly similar to the relevant mark for purposes of the first element. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.9. This is the case at present – the HIT CLUB and 789 CLUB trademarks clearly remain recognizable in each of the disputed domain names.

Finally, it has also long been held that Top-level Domains are generally disregarded when evaluating the confusing similarity of a disputed domain name. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.11.1.

Based on the available record, 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.

While 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 often impossible 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. 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 record, the Panel finds the Complainant has established a prima facie case that the Respondent lacks rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain names, since it has never assigned, granted, licensed, sold, transferred, or in any way authorized the Respondent to register or use the HIT CLUB or 789 CLUB mark in any manner.

There is further no evidence that the Respondent is commonly known by the disputed domain names or has used or made any preparations to use the disputed domain names in relation to a bona fide offering of goods or services.

Finally, the evidence in the Complaint revealed no disclaimer on the websites accessible through the disputed domain names that disclosed the lack of the Respondent’s relationship with the Complainant. Rather, it appears the Respondent has purposely attempted to take unfair advantage of the Complainant’s marks and the purported connection with the Complainant.

The Respondent did not file a Response and hence has not rebutted the Complainant’s contentions.

Based on the available record, the Panel finds the second element of the Policy has been established.

### C. Registered and Used in Bad Faith

As stated in many decisions rendered under the Policy (e.g. *Robert Ellenbogen v. Mike Pearson*, WIPO Case No. [D2000-0001](#)), both conditions, registration and use in bad faith, must be demonstrated; consequently, the Complainant must show that:

- the disputed domain names were registered by the Respondent in bad faith, and
- the disputed domain names are being used by the Respondent in bad faith.

(i) In the present case, the Complainant provided evidence which demonstrates that it has rights and is the owner of the registered trademarks HIT CLUB and 789 CLUB, registered and used in many jurisdictions around the world before the disputed domains were registered.

Further, the Complainant is the owner of the domain names <789.club> and <hit.club>, registered long before the registration of the disputed domain names.

It is therefore inconceivable for this Panel that the Respondent registered and used the disputed domain names without knowledge of the Complainant's rights, which leads to the necessary inference of bad faith. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 3.2.2.

This finding is supported by the fact that the disputed domain names incorporate the Complainant's trademarks HIT CLUB or 789 CLUB entirely and merely add numbers ("2026"), letters ("h" or "z") or obvious misspellings.

Therefore, the Panel is convinced that the disputed domain names were registered in bad faith by the Respondent.

(ii) The Complainant has put forward evidence that the disputed domain names <789club.inc>, <789clubz.biz>, <hit-club.co>, <hitclub.inc>, <hltclub.com>, <789clubh.win>, and <789clud.co> were used by the Respondent to resolve to websites where similar services were offered under similar layouts and visual appearances than those of the Complainant's website, which give Internet users the impression that the sites are controlled or at least authorized by the Complainant, which is not the case. This clearly disrupts the Complainant's business and shows that the Respondent intentionally attempts to attract, for commercial gain, Internet users by creating a likelihood of confusion with the Complainant's marks, which constitutes bad faith use.

Although, the disputed domain names <hit-club.bz>, <hitclub2026.net>, and <789club2026.co> did not resolve to a website with material content, panels have also found that the non-use of a domain name would not prevent a finding of bad faith under the doctrine of passive holding. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 3.3. According to a report generated from a phishing monitoring platform, these disputed domain names previously resolved to similar gambling websites. The Panel has no doubt that these disputed domain names were used in bad faith.

The evidence and documents produced and put forward by the Complainant together with the fact that the Respondent did not reply to a cease-and-desist letter from the Complainant as well as has failed to file a Response and therefore failed to present any evidence of any good faith registration and use with regard to the disputed domain names further prove that the disputed domain names were registered and used by the Respondent in bad faith under paragraph 4(a)(iii) of the Policy.

Based on the available record, 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 <hit-club.bz>, <hit-club.co>, <hitclub.inc>, <hitclub2026.net>, <hltclub.com>, <789clubh.win>, <789club.inc>, <789clubz.biz>, <789club2026.co>, and <789clud.co> be transferred to the Complainant.

*/Peter Burgstaller/*

**Peter Burgstaller**

Sole Panelist

Date: July 28, 2026