

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

CASINO DE SPA S.A. v. KATERINA IOANNOU, CONTRAGO DIGITAL LTD,
Franco Claudio Pace, ASkhat Jumagaliev, Domain Rights Limited, EDUARD
LIASHOV, Astramania, Darlene Rocha Passos, Eduard Halushko
Case No. DNL2026-0036

1. The Parties

The Complainant is CASINO DE SPA S.A., Belgium, represented by COGITUS SRL, Belgium.

The registrants of the disputed domain names are KATERINA IOANNOU, CONTRAGO DIGITAL LTD, Cyprus, Franco Claudio Pace, France, ASkhat Jumagaliev, Kazakhstan, Domain Rights Limited, United Kingdom, EDUARD LIASHOV, Ukraine, Astramania, Bulgaria, Darlene Rocha Passos, Spain, and Eduard Halushko, Ukraine, (the “Respondents”).

2. The Domain Names and Registrars

The disputed domain names <casino777-bonus.nl>, <casino777bonus.nl> and <casino777casino.nl> are registered with SIDN through Registrar.eu.

The disputed domain name <nl-casino777.nl> is registered with SIDN through Key-Systems GmbH.

The disputed domain name <777casinonederland.nl> is registered with SIDN through ILKARI DOMAINS LIMITED.

The disputed domain names <777-casino-nl.nl>, <777casino-nl.nl>, and <777-casinos.nl> are registered with SIDN through Dynadot LLC.

The disputed domain name <777casino-play.nl> is registered with SIDN through ZXCS.

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the “Center”) on July 14, 2026. On July 15, 2026, the Center transmitted by email to SIDN a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain names.

On July 16, 2026, SIDN transmitted by email to the Center its verification response disclosing registrant and contact information for the disputed domain names which differed from the named respondent and contact information in the Complaint.

The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on July 21, 2026, providing the information disclosed by SIDN, and inviting the Complainant to amend the Complaint in this light. On July 23, 2026, the Complainant requested the withdrawal of one domain name from the Complaint. The Complainant filed an amended Complaint on July 24, 2026.

The Center verified that the Complaint as amended satisfies the formal requirements of the Dispute Resolution Regulations for .nl Domain Names (the “Regulations”).

In accordance with the Regulations, articles 5.1 and 16.4, the Center formally notified the Respondents of the Complaint and the proceedings commenced on August 10, 2026. In accordance with the Regulations, article 7.1, the due date for Response was August 30, 2026. The Center did not receive any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondents’ default on September 4, 2026.

The Center appointed Willem J. H. Leppink as the panelist in this matter on September 14, 2026. The Panel finds that it was properly constituted. The Panelist has submitted the Statement of Acceptance and Declaration of Impartiality and Independence, as required to ensure compliance with the Regulations, article 9.2.

4. Factual Background

The following facts are undisputed.

The Complainant is a long-standing and well-known operator in the casino and gambling sector in Belgium, the Netherlands (Kingdom of)¹ and Spain. The Complainant operates the historic “Casino de Spa” in Belgium, which opened in 1763 and is widely presented as the oldest casino in the world.

Building on the reputation of its physical casino services, the Complainant has, for more than a decade, developed an online gaming presence in the regulated gambling market under signs incorporating “777” and “CASINO 777”, including the use of device mark consisting of 777 in red against a black background (the “777 Logo”) and a similar logo but then with “CASINO” in white letters (the “CASINO 777 Logo”). These signs have been used as core brand identifiers for online casino and gambling services, including through the use of the domain names <777.be>, <casino777.be> and <casino777.es>. In the Netherlands it operates websites that are accessible using the domain names <casino777.nl> and <777.nl>.

The Complainant is the owner of several trademark registrations worldwide, incorporating “777” and CASINO 777, including:

- the European Union trademark registration for the CASINO 777 Logo, with registration number 018384332 and a registration date of September 11, 2021, registered for goods and services in classes 9, 16, 28, 35, 38 and 41;
- the European Union trademark registration for the 777 Logo with registration number 017178451 and a registration date of January 9, 2018, registered for goods and services in classes 9, 28, 35, 38 and 41;

¹ Also as the .nl domain is only the domain for the Netherlands as one of the four constituent countries in the Kingdom of the Netherlands, and not for the other three constituent countries, the Panel will in the remainder of this decision refer to (just) “the Netherlands”.

- the European Union trademark registration for Casino 777 (wordmark) with registration number 014632244 and a registration date of March 31, 2016, registered for goods and services in classes 9, 28 and 41;

The disputed domain names were registered between November 2025 and May 2026. The disputed domain names <777-casinos.nl>, <777casino-play.nl>, <casino777-bonus.nl>, <casino777bonus.nl> and <casino777casino.nl> resolve to game sites including the 777 Logo. The disputed domain name <777casino-nl.nl> resolves to a game site including a logo resembling the 777 Logo, but then with only one seven in it. The disputed domain name <777casinonederland.nl> resolves to a game site with a logo with “777 CASINO REVIEW” displayed in white letters against a black background. The disputed domain name <nl-casino777.nl> resolves to a game site with a logo including CASINO 777. The disputed domain name <777-casino-nl.nl> does not currently resolve to an active website, but at the time of filing the Complaint resolved to a gaming website displaying the title “777 Casino Netherlands: Online Slots Live Games Evolution”, offering users a welcome bonus of up to EUR 250, and casino games.

5. Parties’ Contentions

A. Complainant

The Complainant contends that it has satisfied each of the elements required under the Regulations for it to become the registrant of the disputed domain names instead of the Respondents.

Notably, the Complainant contends the following.

The Complainant is duly authorized by the Kansspelautoriteit (Dutch Gambling Authority) and operates under a valid Dutch gambling license, allowing it to legally offer both online betting and casino services to Dutch consumers.

The disputed domain names were registered within a concentrated timeframe, with the majority of registrations occurring between November 2025 and May 2026. These registrations were not random, but form part of a sustained and deliberate pattern built around the Complainant’s trademarks. The repeated incorporation of the same core trademark elements, combined with descriptive terms directly associated with online gaming and explicit references to the Dutch market, demonstrates a coordinated effort to target the Complainant and to exploit the goodwill associated with its Complainant’s trademarks.

The disputed domain names are identical or, at the very least, confusingly similar to the Complainant’s trademarks, as each of the disputed domain names incorporates the distinctive combination of the elements “CASINO” and “777”. The disputed domain names merely add or remove hyphens, add the plural letter “s”, invert the order of the terms “casino” and “777”, or append descriptive, generic or geographical elements such as “nl”, “nederland”, “netherlands”, “online”, “play”, “bonus”, or “casino”. These additions are insufficient to prevent a finding of confusing similarity. On the contrary, terms such as “online”, “play”, “bonus”, “app” and “casino” reinforce the association with the Complainant’s gaming and online casino activities, while “nl”, “nederland” and “netherlands” point directly to the Dutch market targeted by the disputed domain names.

The Complainant’s trademarks remain clearly recognizable in each of the nine disputed domain names, and the first element of the Regulations is satisfied.

The Respondents are neither affiliated with nor authorised by the Complainant to register or use domain names incorporating the Complainant’s trademarks, or to operate websites suggesting an association with the Complainant. Nor are the Respondents commonly known by any of the disputed domain names, or do the Respondents hold any independent trademark, trade name or other right in a 777 trademark.

Furthermore, the Respondents have not made any bona fide offering of goods or services, nor any legitimate non-commercial or fair use of the disputed domain names.

The disputed domain names resolve to websites that do not merely reference the Complainant's trademarks but actively impersonate or strongly suggest an official association with the Complainant's Casino 777 service. By way of example, the website to which <777-casino-nl.nl> resolves is presented as an operational "777 Casino" platform and prominently displays the Complainant's trademarks, together with login and registration buttons, promotional bonuses, casino games, payment methods, and licensing-style information.

Some of the websites to which the disputed domain name resolve, link to unrelated third-party gambling platforms such as "Spinaura", "LuckyGem" and "Duckysino". None of the third-party platforms are affiliated with or authorised by the Complainant.

The disputed domain names therefore operate as commercial funnels. Internet users seeking the Complainant's official CASINO 777 service are first attracted by disputed domain names and websites reproducing the Complainant's signs and official presentation and are then directed to unrelated third-party gambling operators.

Such conduct is commercial, misleading and parasitic. It does not constitute a bona fide offering of goods or services, nor legitimate noncommercial or fair use. Accordingly, the Respondents have no rights to or legitimate interests in any of the disputed domain names.

Moreover, the disputed domain names are registered and used in bad faith. The Respondents' deliberate reproduction of the 777 Trademark, favicon, official licence details and regulatory references demonstrate that the Respondents were fully aware of the Complainant and its rights when registering the disputed domain names. The disputed domain names were selected to target the Complainant's official 777 Trademark and services and exploit the goodwill attached to these.

The disputed domain names are used to operate websites that are presented as official or authorized Dutch Casino 777 platforms, including through false or misleading references to Dutch or Belgian regulatory approval. Visitors to these websites are subsequently redirected, frequently through tracked or affiliate-style links, to unrelated offshore gambling platforms. This deliberate impersonation of the Complainant's brand, combined with the systematic diversion of Internet users for commercial gain, intentionally creates a likelihood of confusion as to the source, sponsorship, affiliation, or endorsement of the websites associated with the disputed domain names. Such conduct constitutes both registration and use in bad faith.

B. Respondents

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

6. Discussion and Findings

Preliminary Issue: Procedural Consideration - The Respondent's location

Under Article 10 of the Regulations, 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 proceeding takes place with due expedition.

The location of the Respondents Eduard Halushko and EDUARD LIASHOV as disclosed by the Registrar is listed to be in Ukraine, which is subject to an international conflict on the date of this Decision that may impact case notification. The Panel therefore would consider, in accordance with its discretion under Article 10 of the Regulations, whether the proceeding should continue.

The Panel notes that the record shows that the Written Notice has not been delivered to the addresses disclosed by the Registrar in its verification. However, it appears that the Notification of Complaint's emails were delivered to the Respondents' email addresses, as provided by the Registrar. Therefore, there is no evidence that the case notification was not successfully received by the Respondents. The Respondents have not opposed the continuation of the proceeding.

The Panel concludes that the Respondents who are allegedly located in Ukraine have been given a fair opportunity to present its case, and so that the administrative proceeding takes place with due expedition, the Panel will proceed to a Decision accordingly.

Pursuant to article 2.1 of the Regulations, the Complainant must prove each of the following three elements:

a) the disputed domain names are identical or confusingly similar to: I) a trademark or trade name protected under Dutch law in which the Complainant has rights; or II) a personal name registered in the General Municipal Register (Gemeentelijke Basisadministratie) of a municipality in the Netherlands, or the name of a Dutch public legal entity or the name of an association or foundation registered in the Netherlands under which the Complainant undertakes public activities on a permanent basis; and

b) the Respondents have no rights to or legitimate interests in the disputed domain names; and

c) the disputed domain names have been registered or are being used in bad faith.

The Respondents did not provide a response to the Complaint. Therefore, based on article 10.3 of the Regulations, the Panel decides on the dispute on the basis of the Complaint. In that case, the Complaint shall be granted, unless the Panel considers it to be without basis in law or in fact.

6.1. First preliminary Issue: Consolidation of the disputed domain names

The Complaint has been filed against multiple registrants of the disputed domain names. The Panel must determine whether it is appropriate to consolidate the proceedings and render a single decision covering all disputed domain names. In line with the practice and case law under the Uniform Domain Name Dispute Resolution Policy ("UDRP"), which to a large extent resembles the key provisions of the Regulations², panels look at whether (i) the domain names or corresponding websites are subject to common control, and (ii) the consolidation would be fair and equitable to all parties. Procedural efficiency would also underpin panel consideration of such a consolidation scenario.

The Panel notes the following. First, all disputed domain names follow the same pattern by incorporating the Complainant's distinctive "777" and "casino" elements, combined with descriptive terms closely associated with the Complainant's field of activity. Second, all disputed domain names were registered within a concentrated timeframe between November 2025 and May 2026. Third, several websites to which the disputed domain names resolve display a strikingly similar layout, prominently featuring the 777 or CASINO 777 Trademarks, branding elements and favicon. Fourth, none of the registrants filed a Response or otherwise participated in these proceedings. The combination of these factors - a shared naming pattern, a narrow registration window, a uniform website presentation and redirection model, and the absence of any objection to consolidation - leads the Panel to conclude that the disputed domain names are subject to common control. The Panel therefore finds that consolidation is fair and equitable to all Parties and procedurally efficient and decides to proceed with a single decision addressing all disputed domain names. The Panel will now refer to the Respondents in singular as the "Respondent".

² Given that the Regulations are largely based on the UDRP, the Panel considers UDRP precedents, and thus the WIPO Overview of WIPO Panel Views on Select UDRP Questions ("[WIPO Overview 3.1](#)"), to be relevant to the present proceedings and will refer to them where appropriate (see, inter alia, *Aktiebolaget Electrolux v. Beuk Horeca B.V.*, WIPO Case No. [DNL2008-0050](#)).

6.2. Substantial Discussion

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.

The Complainant has shown that it has rights in the trademarks, which are also granted protection in the Netherlands.

As regards each of the disputed domain names, at least one of the Complainant's trademarks is recognizable and/or included in each of the disputed domain names. Accordingly, the disputed domain names are confusingly similar to the trademark for the purposes of the Regulations.

Although the addition of other terms here, "nl", "nederland", "play", "bonus" may bear on the assessment of the second and third elements, the Panel finds the addition of such terms does not prevent a finding of confusing similarity between each disputed domain name and the relevant Complainant's trademark for the purposes of the Regulations.

The Panel finds the first element of article 2.1. of the Regulations has been established.

B. Rights or Legitimate Interests

Article 3.1 of the Regulations 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 .NL 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 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.

Furthermore, the record supports the conclusion that the Respondent has not used the disputed domain names in connection with a bona fide offering of goods or services. The websites to which the disputed domain names resolve reproduce the Complainant's trademarks, branding, favicon, and licensing-style information so as to present themselves as official Casino 777 platforms, and subsequently redirect visitors through tracked or affiliate-style links to unrelated third-party gambling platforms.

Panels have held that the use of a domain name for illegal activity here, claimed copycat sites and passing off can never confer rights or legitimate interests on a respondent.

The Respondent has not come forward with any evidence to rebut the Complainant's prima facie case.

The Panel therefore finds that the Complainant has satisfied the second element of article 2.1 of the Regulations.

C. Registered or Used in Bad Faith

In light of its considerations under Section 6.B, the facts presented by the Complainant, and the lack of a response by the Respondent, the Panel finds that the disputed domain names have been registered and/or are used in bad faith. Unlike under the UDRP, the Regulations only require the Complainant to prove registration or use in bad faith.

The Panel notes that, for the purposes of article 2.1(c) of the Regulations, article 3.2 of the Regulations establishes circumstances, in particular, but without limitation, that, if found by the Panel to be present, shall be evidence of the registration or use of a domain name in bad faith.

In the present case, based on the record before it, and considering article 10.3 of the Regulations, the Panel notes that the Respondent must have been aware of the Complainant and has registered and used the disputed domain names to attract, for commercial gain, Internet users by creating a likelihood of confusion with the Complainant's trademarks, also given the extensive use of the 777 Logo and CASINO 777 Logo on several of the websites to which the disputed domain names resolve.

The Panel finds that the Complainant has established the third element of the Regulations.

7. Decision

For all the foregoing reasons, in accordance with articles 1 and 14 of the Regulations, the Panel orders that the Complainant becomes the registrant of the disputed domain names <casino777-bonus.nl>, <casino777bonus.nl>, <casino777casino.nl>, <nl-casino777.nl>, <777casinonederland.nl>, <777-casino-nl.nl>, <777casino-nl.nl>, <777casino-play.nl>, and <777-casinos.nl> instead of the Respondent.

/Willem J. H. Leppink/

Willem J. H. Leppink

Panelist

Date: September 28, 2026