

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

Didiane Ltd. v. Artem Sugaka
Case No. DPH2026-0002

1. The Parties

The Complainant is Didiane Ltd., Cyprus, represented by Šindelka & Lachmannová advokáti s.r.o., Czech Republic.

The Respondent is Artem Sugaka, Ukraine.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <1xbets.com.ph> is registered with 1API GmbH (the “Registrar”). The Registry of the disputed domain name is DotPH (the “Registry”).

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the “Center”) on February 27, 2026. On March 3, 2026, the Center transmitted by email to Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On March 4, 2026, 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 (Privacy Protected by Registry) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on March 10, 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 12, 2026.

The Center verified that the Complaint together with the amended Complaint satisfied the formal requirements of the dotPH Uniform Domain Name Dispute Resolution Policy (the “Policy”), the .PH Uniform Dispute Resolution Implementation Rules (the “Rules”), and the WIPO Supplemental Rules for .PH (the “Supplemental Rules”).

In accordance with paragraphs 2(a) and 4(a) of the Rules, the Center formally notified the Respondent of the Complaint, and the proceedings commenced on March 17, 2026. In accordance with paragraph 5(a) of the Rules, the due date for Response was April 6, 2026. The Respondent sent an email communication to the Center on March 12, 2026, but did not file any formal response. Accordingly, the Center informed the Parties about the Commencement of Panel Appointment Process on April 7, 2026.

The Center appointed Yuji Yamaguchi as the sole panelist in this matter on April 10, 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 paragraph 7 of the Rules.

4. Further Procedural Considerations

Under paragraph 10(b) and (c) 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 proceeding takes 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 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 Respondent sent an email communication to the Center on March 12, 2026, which indicates that the Respondent was informed and had knowledge of the current proceedings. Additionally, as set out below, the Panel has formed the view that the Respondent registered and has used the disputed domain name in bad faith.

The Panel concludes that the Parties have been given a fair opportunity to present their case, and so that the administrative proceeding takes place with due expedition the Panel will proceed to a Decision accordingly.

5. Factual Background

The Complainant was founded in 2007, belongs to the group of companies operating an online gaming platform with worldwide reach, offers sports betting, lottery, bingo, live betting, lottery, etc., and is licensed by the government of Curaçao, Netherlands (Kingdom of the).

The Complainant owns numerous international trademark registrations for the mark 1XBET (the "1XBET Trademark") in a number of jurisdictions designating inter alia Philippines, for instance Nos. 1672896A (registered on April 6, 2022), 1669925A (registered on April 6, 2022), and 1673113A (registered on May 2, 2022).

The Complainant operates an online betting website under the domain name <1xbet.com>.

The disputed domain name was registered on November 28, 2023. The website which is associated with the disputed domain name can be only accessed from the Philippines using a mobile device without VPN, and displays the 1XBET Trademark in its distinctive stylized form and replicates the blue-and-white color scheme that is associated with the Complainant's official trade dress.

6. Parties' Contentions

A. Complainant

The Complainant's contentions may be summarized as follows:

The disputed domain name fully incorporates the Complainant's registered and widely known 1XBET Trademark which is clearly recognizable within the disputed domain name. The addition of "s" (plural) does not distinguish the disputed domain name from the 1XBET Trademarks.

The Complainant has not licensed or authorized the Respondent to register or use the disputed domain name, nor is the Respondent affiliated with the Complainant in any form. There is no evidence that the Respondent is known by the disputed domain name or owns any corresponding registered trademarks. The Respondent has not been using, or preparing to use, the disputed domain name in connection with a bona fide offering of goods and services, nor making a legitimate non-commercial or fair use of the disputed domain name. The structure of the disputed domain name demonstrates the Respondent's intent to create an association with the Complainant and gives rise to a likelihood of confusion in the minds of Internet users, who may be misled into believing that the disputed domain name is affiliated with, authorized by, or endorsed by the Complainant. The website associated with the disputed domain name does not disclose the identity of the individual or entity operating its website or offering the services or products promoted therein, but is deliberately designed to create the false impression of a direct and official association with the Complainant and its 1XBET Trademark.

The Respondent registered the disputed domain name long after the Complainant first adopted and began using the 1XBET Trademark in 2007 and after the Complainant secured its 1XBET Trademark registrations. The Complainant operates a major online betting and gambling business with an overwhelming online presence through its official website and extensive brand promotion. In these circumstances, and given the distinctiveness and notoriety of the 1XBET Trademark, the Respondent could not credibly claim to have been unaware of the Complainant when registering the disputed domain name. The Respondent's selection of the disputed domain name reflects deliberate targeting of the Complainant and an intent to exploit the goodwill attaching to the 1XBET Trademark. Critically, the Respondent's targeting is confirmed by the Respondent's website to which the disputed domain name resolves prominently displays the 1XBET Trademark and adopts the Complainant's distinctive branding and trade dress. This constitutes classic "passing off"/impersonation conduct aimed at misleading users for commercial gain. When a user clicks "Registration", the user is redirected to a different domain name. This redirection to an unrelated third-party domain name whose operator is unknown to the Complainant underscores that the disputed domain name functions as a traffic-diversion, designed to capture users attracted by the Complainant's 1XBET Trademark and then route them to another online location for registration. Such conduct is squarely consistent with bad faith under paragraph 4(b)(iv) of the Policy.

B. Respondent

The Respondent sent an email communication to the Center on March 12, 2026, requesting the full Complaint to prepare a response; however, the Respondent did not reply to the Complainant's contentions.

7. Discussion and Findings

In accordance with paragraph 4(a) of the Policy, the Complainant must prove that each of the following three elements is satisfied:

- (i) the disputed domain name 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 disputed domain name; and
- (iii) the disputed domain name has been registered and is being used in bad faith.

A. Identical or Confusingly Similar

It is well accepted that the first element in paragraph 4(a) of the Policy 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. See section 1.7 of the WIPO Overview of WIPO Panel Views on Select UDRP Questions ("[WIPO Overview 3.1](#)")¹.

¹ Given the similarities between the Policy and the Uniform Domain Name Dispute Resolution Policy (the "UDRP"), the Panel will refer to the [WIPO Overview 3.1](#) where relevant to this proceeding.

The Complainant has shown rights in respect of the international trademark registrations for the 1XBET Trademark designating inter alia Philippines for the purposes of the Policy.

The disputed domain name consists of the 1XBET Trademark in its entirety and one additional letter “s”, along with the country code Top-Level Domain (“ccTLD”) “.com.ph”. The addition of the letter “s” to the disputed domain name does not prevent a finding of confusing similarity under the Policy. Since the ccTLD “.com.ph” is viewed as technical requirements of registration, this element is generally incapable of dispelling confusing similarity between the disputed domain name and the Complainant’s trademark. See *Instagram, LLC v. Jiwon Song*, WIPO Case No. [DPH2018-0002](#).

Accordingly, the Panel finds that the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to the Complainant’s 1XBET Trademark and the first element in paragraph 4(a) of the Policy has been established.

B. Rights or Legitimate Interests

Paragraph 4(c) of the Policy allows three nonexclusive methods for the Panel to conclude that the Respondent has rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name.

As the Complainant asserts, there is no evidence that the Respondent is commonly known by the disputed domain name pursuant to paragraph 4(c)(ii) of the Policy or owns any corresponding registered trademarks. Moreover, the Complainant has not licensed or authorized the Respondent to register or use the disputed domain name, nor is the Respondent affiliated with the Complainant in any form.

The Respondent’s website which can be accessed via the disputed domain name from the Philippines, displays the 1XBET Trademark, making it more likely than not that the Respondent is attempting to pass itself off as the Complainant for commercial gain. The Respondent’s use of the disputed domain name will not be considered fair use pursuant to paragraph 4(c)(iii) of the Policy because it falsely suggests affiliation with the Complainant. See section 2.5 of the [WIPO Overview 3.1](#).

Although the overall burden of proof in the proceedings is on the complainant, where a complainant makes out a prima facie case that the respondent lacks rights or legitimate interests, the burden of production on the second element in paragraph 4(a) of the Policy 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 in paragraph 4(a) of the Policy. See section 2.1 of the [WIPO Overview 3.1](#).

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 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.

Consequently, the Panel finds that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the disputed domain name and the second element in paragraph 4(a) of the Policy has been established.

C. Registered and Used in Bad Faith

The Panel finds that the Complainant has developed a strong presence and reputation in the global online gambling market, as evidenced by the numerous sponsorship agreements signed with top sports organizations. Considering the content of the Respondent’s website which can be accessed via the disputed domain name from the Philippines, the Respondent knew or should have known that the disputed domain name was identical or confusingly similar to the Complainant’s 1XBET Trademark at the time of registration.

The Respondent is using the Complainant’s 1XBET Trademark to divert Internet users to an unauthorized website, thereby creating a clear likelihood of confusion as to source, sponsorship, affiliation, or

endorsement. The Panel also finds that the disputed domain name is irregularly redirected to another website whose operator is unknown. Therefore, the Respondent is considered to have intentionally attempted to attract, for commercial gain, Internet users to the Respondent's website or other online location, by creating a likelihood of confusion with the Complainant's 1XBET Trademark as to the source, sponsorship, affiliation, or endorsement of the Respondent's website or location in accordance with paragraph 4(b)(iv) of the Policy.

In conclusion, the Panel finds that the disputed domain name has been registered and is being used in bad faith and the third element in paragraph 4(a) of the Policy has been established.

8. Decision

For all the foregoing reasons, in accordance with paragraphs 4(h) of the Policy and 15 of the Rules, the Panel orders that the disputed domain name <1xbets.com.ph> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Yuji Yamaguchi/

Yuji Yamaguchi

Sole Panelist

Date: April 24, 2026