

## ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

Novomatic AG v. Volodimir Piddubniy, Priv.Person, Oleh Desiatov,  
Volodymyr Piddubnyi, Maksim Reznik, Andrii Filonenko  
Case No. D2024-4406

### 1. The Parties

The Complainant is Novomatic AG, Austria, represented by Salomonowitz Attorneys-at-Law, Austria.

The Respondents are Volodimir Piddubniy, Priv.Person, Oleh Desiatov, Volodymyr Piddubnyi, Maksim Reznik, Andrii Filonenko, Ukraine.

### 2. The Domain Names and Registrars

The 41 disputed domain names <777admiral.net>, <777admiral.org>, <777admiral.site>, <777admiral.top>, <admiral777-kasino.com>, <admiral-777kasino.net>, <admiralbet.xyz>, <admiralbet777.info>, <admiralbet777.net>, <admiralbet777.pro>, <admiralcas.biz>, <admiralcas.net>, <admiralcas.xyz>, <admirallkasino.co>, <admirallkasino.com>, <casinoadmiral777.info>, <casinoadmiral-na-dengi.net>, <cazinoadmiral.net>, <cazinoadmirall.com>, <games-admiral.org>, <onlinecasinoadmirall.com>, <admiiral.biz>, <admiiral.co>, <admiiral-casino.biz>, <admiiral-na-dengi.com>, <admiral-avtomaty.xyz>, <admiral-casino.co>, <admiralcasino.live>, <admiral-cazino.biz>, <admiral-kazino.live>, <admiralkazino.org>, <admiral-kazino.rocks>, <admiral-kazino.win>, <avtomatyadmiral.org>, <avtomaty-admiral.org>, <avtomaty-admiral.rocks>, <casino-admiral.city>, <casino-admiral.online>, <casinoadmiral-na-dengi.biz>, <casino-admiral-zerkalo.net>, and <admirallkasino.xyz> are registered with NameCheap, Inc.

The disputed domain name <admiralcasino-online.com> is registered with Dynadot Inc.

The 40 disputed domain names <admiralcasino32.com>, <admiral-777-casino.bar>, <admiral-777-casino.bid>, <admiral-777-casino.bike>, <admiral-777-casino.biz>, <admiral-777-casino.cfd>, <admiral-777-casino.cheap>, <admiral-777-casino.click>, <admiral-777-casino.cloud>, <admiral-777-casino.cool>, <admiral-game.com>, <admiral-game.info>, <admiral-game.net>, <admiral-game.org>, <admiral-online.pro>, <admiral-zerkalo.club>, <admiral-zerkalo.pro>, <admiral-zerkalo.top>, <admiral-zerkalo.vip>, <admiral777-casino.info>, <admiral777-casino.pro>, <admiral777casino.pro>, <admiralcasino12.com>, <admiralcasino17.com>, <admiralcasino22.com>, <admiralcasino27.com>, <admiralcasino37.com>, <admiralcasino42.com>, <admiralcasino47.com>, <admiralcasino52.com>, <admiralclub-official.com>, <admiralclub-official.info>, <admiralclub-official.net>, <admiralclub-official.org>, <admiralclub-official.pro>, <admiralkasino.info>

<casino-admiral-zerkalo.com>, <casino-admiral-zerkalo.info>, <casino-admiral-zerkalo.org>, and <casino-admiral-zerkalo.pro> are registered with NameSilo, LLC.

The disputed domain name <admiral365.bet> is registered with 101domain GRS Limited.

The disputed domain name <igrovyevavtomati-admiral-2018.xyz> is registered with Key-Systems GmbH.

(Together the “Registrars”).

### 3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the “Center”) on October 22, 2024. On October 28, 2024, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain names. From October 28 to October 31, 2024, the Registrars transmitted by email to the Center each of its verification response disclosing registrant and contact information for the disputed domain names which differed from the named Respondent (Privacy service provided by Withheld for Privacy ehf, et al.) and contact information in the Complaint.

The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on October 31, 2024 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 an amended Complaint on November 5, 2024. On November 7, 2024, the Complainant filed a second amended Complaint further to the Center’s email on November 6, 2024, regarding the mis-identified registrars in the Complaint.

The Center verified that the Complaint together with the second 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 Respondents of the Complaint, and the proceedings commenced on November 8, 2024. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was November 28, 2024. The Respondents did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondents’ default on November 29, 2024.

The Center appointed Luca Barbero as the sole panelist in this matter on December 5, 2024. 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.

On December 27, 2024, the Panel instructed the Center to transmit a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name <admiralcasino32.com>. On December 27, 2024, the concerned Registrar, confirmed that the registrant of the disputed domain name is the same as that for the other 39 disputed domain names registered with NameSilo, LLC (i.e., Andrii Filonenko). On the same day, the Panel issued the Administrative Panel Procedural Order No. 1, in which the Respondent was invited to submit its comments by January 2, 2025. The Respondent Andrii Filonenko did not respond to the Administrative Panel Procedural Order No 1.

#### 4. Factual Background

The Complainant was founded in 1980 and is one of Europe's largest gaming technology groups. It has a global presence via numerous subsidiaries, employs more than 21,000 people, and operates about 2,000 casinos and other gaming facilities in about 50 countries. The Complainant exports electronic gaming equipment to more than 70 countries.

The Complainant is the owner of several trademark registrations for ADMIRAL, including the following, as per trademark registration details provided in Annex 6 to the Complaint:

- European Union trademark registration No. 004134433 for ADMIRAL (word mark), filed on November 22, 2004, and registered on August 14, 2006, in classes 9, 16, 28, 36, 37, 41, 42 and 43;
- European Union trademark registration No. 015570005 for ADMIRAL (figurative mark), filed on June 22, 2016, and registered on October 27, 2016, in class 41;
- Chinese trademark registration No. 9615327 for ADMIRAL (word mark), filed on June 20, 2011, and registered on March 21, 2016 in class 41;
- United Kingdom trademark registration No. UK00915570005 for ADMIRAL (figurative mark), filed on June 22, 2016, and registered on October 27, 2016, in class 41;
- International trademark registration No. 598347 for ADMIRAL (word mark), registered on December 17, 1992, in classes 9, 28, 36, 37, 41 and 42;

The ADMIRAL casino and betting services are promoted online via several websites including "www.admiral.ag" – based on the domain name <admiral.ag>, registered on August 20, 2002 – and "www.casinoadmiral.cz" – based on the domain name <casinoadmiral.cz>, registered on March 14, 2006.

The disputed domain name <admiralcasino32.com> was registered on March 26, 2024. The disputed domain name <admiral365.bet> was registered on September 6, 2016. The disputed domain name <games-admiral.org> was registered on March 13, 2017. The disputed domain names <admiralbet.xyz>, <admiralbet777.info>, <admiralbet777.net>, <admiralbet777.pro>, <admiralcas.biz>, <admiralcas.net> and <admiralcas.xyz> were registered on October 19, 2018. The disputed domain name <igrovyeavtomati-admiral-2018.xyz> was registered on November 8, 2018. The disputed domain names <admiralkasino.com>, <cazinoadmirall.com>, <cazinoadmiral.net> and <onlinecasinoadmirall.com> were registered on December 13, 2018. The disputed domain names <admiral777-kasino.com> and <admiral-777kasino.net> were registered on January 3, 2019. The disputed domain names <casinoadmiral-na-dengi.net> and <casinoadmiral777.info> were registered on March 7, 2019. The disputed domain names <777admiral.net>, <777admiral.org>, <777admiral.site> and <777admiral.top> were registered on April 8, 2019. The disputed domain name <admiralkasino.co> was registered on May 17, 2019. The disputed domain name <admiralkasino.xyz> was registered on April 14, 2020. The disputed domain names <admiral-avtomaty.xyz>, <avtomaty-admiral.org>, <avtomatyadmiral.org> and <avtomaty-admiral.rocks> were registered on May 18, 2020. The disputed domain names <admiiral.biz>, <admiiral.co>, <admiiral-na-dengi.com>, <admiral-cazino.biz>, <admiral-kazino.live>, <admiral-kazino.rocks>, <casinoadmiral-na-dengi.biz> and <admiral-kazino.win> were registered on July 6, 2020. The disputed domain name <admiralcasino.live> was registered on August 3, 2020. The disputed domain names <admiiral-casino.biz> and <admiral-casino.co> were registered on September 4, 2020. The disputed domain names <admiralkazino.org>, <casino-admiral.online> and <casino-admiral-zerkalo.net> were registered on December 7, 2022. The disputed domain names <admiral-777-casino.bar>, <admiral-777-casino.bid>, <admiral-777-casino.bike>, <admiral-777-casino.biz>, <admiral-777-casino.cfd>, <admiral-777-cacasino.cheap>, <admiral-777-casino.click>, <admiral-777-casino.cloud> and <admiral-777-casino.cool> were registered on April 28, 2023. The disputed domain name <admiral-zerkalo.top> was registered on September 18, 2023. The disputed domain name <casino-admiral.city> was registered on November 9, 2023. The disputed domain names

<admiralclub-official.com>, <admiralclub-official.info>, <admiralclub-official.net>, <admiralclub-official.org>, <admiralclub-official.pro>, <admiralkasino.info>, <admiral777-casino.info>, <admiral777-casino.pro>, <admiral777casino.pro>, <casino-admiral-zerkalo.com>, <casino-admiral-zerkalo.info>, <casino-admiral-zerkalo.org> and <casino-admiral-zerkalo.pro> were registered on November 15, 2023. The disputed domain names <admiralcasino12.com>, <admiralcasino17.com>, <admiralcasino22.com>, <admiralcasino27.com>, <admiralcasino37.com>, <admiralcasino42.com>, <admiralcasino47.com> and <admiralcasino52.com> were registered on March 26, 2024. The disputed domain names <admiral-game.com>, <admiral-game.info>, <admiral-game.net>, <admiral-game.org>, <admiral-online.pro>, <admiral-zerkalo.club>, <admiral-zerkalo.pro> and <admiral-zerkalo.vip> were registered on August 5, 2024. The disputed domain name <admiralcasino-online.com> was registered on October 3, 2024.

The Complainant submitted, and the Respondents have not denied, that the disputed domain names redirected in the past to active websites offering illegal online gambling services whilst using the Complainant's marks and providing copies of the Complainant's slot games. According to the screenshots saved by the Internet Archive "www.archive.org", the disputed domain names previously resolved to gambling sites<sup>1</sup>.

At the time of the drafting of the Decision, all disputed domain names resolve to error pages or inactive websites.

## 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 names.

Notably, the Complainant contends that in virtue of the numerous prior trademark registrations it is the rightful owner of the ADMIRAL mark and that the disputed domain names are all confusingly similar to the trademark ADMIRAL in which it has rights as they reproduce the trademark in its entirety with the mere addition of terms which are descriptive for the services offered under the disputed domain names.

The Complainant submits that the Respondents have no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the disputed domain name since i) the Complainant's trademark rights date back to the 1980s and the Respondents are in no way related or permitted by the Complainant to use its ADMIRAL mark in any way; ii) the Respondents are not commonly known by the disputed domain names nor have the Respondents ever acquired any rights in the ADMIRAL mark; and iii) the Respondents used the disputed domain names to offer infringing slot games and to provide illegal gambling, infringing the law and the Complainant's trademark rights.

The Complainant submits that the Respondents registered and are using the disputed domain names in bad faith since: i) the disputed domain names were registered long after the Complainant had registered its ADMIRAL trademarks and long after the Complainant had opened its websites, which were copied from the Respondents; ii) the Complainant's ADMIRAL mark and the websites at "www.admiral.ag", "www.casinoadmiral.cz" and "www.admiral.at" are so well-known that the Respondents could not ignore them; iii) the Respondents were fully aware of the Complainant and its marks since they used the disputed domain names to offer illegal copies of the Complainant's famous slot games and to provide illegal gambling; and iv) the Respondents use the disputed domain names to attract, for commercial gain, Internet users to the

---

<sup>1</sup> As stated in section 4.8 of the WIPO Overview of WIPO Panel Views on Selected UDRP Questions, Third Edition ("[WIPO Overview 3.0](#)"), "Noting in particular the general powers of a panel articulated inter alia in paragraphs 10 and 12 of the UDRP Rules, it has been accepted that a panel may undertake limited factual research into matters of public record if it would consider such information useful to assessing the case merits and reaching a decision".

their websites, by creating a likelihood of confusion with the Complainant's trademarks as to the source, sponsorship, affiliation, or endorsement of its websites or products on such websites; and v) the Respondents are preventing the Complainant from reflecting its trademark in corresponding domain names.

## B. Respondents

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

## 6. Discussion and Findings

### 6.1. 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 Complaint 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 Selected UDRP Questions, Third Edition ("[WIPO Overview 3.0](#)"), section 4.11.2.

As regards common control, the Panel notes that:

For <777admiral.net>, <777admiral.org>, <777admiral.site>, <777admiral.top>, <admiral777-kasino.com>, <admiral-777kasino.net>, <admiralbet.xyz>, <admiralbet777.info>, <admiralbet777.net>, <admiralbet777.pro>, <admiralcas.biz>, <admiralcas.net>, <admiralcas.xyz>, <admirallkasino.co>, <admirallkasino.com>, <casinoadmiral777.info>, <casinoadmiral-nadengi.net>, <cazinoadmiral.net>, <cazinoadmirall.com>, <games-admiral.org>, and <onlinecasinoadmirall.com>, the registrant is Volodimir Piddubniy, Ukraine.

For <admiral365.bet> and <igrovyevavtomati-admiral-2018.xyz>, the registrant is Volodymyr Piddubnyi, Ukraine.

For <admirallkasino.xyz>, the registrant is Oleh Desiato, Ukraine.

For <admiiral.biz>, <admiiral.co>, <admiiral-casino.biz>, <admiiral-na-dengi.com>, <admiralavtomaty.xyz>, <admiral-casino.co>, <admiralcasino.live>, <admiral-cazino.biz>, <admiralkazino.live>, <admiralkazino.org>, <admiral-kazino.rocks>, <admiral-kazino.win>, <avtomatyadmiral.org>, <avtomaty-admiral.org>, <avtomaty-admiral.rocks>, <casinoadmiral.city>, <casino-admiral.online>, <casinoadmiral-na-dengi.biz> and <casino-admiralzerkalo.net>, the registrant is Maksim Reznik, Ukraine.

For <admiralcasino32.com>, <admiralcasino-online.com>, <admiral-777-casino.bar>, <admiral-777-casino.bid>, <admiral-777-casino.bike>, <admiral-777-casino.biz>, <admiral-777-casino.cfd>, <admiral-777-casino.cheap>, <admiral-777-casino.click>, <admiral-777-casino.cloud>, <admiral-777-casino.cool>, <admiral-game.com>, <admiral-game.info>, <admiral-game.net>, <admiral-game.org>, <admiral-online.pro>, <admiral-zerkalo.club>, <admiral-zerkalo.pro>, <admiral-zerkalo.top>, <admiral-zerkalo.vip>, <admiral777-casino.info>, <admiral777-casino.pro>, <admiral777casino.pro>, <admiralcasino12.com>, <admiralcasino17.com>, <admiralcasino22.com>,

<admiralcasino27.com>, <admiralcasino37.com>, <admiralcasino42.com>, <admiralcasino47.com>, <admiralcasino52.com>, <admiralclubofficial.com>, <admiralclub-official.info>, <admiralclub-official.net>, <admiralclubofficial.org>, <admiralclub-official.pro>, <admiralkasino.info>, <casino-admiral-zerkalo.com>, <casino-admiral-zerkalo.info>, <casino-admiral-zerkalo.org> and <casino-admiral-zerkalo.pro>, the registrant is Andrii Filonenko, Ukraine.

The Complainants asserted that the disputed domain names, although registered in the name of different named registrants, are under common control since:

- i) A reverse IP lookup shows that all the disputed domain names are hosted on the same IP address / server and no other domain name or website can be found on that IP address.
- ii) The identical illegal online casino is or was offered under all the disputed domain names, which also offer counterfeit games of the Complainant.
- iii) The different named registrants may have been used only as a pretext and the registrants “Volodimir Piddubniy” and “Volodymyr Piddubnyi” are obviously the same person with only a different spelling.
- iv) All the telephone numbers listed in the Whois of the disputed domain names have been deactivated.
- v) All the named registrants have supposed addresses in Kiev and use a Gmail email account.
- vi) The Respondent Oleh Desiatov was involved in a prior UDRP proceeding brought by the Complainant concerning a domain name including a Complainant’s mark, i.e. *Novomatic AG v. Oleh Desiatov*, WIPO Case No. [D2019-2947](#) (<novomatic-casinos.org>).
- vii) The Respondents Volodimir Piddubniy and Maksim Reznik were involved in prior UDRP proceedings concerning domain names incorporating third parties’ trademarks, i.e. *DAREOS LTD. and DAREOS HOLDING LTD (former DAREOS INC) v. Volodimir Piddubniy*, WIPO Case No. [D2023-5407](#) and *VKR Holding A/S v. Perfect Privacy, LLC / Evgenia Reznik*, WIPO Case No. [D2019-0610](#).

The Panel concurs with the Complainant that the elements highlighted above suggest common ownership of the disputed domain names. Moreover, none of the named registrants have filed a Response to rebut the Complainant’s contentions including on the consolidation issue.

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 Respondents”) in a single proceeding.

## **6.2. Additional Procedural Considerations**

Under paragraph 10 of the Rules, the Panel needs to ensure that the Parties are treated with equality, that each Party is given a fair opportunity to present its case, and that the administrative proceeding takes place with due expedition.

The Panel notes that, according to the Whois records, the Respondents are based in Ukraine, which is subject to an international conflict at the date of this Decision that may impact case notification. Therefore, it is appropriate for the Panel to consider, in accordance with its discretion under paragraph 10 of the Rules, whether the proceeding should continue.

The Panel is of the view that it should. According to the records, the Center sent notification of the Complaint to the Respondents at their email addresses as disclosed by the Registrars and no delivery failure notice was apparently received.

The Panel also notes that the Respondents, which registered some of the disputed domain names in 2023 and 2024, appear to have been capable of controlling the disputed domain names and the related content and that, having apparently received notification of the Complaint by email, they would have been able to formulate and file a Response in the administrative proceeding in case it wished to do so.

Moreover, for the reasons detailed below, the Panel has no doubts (albeit in the absence of a Response) that the Respondents registered and have used the disputed domain names in bad faith.

Lastly, the Panel also notes that the Complainant elected as the mutual jurisdiction in this proceeding the courts at the location of the principal offices of the Registrars, none of which are impacted by the above-referenced international conflict and thus, given the above findings as regards the Respondents' notice, the Panel finds that proceeding with this Decision does not preempt the Respondents from asserting its rights under paragraph 4(k) of the Policy to submit this dispute to the courts at the applicable mutual jurisdictions.

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

### **6.3. Substantive Issues**

According to paragraph 15(a) of the Rules: "A Panel shall decide a complaint on the basis of the statements and documents submitted and in accordance with the Policy, these Rules and any rules and principles of law that it deems applicable." Paragraph 4(a) of the Policy directs that the Complainant must prove each of the following:

- (i) that the disputed domain names registered by the Respondents are identical or confusingly similar to a trademark or service mark in which the Complainant has rights;
- (ii) that the Respondents have no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the disputed domain names; and
- (iii) that 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 trademark and the disputed domain names. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 1.7.

The Complainant has shown rights in respect of a trademark or service mark for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 1.2.1. Indeed, the Complainant has provided evidence of ownership of valid trademark registrations for ADMIRAL.

The mark is recognizable within the disputed domain names. Accordingly, the disputed domain names are all confusingly similar to the ADMIRAL mark for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 1.7.

Although the addition of other terms such as "bet", "games", "game", "cas", "cazino", "casino", "kasino", "kazino", "online", "rocks", "club", "na-dengi" (meaning "for money" in Russian), "avtomaty" (meaning "automatic" in Russian), "zerkalo" (meaning "mirror" in Russian), "igrovyevavtomati" (meaning "slot machines" in Russian) - combined in some cases with a hyphen and/or a number - may bear on assessment of the second and third elements, the Panel finds the addition of such terms does not prevent a finding of confusing similarity between the disputed domain names and the mark for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 1.8.

The applicable Top Level Domain (“TLD”) in a domain name, such as the TLDs “.bet”, “.org”, “.xyz”, “.info”, “.net”, “.pro”, “.biz”, “.com”, “.site”, “.co”, “.rocks”, “.online”, “.bar”, “.bid”, “.bike”, “.cf”, “.cheap”, “.cloud”, “.cool”, “.top”, “.city”, “.vip”, “.click” and “.club” here, is viewed as a standard registration requirement and as such is disregarded under the first element confusing similarity test.

Therefore, 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 Respondents may demonstrate rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain names.

Although 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 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 3.0](#), section 2.1.

Having reviewed the available records, the Panel finds the Complainant has established a prima facie case that the Respondents lack rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain names. The Respondents have not rebutted the Complainant’s prima facie showing and have not come forward with any relevant evidence demonstrating rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain names such as those enumerated in the Policy or otherwise.

The Panel notes that there is no relation, disclosed to the Panel or otherwise apparent from the record, between the Respondents and the Complainant. The Respondents are not a licensee of the Complainant, nor have the Respondents otherwise obtained an authorization to use the Complainant’s trademark.

Moreover, there is no element from which the Panel could infer the Respondents’ rights and legitimate interests over the disputed domain names, or that the Respondents might be commonly known by the disputed domain names.

The Panel finds that although the disputed domain names currently do not resolve to active websites, the Respondents’ initial use of the disputed domain names to redirect Internet users to websites offering online gambling services identical to those offered by the Complainant does not amount to bona fide offering of goods or services or a legitimate noncommercial or fair use without intent for commercial gain to misleadingly divert consumers or to tarnish the Complainant’s trademark.

Furthermore, where a domain name consists of a trademark plus an additional term (at the second- or top-level), such composition cannot constitute fair use if it effectively impersonates or suggests sponsorship or endorsement by the trademark owner. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 2.5.1.

Therefore, the Panel finds the second element of the Policy has also 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.

In the present case, considering i) the Complainant's prior registration and use of the ADMIRAL mark in connection with the Complainant's gambling services, promoted online via the Complainant's official websites, and ii) the Complainant's goodwill and world renown acquired before the registration of the disputed domain names, the Panel finds that the Respondents knew or should have known the Complainant's trademark at the time of registration of the disputed domain names. As indicated in section 3.2.2 of the [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), "Noting the near instantaneous and global reach of the Internet and search engines, and particularly in circumstances where the complainant's mark is widely known (including in its sector) or highly specific and a respondent cannot credibly claim to have been unaware of the mark (particularly in the case of domainers), panels have been prepared to infer that the respondent knew, or have found that the respondent should have known, that its registration would be identical or confusingly similar to a complainant's mark".

Moreover, since the disputed domain names are confusingly similar to the Complainant's prior trademark and had initially been redirected by the Respondents to websites offering online gambling services identical to those offered by the Complainant, the Panel finds that the Respondents were indeed actually aware of the Complainant and registered the disputed domain names to target the Complainant and its trademark.

In view of the prior use of the disputed domain names in connection with the websites described above, the Panel finds that the Respondents intentionally attempted to attract Internet users to its websites for commercial gain, by creating a likelihood of confusion with the Complainant's trademark as to the source, sponsorship, affiliation or endorsement of their websites according to paragraph 4(b)(iv) of the Policy.

With regards to the current inactive use of the disputed domain names, Panels have 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 3.0](#), section 3.3. Having reviewed the available record, the Panel notes the distinctiveness and reputation of the Complainant's trademark, the composition of the disputed domain names and the Respondents' failure to submit a Response to counter the Complainant's allegations and to provide evidence of good faith use, and finds that in the circumstances of this case the passive holding of the disputed domain names does not prevent a finding of bad faith under the Policy.

Therefore, the Panel finds that the Complainant has established the third element of the Policy as well.

## 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 <admiralcasino32.com>, <777admiral.net>, <777admiral.org>, <777admiral.site>, <777admiral.top>, <admiral777-kasino.com>, <admiral-777kasino.net>, <admiralbet.xyz>, <admiralbet777.info>, <admiralbet777.net>, <admiralbet777.pro>, <admiralcas.biz>, <admiralcas.net>, <admiralcas.xyz>, <admirallkasino.co>, <admirallkasino.com>, <casinoadmiral777.info>, <casinoadmiral-na-dengi.net>, <cazinoadmiral.net>, <cazinoadmirall.com>, <games-admiral.org>, <onlinecasinoadmirall.com>, <admiiral.biz>, <admiiral.co>, <admiiral-casino.biz>, <admiiral-na-dengi.com>, <admiral-avtomaty.xyz>, <admiral-casino.co>, <admiralcasino.live>, <admiral-cazino.biz>, <admiral-kazino.live>, <admiralkazino.org>, <admiral-kazino.rocks>, <admiral-kazino.win>, <avtomatyadmiral.org>, <avtomaty-admiral.org>, <avtomaty-admiral.rocks>, <casino-admiral.city>, <casino-admiral.online>, <casinoadmiral-na-dengi.biz>, <casino-admiral-zerkalo.net>, <admirallkasino.xyz>, <admiralcasino-online.com>, <admiral-777-casino.bar>, <admiral-777-casino.bid>, <admiral-777-casino.bike>, <admiral-777-casino.biz>, <admiral-777-casino.cfd>, <admiral-777-casino.cheap>, <admiral-777-casino.click>, <admiral-777-casino.cloud>, <admiral-777-casino.cool>, <admiral-game.com>, <admiral-game.info>, <admiral-game.net>, <admiral-game.org>, <admiral-online.pro>, <admiral-zerkalo.club>, <admiral-zerkalo.pro>, <admiral-zerkalo.top>, <admiral-zerkalo.vip>, <admiral777-casino.info>, <admiral777-casino.pro>, <admiral777casino.pro>, <admiralcasino12.com>, <admiralcasino17.com>, <admiralcasino22.com>, <admiralcasino27.com>, <admiralcasino37.com>, <admiralcasino42.com>, <admiralcasino47.com>, <admiralcasino52.com>, <admiralclub-official.com>, <admiralclub-official.info>, <admiralclub-official.net>.

<admiralclub-official.org>, <admiralclub-official.pro>, <admiralkasino.info>, <casino-admiral-zerkalo.com>, <casino-admiral-zerkalo.info>, <casino-admiral-zerkalo.org>, <casino-admiral-zerkalo.pro>, <admiral365.bet> and <igrovyevavtomati-admiral-2018.xyz> be transferred to the Complainant.

*/Luca Barbero/*

**Luca Barbero**

Sole Panelist

Date: January 7, 2025