

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

Mokveza Ltd v. Domain Admin, DomainNameNexus
Case No. D2025-0912

1. The Parties

The Complainant is Mokveza Ltd, Cyprus, represented internally.

The Respondent is Domain Admin, DomainNameNexus, United States of America.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <1xbetclub.com> is registered with Sav.com, LLC (the “Registrar”).

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the “Center”) on February 28, 2025. On March 7, 2025, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On March 7, 2025, 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 (REDACTED FOR PRIVACY) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on March 10, 2025, 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 11, 2025.


The Center verified that the Complaint together with the 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 Respondent of the Complaint, and the proceedings commenced on March 12, 2025. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was April 1, 2025. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent’s default on April 3, 2025.

The Center appointed David Stone as the sole panelist in this matter on April 22, 2025. 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 company registered in Cyprus. It owns the following registered trade marks (the "Marks"), which are used in connection with an online sports betting brand:

-  European Union Trade Mark ("EUTM") registration no. 13914254, registered on July 27, 2015, in international classes 35, 41 and 42;
- 1XBET: EUTM registration no. 14227681, registered on September 21, 2015, in international classes 35, 41 and 42;
-  : EUTM registration no. 17517384, registered on March 7, 2018, in international classes 41 and 42;
-  : EUTM registration no. 17517327, registered on March 7, 2018, in international classes 41 and 42;
-  : EUTM registration no. 18669991, registered on June 22, 2022, in international classes 35, 41 and 42;
-  : EUTM registration no. 18669993, registered on June 22, 2022, in international classes 35, 41 and 42;
-  : EUTM registration no. 18669996, registered on June 22, 2022, in international classes 35, 41 and 42; and
-  : EUTM registration no. 18669999, registered on June 22, 2022, in international classes 35, 41 and 42.

The disputed domain name <1xbetclub.com> was registered on October 29, 2024. The Complainant provided evidence that the disputed domain name is offered for sale on the domain aftermarket site, Godaddy.com.

At the date of this Decision, the disputed domain name remains for sale on Godaddy.com

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.

The Complainant contends that, under the first element, the disputed domain name contains the identical element "1xbet", and that the term "club" would be perceived separately from "1xbet".

Under the second element, the Complainant contends that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the disputed domain name, as the Respondent is utilising the disputed domain name with the intent to profit from its resale.

The Complainant further contends that the disputed domain name fails to provide any information and contact details regarding the Respondent or any specifics about the services offered, and this lack of transparency suggests that the Respondent is not engaging in any legitimate commercial activities through the use of the website hosted at the disputed domain name.

The Complainant further notes that the Respondent: i) is not making any commercial or fair use of the disputed domain name; ii) does not intend to make any legitimate use of the disputed domain name; and iii) is not offering any actual goods or services at the disputed domain name.

Under the third element, the Complainant contends that the apparent lack of so-called active use (e.g., to resolve to a website) of the disputed domain name or without any active attempt to sell or to contact the trade mark holder (passive holding), does not as such prevent a finding of bad faith. The Complainant contends that, by including the identical element “1xbet” in the disputed domain name and suffixed with “club”, the Respondent can take unfair advantage of the Complainant’s rights in the Marks and is misleading Internet users into believing that the disputed domain name is operated by or authorized by the Complainant. A consumer might reasonably be under the impression that the disputed domain name is a member of the “1xbet” group.

B. Respondent

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

6. Discussion and Findings

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 Marks and the disputed domain name. WIPO Overview of WIPO Panel Views on Selected UDRP Questions, Third Edition, ([“WIPO Overview 3.0”](#)), section 1.7.

The Complainant has shown rights in respect of a trade mark or service mark for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 1.2.1.

The entirety of the trade mark 1XBET is reproduced within the disputed domain name. Accordingly, the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to the Marks for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), sections 1.7 and 1.10.

Although the addition of the term “club” may bear on the assessment of the second and third elements, the Panel finds the addition of such term does not prevent a finding of confusing similarity between the disputed domain name and the Marks for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 1.8.

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.

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 record, the Panel finds 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.

The Panel finds 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 domain name in bad faith.

In the present case, the Panel notes that the Respondent registered the disputed domain name which incorporates identically the trade mark 1XBET, and the disputed domain name is being offered for sale for the amount of USD19,888.00, substantially more than the ordinary cost of registration of a domain name.

Paragraph 4(b) of the Policy sets out a list of non-exhaustive circumstances that may indicate that a domain name was registered and used in bad faith, but other circumstances may be relevant in assessing whether a respondent's registration and use of a domain name is in bad faith. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 3.2.1.

While holding domain names for resale can be bona fide and is not per se illegitimate under the Policy, in the case of circumstances indicating that the respondent's intent in registering the disputed domain name was to profit in some fashion from or otherwise exploit the complainant's trade mark, panels will find bad faith on the part of the respondent. While the assessment remains fact-specific, generally speaking such circumstances, alone or together, include: (i) the respondent's likely knowledge of the complainant's rights, (ii) the distinctiveness of the complainant's mark, (iii) a pattern of abusive registrations by the respondent, (iv) the failure of a respondent to present a credible evidence-backed rationale for registering the domain name, and (v) a respondent's past conduct or business dealing. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 3.1.1.

The Panel finds that, given the composition of the disputed domain name combining the 1XBET trade mark, suffixed with the descriptive element "club", which suggests some sort of membership or association with the Complainant, and that it is being offered for sale for the substantial price of USD19,888.00, suggests, on the balance of probabilities, that the Respondent unfairly targeted the Complainant, intending to capitalize on the reputation and goodwill inherent in the Complainant's 1XBET trade mark, and registered the disputed domain name primarily to sell the disputed domain name to the Complainant (or its competitor) for profit. This is evidence of bad faith under paragraph 4(b)(i) of the Policy.

Furthermore, the Respondent has not attempted to refute any of the Complainant's contentions nor has it provided any explanation as to its choice of the disputed domain name, which casts additional doubt on the nature of its conduct. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 3.2.1.

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 name <1xbetclub.com> be transferred to the Complainant.

/David Stone/

David Stone

Sole Panelist

Date: May 6, 2025