

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

BML Group Limited, Betsson Services Limited v. Igor Vasiliev
Case No. D2025-1160

1. The Parties

The Complainants are BML Group Limited and Betsson Services Limited, both of Malta, represented by CSC Digital Brand Services Group AB, Sweden.

The Respondent is Igor Vasiliev, Ukraine.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <betssonchile.com> is registered with Dynadot Inc (the “Registrar”).

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the “Center”) on March 20, 2025. On March 20, 2025, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On March 21, 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/ Super Privacy Service LTD c/o Dynadot) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainants on March 21, 2025, providing the registrant and contact information disclosed by the Registrar, and inviting the Complainants to submit an amendment to the Complaint. The Complainants filed an amended Complaint on March 21, 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 27, 2025. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was April 16, 2025. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent’s default on April 17, 2025.

The Center appointed W. Scott Blackmer as the sole panelist in this matter on May 1, 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.

Mindful of the ongoing conflict in Ukraine and the need to ensure fair process in Policy proceedings (see Rules paragraph 2(a) specifying notice procedures), the Panel notes that the Complaint and other communications from the Center were duly forwarded to the Respondent using the email and postal addresses that the Respondent provided to the Registrar. It appears that the Center's registered letter failed in delivery, but the email communications were delivered. The Panel is satisfied that the Center took all reasonable steps necessary to notify the Respondent of the filing of the Complaint and initiation of these proceedings, and that the failure of the Respondent to submit a reply is not due to any omission by the Center.

4. Factual Background

The Complainants, who share a postal address in Malta, are both wholly owned subsidiaries of Betsson AB and are part of the Betsson Group of companies. Betsson AB is a Swedish holding company that invests in and manages companies operating online gaming sites, such as online casinos, sportsbooks, and other games with licenses in Europe, Africa, North America, and South America under multiple brands, including BETSSON. The Complaint characterizes the Group as one of the largest online gaming companies in Europe, operating since 1963 and now holding licenses in 23 countries, with approximately 2,300 employees and over 29 million registered customers. Betsson AB has been listed on the NASDAQ Stockholm stock exchange since 2000 and reported 2023 revenues of EUR 948 million.

The Group operates online gaming through its primary website at "www.betsson.com", which is published in multiple languages (including English, Spanish, and Russian), and through localized websites such as "www.betssonchile.cl" for the Chilean market. The BETSSON mark is promoted offline as well, as the Group sponsors sports teams and events, such as the Chile Open 2023 Tennis Championship and the Chilean national football team in 2022 through the FIFA World Cup in Qatar.

The Complainants hold registered BETSSON trademarks for the use of Group companies, including the following:

Mark	Owner	Jurisdiction	Registration Number	Registration Date	Goods or Services
BETSSON (word)	BML Group Limited	United Kingdom	UK00906517056	September 30, 2008	International Classes 36, 38,41
BETSSON (word)	Betsson Services Limited	European Union	006517056	September 30, 2008	International Classes 36, 38,41
BETSSON (word)	BML Group Limited	INAPI (Chile)	1208216	June 6, 2016	International Classes 09, 41, 42
BETSSON (word)	Betsson Services Limited	International	1494220	September 10, 2019	International Classes 09, 41, 42
BETSSON (stylized letters)	BML Group Limited	Ukraine	329478	March 1, 2023	International Classes 09, 41, 42
BETSSON (word)	BML Group Limited	United States	7202441	October 24, 2023	International Classes 09, 41, 42

The disputed domain name was created on July 21, 2021, and is registered to the Respondent Igor Vasiliev, listing a postal address in Ukraine and an email address ending in “.bet”.

The disputed domain name does not resolve to an active website at the time of this Decision. However, the Complaint attaches screenshots from the Internet Archive’s Wayback Machine showing that in 2022 the disputed domain name resolved to pages in Spanish reviewing the Complainant’s casino and sportsbook sites and mobile applications, linking to the Complainant’s casino site, and displaying the Complainant’s figurative logo, and also describing and providing the links for competitors “Betway Casino” and “Book of Ra Online Slot”.

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.

Notably, the Complainant contends that the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to its registered BETSSON mark, incorporating the mark in its entirety, and that the addition of the geographic term “Chile” merely adds to the confusion as the Complainant is active in that market and closely identified with it. The Complainant asserts that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name, not having a corresponding name, not currently making use of it, and formerly using it misleadingly to suggest an association with the Complainant while linking to competing online gaming websites. According to the Complainant, this also demonstrates the Respondent’s awareness of the Complainant and its well-known BETSSON mark, as well as the Respondent’s bad faith in registering the disputed domain name and using it to misdirect Internet users for commercial gain and then passively holding it for no conceivable legitimate purpose.

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 trademark 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 trademark or service mark, the registered BETSSON mark, for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 1.2.1.

The entirety of the mark is reproduced within the disputed domain name. Accordingly, the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to the mark for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 1.7.

Although the addition of other terms (here, the geographical term “chile”) may bear on 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 mark 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, who does not appear to have a name corresponding to the disputed domain name, 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. Rights or legitimate interests are normally assessed at the time of the Policy proceeding, and the Respondent has evidently not made use of the disputed domain name since 2022. See [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 2.11. In any event, the Respondent’s former use of the disputed domain name does not reflect legitimate rights or interests. The Respondent’s former website did not identify the website operator and its relationship with the Complainant. Moreover, it reviewed and linked to competitors, as well as the Complainant. Thus, the site would fail the commonly accepted tests for nominative fair use of the Complainant’s mark. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 2.8. Similarly, it would not clearly qualify as noncommercial fair use of the Complainant’s mark for a fan site or commentary site, again because it created confusion as to affiliation with the Complainant and was not confined to discussing the Complainant, but also linked to commercial competitors. Thus, the Respondent could not have claimed rights or legitimate interests under the Policy, paragraph 4(c)(i) or (ii).

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 was clearly aware of the Complainant’s distinctive and well-established BETSSON mark. The disputed domain name is composed of the exact mark and the country name “chile”. The Respondent used the disputed domain name to publish a website in Spanish discussing the Complainant’s offerings available in Chile, including topics such as “Is Betsson legal in Chile?” The website included an extensive, largely favorable, review of the Complainant’s offerings, without identifying the website operator, including reproductions of the Complainant’s logo. This was followed by reviews of competitors’ gaming websites, including links to them. Thus, although the Respondent offered what might be characterized as “neutral” reviews of the Complainant and its competitors, the Respondent was also using the Complainant’s well-known mark misleadingly to attract Internet users to a site not affiliated with the Complainant and then connecting them to the Complainant’s competitors as well as to the Complainant itself. This accords with the example of bad faith given in the Policy, paragraph 4(b)(iv) (attracting Internet users for commercial gain by creating a likelihood of confusion with the Complainant’s mark), even if the Respondent was not the party profiting from the diversion, a fact which cannot be ascertained from this record. It must in any event be deemed bad faith under the Policy to use a domain name composed of a trademark in a manner that directly benefits the trademark holder’s competitors.

The Complainant also cites the “passive holding” doctrine as described in [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 3.4, which could well apply in this instance given the notoriety and distinctiveness of the Complainant’s BETSSON mark. However, in this case the Respondent has in fact employed the disputed domain name in the past and thus demonstrated bad faith in its registration and use, as discussed above.

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 <betssonchile.com> be transferred to the Complainant.

/W. Scott Blackmer/

W. Scott Blackmer

Sole Panelist

Date: May 15, 2025