

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

TONKS LTD v. Victor VASNETSO, Petro KRIVIN
Case No. D2025-1328

1. The Parties

The Complainant is TONKS LTD, Cyprus, represented by SafeNames Ltd, United Kingdom (“U.K.”).

The Respondent is Victor VASNETSO, Ukraine; Petro KRIVIN.¹

2. The Domain Names and Registrar

The disputed domain names <linebetbangladesh.net>, <linebetbdapp.com>, and <linebet-bd.net> are registered with NETIM SARL (the “Registrar”).

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the “Center”) on April 1, 2025. On April 2, 2025, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain names. On April 3, 2025, the Registrar 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 (REDACTED FOR PRIVACY) and contact information in the Complaint.

The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on April 11, 2025 with the registrant and contact information of nominally multiple underlying registrants revealed by the Registrar, requesting the Complainant to either file separate complaint 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 April 14, 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”).

¹ The Registrar’s verification did not reveal any country associated with this registrant.

In accordance with the Rules, paragraphs 2 and 4, the Center formally notified the Respondents of the Complaint, and the proceedings commenced on April 28, 2025. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was May 18, 2025. The Respondents did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondents' default on May 19, 2025.

The Center appointed Luca Barbero as the sole panelist in this matter on May 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 wholly owned subsidiary of Aspro N.V. and operates internationally as a provider of online gambling services under the LINEBET brand through the platform at "www.linebet.com".

The Complainant's offerings under the LINEBET brand predominantly pertain to online slots, live casinos and sports betting events.

The Complainant's online platform is available in over sixty languages and allows users to deposit using over 100 payment methods including Bitcoin, Sticpay, and WebMoney, accepting more than twelve different currencies.

Over the years, and specifically between 2021 and 2022, the LINEBET platform has seen continued expansion and an increase in organic traffic, reaching between 50,000-75,000 visits in 2022 and broadening its range of services to include a LINEBET mobile application for download on iOS and Android, which allows customers quick access to its LINEBET services and an affiliate program, which has allowed over 20,000 affiliate users to generate revenue for referring customers as well as earning extra bonuses.

The Complainant's LINEBET services and mobile application have also been subject of significant media attention, which included being published on the Casino Guru website, accruing a 4.5-star rating on Trustpilot and being awarded 'Excellence in Sports Betting Innovation 2024' at SiGMAI's Europe B2C Awards in 2024.

The Complainant also operates as an official sports betting partner in Africa and Middle East and North Africa, as well as an official principal partner for Bulawayo Brave Jaguars.

The Complainant is the owner of several figurative trademark registrations for LINEBET, including the European Union trademark registration Nos. 018952911, 018953504, 018952983 and 018952940, all filed on November 20, 2023, and registered on March 2, 2024, March 5, 2024, March 2, 2025, and March 20, 2024, in classes 35, 41 and 42, respectively, as per trademark registration certificates submitted as annexes 12 to the Complaint.

The Complainant is also the owner of the domain name <linebet.com>, which is used by the Complainant to provide its online gambling services under the trademark LINEBET.

The disputed domain names <linebetbangladesh.net> <linebetbdapp.com> and <linebet-bd.net> were all registered on July 14, 2022.

The disputed domain name <linebet-bd.net> has been pointing to a website publishing the Complainant's LINEBET figurative mark, promoting LINEBET betting and online casino services and claiming to be a LINEBET official website for Bangladesh. The disputed domain names <linebetbangladesh.net> and <linebetbdapp.com> currently resolve to an inactive website available at "www.linebetbangladesh.net", but according to the screenshots submitted by the Complainant – which have not been contested by the Respondent -, prior to the present proceeding, they pointed to a very similar website featuring the Complainant's marks and promoting the Complainant's online gambling services, encouraging Internet users

to register or login and then redirecting them to competitors' 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 it maintains registered trademarks for LINEBET in European Union and that the design elements in the marks do not comprise the dominant portion of the relevant mark, which consists of the denominative element "linebet", nor does it overtake the textual element in prominence.

The Complainant also states that it has attained goodwill and recognition internationally under the name "Linebet", which has become the distinctive identifier of the Complainant's services. The Complainant submits that despite its marks having been registered on March 2, 2024, its LINEBET online gambling platform had already acquired goodwill and world renown since 2019, becoming a distinctive identifier well before the trademarks were registered.

In view of the above, the Complainant contends that it has rights in the LINEBET mark and that the disputed domain names are all confusingly similar to the mark as they reproduce the trademark in its entirety with the mere addition of the geographical term "Bangladesh" or "bd" and the generic term "app" (meaning "application") and, in the case of the <linebet-bd.net> disputed domain name, of a hyphen between the mark and the two letters "bd". The Complainant emphasizes that the addition of such terms reinforces the likelihood of confusion, given the Complainant's prominence in the Bangladesh market and the Complainant is covering more than 1,00 sports betting events on a global scale.

The Complainant submits that the Respondent lacks rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name since i) the Respondent has not registered any trademarks for LINEBET, nor any terms similar to those comprised in the disputed domain names; ii) the Respondent is not commonly known by the disputed domain names; iii) the Respondent has not been licensed by the Complainant to use the "linebet" term in any way; iv) the disputed domain names have been used to impersonate the Complainant's offerings, displaying on the correspondent websites the Complainant's LINEBET mark and visual elements taken from the Complainant's main website, promoting gambling services without providing any disclaimer of non-affiliation with the Complainant and redirecting users to websites of the Complainant's competitors; and v) since the Respondent has impersonated the Complainant's offerings and is attempting to misleadingly divert consumers for the purpose of deriving commercial gain, the Respondent's conduct is illegitimate and cannot constitute either legitimate non-commercial or fair use.

The Complainant also states that, despite the fact that, when accessing the disputed domain names from Bangladesh, the aforementioned prompts direct users to the LINEBET website, this does not give rise to any rights or legitimate interest on part of the Respondent, since control of the redirect is in the hands of the Respondent, which could change the redirect to competing websites in Bangladesh, and even when considering the Respondent as an "affiliate" of the Complainant, such conduct would anyway be in direct violation of the Complainant's affiliate Terms & Conditions which explicitly prohibits "contextual advertising containing the Linebet brand name, or to create websites, whose domain names contain the Linebet brand name".

With reference to the circumstances evidencing bad faith, the Complainant indicates that the disputed domain names were registered after the LINEBET mark had already achieved widespread recognition and popularity. In particular, the Complainant asserts that its online platform was founded in 2019, that it has continued to operate its LINEBET brand since then and that the Complainant's activity under the LINEBET brand predates the registration of the disputed domain names by almost three years. The Complainant further states that the Complainant has accrued substantial goodwill and international recognition in its

LINEBET offerings, accruing hundreds of thousands of customer registrations and new visitors to its main website since it began operating its online betting platform in 2019. The Complainant also points out that its activity has received widespread media publication globally by third-party sources, as well as within the Complainant's sector, and concludes that the Complainant's continuous use of the LINEBET brand since 2019 supports the conclusion that the Respondent was likely aware of the Complainant's LINEBET brand at the time of registering the disputed domain names.

The Complainant further asserts that, given the Respondent's clear and prominent use of the Complainant's marks in the disputed domain names and on the correspondent websites, it is clear that the Respondent targeted the Complainant when registering the disputed domain names.

The Complainant contends that the Respondent engaged in a pattern of abusive conduct by registering three disputed domain names containing the Complainant's highly established LINEBET brand and chose to do so in an attempt to prevent the Complainant from reflecting its brand in equivalent domain names.

The Complainant further submits that the Respondent has intentionally attempted to attract, for commercial gain, Internet users by creating a likelihood of confusion with the Complainant's LINEBET brand and offerings.

Therefore, the Complainant concludes that the Respondent registered and used the disputed domain names in bad faith, with the intent to profit from the LINEBET name and trademark, deceive consumers, and damage the Complainant's business and reputation.

B. Respondent

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

6. Discussion and Findings

6.1 Consolidation: 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 the Complainant asserted that the disputed domain names, although registered in the name of different individuals, are under common control since:

(i) The disputed domain names share a similar composition, involving the LINEBET mark and the same country or geographical identifier 'Bangladesh' or 'bd'. Specifically, the disputed domain names <linebetbdapp.com> and <linebet-bd.net> both include 'bd' in their composition;

(ii) The disputed domain names were all registered on the same date and with the same registrar;

(iii) The disputed domain name <linebet-bd.net> resolves to a website displaying the Complainant's LINEBET logo and offerings for Bangladesh as the other disputed domain names and the disputed domain name <linebetbdapp.com> redirects to the website at <linebetbangladesh.net>. Specifically, all of the disputed domain names initially resolved to websites displaying the same promotion code 'LINEBDNET' on the landing pages. Similarly, the disputed domain name <linebetbd.net> pointed to a website displaying an almost identical promotion code as the disputed domain name <linebetbangladesh.net> ('BDTLINE100') in late 2022;

(iv) The disputed domain names <linebetbangladesh.net> and <linebet-bd.net> each utilize the same unique affiliate link code to redirect Bangladesh-based visitors to the Complainant's website when they engage with the respective website prompts;

(v) The disputed domain names <linebetbdapp.net> and <linebet-bd.net> are using the same hosting provider (Cloudflare, Inc.), the respective websites are hosted on IP addresses that begin in the same way (104.21; 172.67) and all of the disputed domain names use the same name server provider;

(vi) Although the registrant details for the disputed domain name <linebet-bd.net> and the other disputed domain names differ, both email addresses have been used to register other domain names that comprise betting industry terms using the same country-code top-level domain (ccTLD '.br') and the same Brazil-based registrar.

The Panel finds that the elements highlighted by the Complainant and referenced above demonstrate a common control of the disputed domain names. Indeed, the disputed domain names all reproduce the LINEBET mark of the Complainant with the mere addition of the geographical indicator "Bangladesh" or "bd" and the generic term "app" (meaning "application") and have been used in connection with very similar websites displaying the Complainant's LINEBET logo and offerings for Bangladesh.

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 Respondent") in a single proceeding.

6.2. 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 Respondent are identical or confusingly similar to a trademark or service mark in which the Complainant has rights;
- (ii) that the Respondent has 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 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 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 LINEBET (figurative mark).

The Panel finds that the dominant portion of the Complainant's marks, consisting of the denominative element "linebet", is entirely reproduced, and is thus recognizable, in the disputed domain names. Accordingly, the disputed domain names are confusingly similar to the marks for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 1.7. Since design elements are incapable of representation in domain names, these elements can be disregarded for purposes of assessing identity or confusing similarity under the first element. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 1.10.

The Complainant also asserts unregistered trademark rights over LINEBET, submitting the following documents and statements:

- The Complainant operates its main platform at "www.linebet.com", which it has been using to facilitate access to its gambling offerings worldwide under the LINEBET mark since 2019;
- Notwithstanding the jurisdictional restrictions applicable to online gambling services, the LINEBET platform has seen continued expansion since its establishment, with the platform receiving over 13,132 user registrations in 2021 (increasing to 88,689 in 2022) across numerous countries worldwide including, for example, Morocco, Cameroon, and Tanzania. Furthermore, the Complainant's platform received an increase of organic traffic from approximately 20,000 visits in 2021 to between 50,000-75,000 visits in 2022 (Annex 6 to the Complaint);
- The Complainant operates its mobile application for download to iOS and Android, which allows customers quick and easy access to its LINEBET services (Annex 7 to the Complaint). The Complainant's LINEBET services and mobile application have also received significant media publication and review including being published on the Casino Guru website and accruing a 4.5-star rating on Trustpilot with more than 550 reviews overall (Annex 8 to the Complaint, including reviews dated May 2022);
- The Complainant is recognized as a prominent and trusted provider of gambling services and was awarded 'Excellence in Sports Betting Innovation 2024' at SiGMAI's Europe B2C Awards in 2024 (Annex 9 to the Complaint). The Complainant also operates as an official sports betting partner in Africa and Middle East and North Africa as well as an official principal partner for Bulawayo Brave Jaguars.
- The Complainant operates an affiliate program from "www.linebet.partners", which has allowed over 20,000 affiliate users to generate revenue for referring customers as well as earning extra bonuses. The Complainant encourages its affiliates to participate and meet with the Complainant at international conference events such as SIGMA Euraisa and iGBLIVE in Dubai and Amsterdam 2024 respectively (Annex 11 to the Complaint).
- The Complainant's marks are also featured prominently on the Complainant's social media, where the Complainant actively promotes its products and services since 2019 under the LINEBET name, particularly on Facebook, Instagram, X, Telegram and LinkedIn (Annex 13 to the Complaint).

The Panel finds that the evidence provided by the Complainant shows that LINEBET has become a distinctive identifier which the relevant consuming public associates with the Complainant's online gambling services. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 1.3.

The mere addition of a hyphen, of the terms "Bangladesh", "app", of the two letters "bd" and "app" and of the generic Top Level Domains ("gTLDs") ".com" and ".net" to the LINEBET mark does not prevent a finding of confusing similarity under the first element confusing similarity test. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), sections 1.8 and 1.11.1.

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 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 names. 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 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 Respondent and the Complainant. The Respondent is not an affiliate or licensee of the Complainant, nor has the Respondent obtained authorization to use the Complainant's trademarks or to register the disputed domain names.

Moreover, there is no element from which the Panel could infer the Respondent's rights over the disputed domain names, or that the Respondent might be commonly known by the disputed domain names.

The Panel also finds that there is no evidence of use of the disputed domain names by the Respondent in connection with a bona fide offering of goods or services or a legitimate non-commercial or fair use without intent for commercial gain to misleadingly divert consumers or to tarnish the Complainant's trademarks.

As mentioned above, the disputed domain name <linebet-bd.net> is has been pointing to a website publishing the Complainant's LINEBET figurative mark, promoting LINEBET betting and online casino services and claiming to be a LINEBET official website for Bangladesh. The disputed domain names <linebetbangladesh.net> and <linebetbdapp.com> currently resolve to an inactive website available at "www.linebetbangladesh.net", but according to the screenshots submitted by the Complainant – which have not been contested by the Respondent –, they previously pointed to a very similar website featuring the Complainant's marks and promoting the Complainant's online gambling services, encouraging Internet users to register or login only to then redirect them to competitors' websites. Moreover, none of the websites ever included a proper disclaimer of non-affiliation with the Complainant.

The Panel notes that the Respondent's use of the disputed domain names suggests that the Respondent intended to attract users to its websites for commercial gain, passing off as the Complainant and/or suggesting an affiliation with it, and finds that such use does not amount to a bona fide offering of goods or services or a legitimate noncommercial or fair use.

Panels have categorically held that the use of a domain name for illegal activity, such as impersonation or passing off, can never confer rights or legitimate interests on a respondent. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 2.13.1.

The Panel further notes that the disputed domain names, reproducing the Complainant's LINEBET mark in its entirety, carry a risk of implied affiliation with the Complainant. Therefore, such composition cannot constitute fair use. [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, the disputed domain names were registered on July 14, 2022, before the Complainant's LINEBET marks were filed and registered with the European Union Intellectual Property Office. However, as indicated above, the Panel finds that the Complainant has demonstrated to have used the LINEBET mark in connection with its online betting and gambling services since 2019 and that the mark has become known in the gambling sector before the registration of the disputed domain names.

In view of the above, the Panel finds that the Respondent knew or should have been aware of the Complainant's LINEBET mark at the time of the registration of the disputed domain names.

Moreover, the content initially published on the websites to which all the disputed domain names resolved, featuring the LINEBET marks and providing links to purportedly access the Complainant's betting and gambling services, suggests that the Respondent was not only well aware of the Complainant's mark but also that the disputed domain names were registered with a deliberate intent to create an impression of an association with the Complainant and its services.

In view of the use of the disputed domain names in connection with the websites described above, publishing the Complainant's marks and promoting the Complainant's LINEBET offerings, without displaying any disclaimer of non-affiliation with the Complainant and claiming to be the "Official Website for Betting and Online Casino", providing also links to websites of the Complainant's competitors, the Panel finds that the Respondent used the disputed domain names to intentionally attempt to attract, for commercial gain, Internet users to its websites, by creating a likelihood of confusion with the Complainant's marks as to the source, sponsorship, affiliation, or endorsement of its websites and the services promoted therein according to paragraph 4(b)(iv) of the Policy.

Lastly, as mentioned above, the disputed domain names <linebetbangladesh.net> and <linebetbdapp.com> do not currently resolve to active websites. 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 reputation of the Complainant's LINEBET mark in its sector and, considering the composition of the disputed domain names, the Respondent's failure to provide any evidence of actual or contemplated good-faith use and the implausibility of any good faith use to which the disputed domain names may be put, finds that, under the circumstances, the current passive holding of the disputed domain names <linebetbangladesh.net> and <linebetbdapp.com> 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.

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 <linebetbangladesh.net>, <linebetbdapp.com>, and <linebet-bd.net> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Luca Barbero/

Luca Barbero

Sole Panelist

Date: June 5, 2025