

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

Novomatic AG v. Kieran Holmes

Case No. D2025-1468

1. The Parties

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

The Respondent is Kieran Holmes, Afghanistan.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <bookofragame.store> is registered with NameCheap, Inc. (the “Registrar”).

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the “Center”) on April 8, 2025. On April 10, 2025, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On April 10, 2025, the Registrar transmitted by email to the Center its verification response confirming that the Respondent is listed as the registrant and providing the contact details.

The Center verified that the 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 April 17, 2025. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was May 7, 2025. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent’s default on May 8, 2025.

The Center appointed Mario Soerensen Garcia as the sole panelist in this matter on May 15, 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 Novomatic AG, owner of several trademark registrations for the mark BOOK OF RA in particular to cover casino games in class 9, including:

- European Union registration No. 004451431, for BOOK OF RA, registered on May 24, 2006, in class 9; and
- United States registration No. 4800800, for BOOK OF RA, registered on August 25, 2015, in classes 9 and 42.

The Respondent was identified as Kieran Holes, reportedly located in Afghanistan.

The disputed domain name <bookofragame.store> was created on January 24, 2025, it is currently inactive but it previously resolved to a website purportedly offering copies of the Complainant's slot games and providing gambling.

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 identical or at least confusingly similar to the Complainant's trademarks and the addition of the descriptive term "game" is not sufficient to avoid confusing similarity;
- the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name and has neither been commonly known by the disputed domain name;
- the Respondent has already been involved in other UDRP proceedings and is acting in bad faith, by using the disputed domain name to offer infringing slot games and to provide illegal gambling.

The Complainant requests the transfer of the disputed domain name.

B. Respondent

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

6. Discussion and Findings

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

- (i) the disputed domain name is identical or confusingly similar to the trademarks or service marks in which the Complainant has rights;
- (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 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 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 term here, “game”, may bear on assessment of the second and third elements, the Panel finds the addition of such descriptive 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 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 disputed domain name resolved to a website providing services in the same segment as Complainant’s and the Complainant has showed evidence indicating that such website reproduced images of the Complainant’s slot games. Thus, the Panel is of the view that the Respondent is not using the disputed domain name in connection with a bona fide offering of goods or services, nor is the Respondent making a legitimate noncommercial or fair use of the disputed domain name.

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

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 obviously knew the Complainant and its trademarks when registered the disputed domain name.

Also, the Respondent has already been involved in other previous domain name disputes under the Policy, namely *Calvin Broadus v. Kieran Holmes*, WIPO Case No. [D2025-0510](#), *Groupe Partouche v. Kieran Holmes*, WIPO Case No. [D2024-4992](#), *Groupe Lucien Barrière v. Kieran Holmes*, WIPO Case No. [D2024-0807](#), being engaged in a pattern of cybersquatting conduct.

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.

The Respondent used the disputed domain name in connection with a website offering slot games to attract Internet users for commercial gain, by creating a likelihood of confusion with the Complainant's trademarks.

Panels have held that the use of a domain name for illegitimate activity, here, claimed impersonation/passing off, constitutes bad faith. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 3.4. Having reviewed the record, the Panel finds the Respondent's registration and use of the disputed domain name constitutes bad faith under the Policy.

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 <bookofragame.store> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Mario Soerensen Garcia/

Mario Soerensen Garcia

Sole Panelist

Date: May 27, 2025