

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

Ninja Global OÜ v. Genevieve King
Case No. D2025-1898

1. The Parties

The Complainant is Ninja Global OÜ, Estonia, represented by Wiggin LLP, United Kingdom.

The Respondent is Genevieve King, United States of America.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <ninjacasinox.com> is registered with Hosting Concepts B.V. d/b/a Registrar.eu. (the "Registrar").

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the "Center") on May 12, 2025. On May 13, 2025, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On May 13, 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 (Persons Unknown) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on May 21, 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 amendment to the Complaint on May 22, 2025.

The Center verified that the Complaint together with the amendment to 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 May 26, 2025. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was June 15, 2025. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent's default on June 20, 2025.

The Center appointed Andrew Brown K.C. as the sole panelist in this matter on July 4, 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 private limited company incorporated in Estonia. It has contact details in London, United Kingdom. The Complainant is part of the Entain Group, a large sports betting, gaming and interactive entertainment group which operates such brands as Ninja Casino, bwin, Ladbrokes, Coral, Gala, Foxy, PartyPoker, and SportingBet. The parent company, Entain Group Limited, is listed on the London Stock Exchange and is a member of the FTSE 100 Index.

The relevant trademark registrations of the Complainant ("the NINJA CASINO Trademark") include:

Country	Number	Trademark	Registration Date	Class
EU	015743685	NINJACASINO	November 28, 2016	9 and 41
EU	017754516	NINJACASINO (logo)	May 14, 2018	9, 38 and 41
EU	017754573	NINJACASINO (logo)	May 14, 2018	9, 38 and 41

The Complainant has registered and has been actively using the domain name <ninjacasino.com>.

The domain name was registered on April 15, 2025. The disputed domain name resolves to a landing page used for casino related services. The clickable content on the landing page redirects Internet users to various third party platforms.

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 either identical or confusingly similar to its NINJA CASINO Trademark. The Complainant points to the clear presence of NINJA CASINO in the disputed domain name and says that the addition of the letter "x" does not distinguish the disputed domain name from the Complainant's NINJA CASINO Trademark.

The Complainant says that the Respondent has not made any bona fide or legitimate commercial use of the disputed domain name. Rather, the Respondent is using the disputed domain name to redirect Internet users to various third party platforms including <winorio1.com>, <bofcasino.com> and <trackingthejackpotj.com>. The Complainant has no connection with any of these platforms or their operators. Further the Respondent is using the disputed domain name in connection with a website which refers to itself as "Ninja Casino" – a casino for Finnish players, presented in the Finnish language

The Complainant says that it has no relationship with the Respondent and that the disputed domain name as registered without its consent. It further says that the unauthorized reproduction of its NINJA CASINO Trademark – in particular the Complainant's NINJA CASINO logo - in the disputed domain name amounts to infringement of its intellectual property rights. The Complainant relies too on jurisprudence that the use of a domain name for illegal activity such as impersonation/passing off can never confer rights or legitimate interests on a respondent.

The Complainant states that the disputed domain name was registered in bad faith. It states that the Respondent is using the disputed domain name in connection with a website that refers to itself as “Ninja Casino – a casino for Finnish players in the Finnish language”. In support of this requirement the Complainant refers to screenshots showing the Respondent’s use of a copy of the Complainant’s stylized NINJA CASINO logo on the website that resolves from the disputed domain name.

Given this, the Complainant states that it is inconceivable that the Respondent did not previously know of the Complainant and its NINJA CASINO Trademark, and its legitimate platform <ninjacasino.com>.

The Complainant states that the disputed domain name has been used to:

- (a) Create the impression that it is connected to the Complainant;
- (b) Disrupt the business of the Complainant;
- (c) Attract for commercial gain Internet users to the disputed domain name by creating a likelihood of confusion with the Complainant’s NINJA CASINO Trademark; and
- (d) Infringe the Complainant’s intellectual property rights.

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, namely the NINJA CASINO Trademark for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 1.2.1.

The entirety of the word mark NINJA CASINO 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 addition of the letter “x”) 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 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 finds that the disputed domain name is registered in bad faith for the following reasons:

(a) The Complainant has clearly demonstrated that it had rights to its NINJA CASINO Trademark and that the relevant trademarks relied on were registered prior to registration of the disputed domain name. The Complainant has also provided evidence of its use of its distinctive NINJA CASINO logo on its website <ninjacasino.com> and on its social media platforms. The Complainant’s NINJA CASINO Trademark had a recognized reputation as of the date of registration of the disputed domain name, as a result of the Complainant’s operations on its website <ninjacasino.com> and on its corresponding social media platforms for its NINJA CASINO gaming services.

(b) The Respondent clearly knew the Complainant’s NINJA CASINO Trademark when it registered the disputed domain name. This is evidenced by the Respondent’s use of the Complainant’s stylized NINJA CASINO logo (one of its registered trademarks) on the landing page of the disputed domain name. The Respondent reproduces the Complainant’s logo at both the top and bottom of the page. The Panel is also satisfied that the Respondent is using the disputed domain name in bad faith for the following reasons:

(a) The Complainant has provided evidence that the disputed domain name is being used to direct Internet users (who may be looking for the Complainant and its well-established NINJA CASINO Trademark) to a landing page that is not connected in any way with the Complainant.

(b) As noted earlier, the landing page at the disputed domain name prominently feature the Complainant’s NINJA CASINO logo Trademark. Members of the public will be confused or deceived by such into believing that the disputed domain name (and the associated website located there) are in fact the Complainant’s or are connected with the Complainant when this is not the case. This results in consumers being driven away from the Complainant’s legitimate website.

(c) The Respondent has intentionally tried to disrupt the business of the Complainant.

(d) The Panel is entitled to draw and it does draw an adverse inference from the failure of the Respondent to respond to the Complaint and to the factual allegations made by the Complainant.

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 <ninjacasinox.com> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Andrew Brown K.C./

Andrew Brown K.C.

Sole Panelist

Date: July 14, 2025