

## **ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION**

Rillius Holding Limited v. Valentina Nikolaeva  
Case No. D2025-1987

### **1. The Parties**

The Complainant is Rillius Holding Limited, Cyprus, represented by Antroulla Vasileiou, Cyprus.

The Respondent is Valentina Nikolaeva, Ukraine.

### **2. The Domain Name and Registrar**

The disputed domain name <parimatchaffiliate.com> is registered with NameCheap, Inc. (the "Registrar").

### **3. Procedural History**

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the "Center") on May 19, 2025. On May 20, 2025, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On May 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, Privacy service provided by Withheld for Privacy ehf) 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 opted not to amend the Complaint.

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 May 23, 2025. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was June 12, 2025. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent's default on June 16, 2025.

The Center appointed Dr. Clive N.A. Trotman as the sole panelist in this matter on June 20, 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, based in Cyprus, is engaged in the business of online betting and gaming under the trademark PARIMATCH. The Complainant holds a number of trademark registrations for PARIMATCH, including:

PARIMATCH, International Trademark, registration number 1630588, registered on August 17, 2021, in classes 35 and 41;

PARIMATCH, stylized, Ukrainian trademark, registration number 288170, registered on December 28, 2020, in classes 35 and 41.

The Complainant or its authorized affiliates, conduct business through domain names incorporating the Complainant's trademark, including <parimatch.kz> and <parimatch.co.uk>.

The only background information available about the Respondent is the contact information furnished to the Registrar at the time of registration of the disputed domain name on November 8, 2024. The disputed domain name has resolved to a website (the "Respondent's website"), the Complainant's download of which, including subpages, occupies some 31 pages. The Respondent's website displays the Complainant's trademark and offers services similar to that of the Complainant. Additionally, buttons on the Respondent's website redirect to a third-party website of the Complainant's competitor.

#### **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 a trademark or service mark in which the Complainant has rights. The disputed domain name incorporates the Complainant's trademark with the additional word "affiliate", which the Complainant submits does not prevent a finding of confusing similarity between the trademark and the disputed domain name.

The Complainant contends that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the disputed domain name. The Complainant says neither itself nor any legitimate affiliate registered the disputed domain name, that the Respondent is in no way affiliated with the Complainant, nor has the Complainant authorized the Respondent to use its trademark. The Respondent is using the disputed domain name for the purpose of deceiving visitors into believing it to be connected with the Complainant, which cannot be a genuine provision of goods or services. There is no evidence the Respondent has been commonly known by the disputed domain name.

The Complainant further contends that the disputed domain name was registered and is being used in bad faith. The Complainant's trademark is a fictitious word and it is unlikely that the Respondent did not know about it when registering the disputed domain name.

The Complainant says the disputed domain name resolves to a website, and to subpages accessed by clicking the link on that website marked “Parimatch Casino”. The Respondent’s website makes many references to the Complainant’s trademark and to a purported “Parimatch Affiliate Program”. The colour scheme and use of the Complainant’s trademark on the Respondent’s website make it likely the website would confuse visitors into believing it to be operated with the Complainant’s permission. Elements of the Respondent’s website resemble those seen on the Complainant’s legitimate websites at <parimatch.kz> and <parimatch.co.uk>, which are operated with the Complainant’s permission.

Furthermore, by following various links from the Respondent’s website, such as the link marked “registration”, the visitor is diverted to the website of the betting company Mostbet and its associated affiliate program, being a competitor of the Complainant. The Complainant says the Respondent is acting in bad faith because the purpose of the disputed domain name is to lead potential and current customers of the Complainant and its partners to a competitor’s website for commercial gain.

The Complainant says the Respondent’s website does not contain any information about its true ownership or contact details, except for the false implication that it is associated with the Complainant. The provision of false contact information should be taken as an indication of the Respondent’s bad faith.

The Complainant has cited a number of previous decisions under the Policy that it considers may be of assistance to the Panel.

## **B. Respondent**

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

## **6. Discussion and Findings**

### **6.1 Preliminary Matters**

The Panel notes that the Respondent’s postal address is stated to be in Ukraine and that no communication has been received from the Respondent. Noting that Ukraine is subject to an international conflict at the date of this Decision, the Panel is to consider, in accordance with paragraph 10 of the Rules, whether the proceeding should continue.

The Panel considers that the Notification of Complaint and Commencement of Administrative Proceedings email was successfully delivered to the Respondent at its email address as registered with the Registrar and to a privacy service email address as specified by the Rules. The Panel further notes that the use of the disputed domain name has changed, with it now being inactive, indicating that the Respondent appears to have had control of the disputed domain name. The Panel is thus of the view that the Parties have been given a fair opportunity to present their case and will proceed to a Decision accordingly.

### **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 terms (here, “affiliate”) 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.

In particular, the Complainant has shown in evidence that the disputed domain name has been used for a website that displays the Complainant’s trademark without permission in order to make an offering of the Respondent’s goods or services, which cannot qualify as a bona fide use or as a legitimate noncommercial or fair use. Further, there is no evidence the Respondent has been known by a name similar to the disputed domain name.

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.

Paragraph 4(b)(iv) of the Policy is pertinent here, and reads as follows:

“(iv) by using the domain name, you have intentionally attempted to attract, for commercial gain, Internet users to your web site or other on-line location, by creating a likelihood of confusion with the complainant’s mark as to the source, sponsorship, affiliation, or endorsement of your web site or location or of a product or service on your web site or location”.

The Complainant has produced in evidence a 31-page screen capture of the Respondent’s website, including the subpage “[www.parimatchaffiliate.com/parimatch-casino/](#)”, which was accessed by selecting the link marked “Parimatch Casino”. The screen capture shows that the Respondent’s website displays multiple references to the Complainant’s trademark, commonly adopting the Complainant’s characteristic yellow colour and font style, usually in association with the words “affiliate” or “affiliates”. The nature of the Respondent’s website is purportedly to offer visitors the opportunity to become affiliates of the Complainant and to earn commercial gains by doing so. Numerous prominent headings proclaim, for example,

“Parimatch Affiliates: Your Gateway to Affiliate Success”, “Distinctive Features of the Parimatch Affiliate Program”, “Commission Plans and Earning Potential”, and “How to Create Your Parimatch Affiliate Account”.

The Complainant has found and stated in evidence that a number of link buttons on the Respondent’s website including “Login”, “Registration”, “Join”, “Start Now”, “Become An Affiliate”, “Start Earning”, and “Sign Up” all redirect to a website having no relationship with the Complainant but operated by the affiliate program of a third party and direct competitor of the Complainant, which allows partners to earn money by referring new players to this third party’s sports betting and online casino platform.

On the evidence, and on the balance of probabilities, the Panel finds the Respondent to have used the disputed domain name in bad faith for the purpose of attracting or attempting to attract Internet users to the Respondent’s website by confusion with the Complainant’s trademark, by offering them the affiliate program of a different company that is in competition with the Complainant, for the Respondent’s commercial gain. The similarity between the disputed domain name and the Complainant’s invented trademark supports the conclusion that the Respondent was aware of and intentionally targeted the Complainant at the time of registration of the disputed domain name, constituting registration in bad faith.

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 <parimatchaffiliate.com> be transferred to the Complainant.

*/Dr. Clive N.A. Trotman/*

**Dr. Clive N.A. Trotman**

Sole Panelist

Date: July 4, 2025