

## ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

Moonlite N.V., v. Gee  
Case No. D2025-2131

### 1. The Parties

The Complainant is Moonlite N.V., Curaçao, Netherlands (Kingdom of the), represented by Gabné.Gabnys, Lithuania.

The Respondent is Gee, Russian Federation.

### 2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <casino-leon-gr1.com> is registered with PDR Ltd. d/b/a PublicDomainRegistry.com (the “Registrar”).

### 3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the “Center”) on May 30, 2025. On May 30, 2025, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On May 31, 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 (PDR Ltd. ) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on June 4, 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 amended Complaint on June 6, 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 June 11, 2025. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was July 1, 2025. The Respondent sent an email to the Center on June 4, 2025, but did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent’s default on July 2, 2025.

The Center appointed Kaya Köklü as the sole panelist in this matter on July 8, 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 company located in Curaçao, Netherlands (Kingdom of the), which offers various online gambling services.

The Complainant is the owner of the United Kingdom Trademark Registration No. UK00003148764, registered on May 6, 2016, for LEON, claiming protection for various gambling services as protected in class 41.

The Complainant further holds and operates websites at domain names which comprise its LEON trademark in its entirety, such as “www.leon.bet”, “www.leonbets.com” and “www.leon.casino”.

The Respondent is reportedly located in the Russian Federation.

The disputed domain name was registered on June 7, 2024.

At the time of the Decision, access to a website linked to the disputed domain name was blocked.

#### **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. According to undisputed information provided by the Complainant in its Complaint, the disputed domain name has been either inactive or has directed Internet users to the Complainant's goods and services.

##### **B. Respondent**

The Respondent did not reply to the Complainant's contentions. However, the Respondent sent an email communication on June 4, 2025, referring to the dispute and to the fact that it has not received any official notification, neither about the initiation of proceedings nor about the complaint itself. The Panel notes that the Center acknowledged receipt of the Respondent's email communication on June 4, 2025 providing general information about the UDRP and how to file a response, and that the Complaint was notified on June 11, 2025 to the email address used by the Respondent.

#### **6. Discussion and Findings**

According to paragraph 15(a) of the Rules, the Panel shall decide the Complaint in accordance with the Policy, the Rules and any rules and principles of law that it deems applicable.

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 a trademark 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.

For the evaluation of this case, the Panel has taken note of the WIPO Overview of WIPO Panel Views on Selected UDRP Questions, Third Edition, ("[WIPO Overview 3.0](#)") and, where appropriate, will decide consistently with the consensus views stated therein.

### **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 the LEON trademark for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 1.2.1.

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

Although the addition of other terms, here "casino" and "gr1" separated by hyphens, may bear on assessment of the second and third elements, the Panel finds the addition of such terms does not prevent a finding of confusing similarity between the disputed domain name and the LEON 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 Panel particularly notes that the nature of the disputed domain name, which comprises the Complainant's LEON trademark together with the term "casino" (which falsely suggests an association with the gambling services provided by the Complainant). In view of the Panel, this indicates the Respondent's awareness of the Complainant and its LEON trademark, and hence, its illicit intent to take unfair advantage of such, which does not support a finding of rights or legitimate interests of the Respondent.

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 notes The Panel finds the second element of the Policy has been established.

### **C. Registered and Used in Bad Faith**

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) 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.

In the present case, the Panel notes that the Respondent must have had the Complainant and its LEON trademark in mind when registering the disputed domain name, particularly considering the nature and composition of the disputed domain name. It is obvious to the Panel that the Respondent has deliberately chosen the disputed domain name, which fully comprises the Complainant's LEON trademark in combination with the term "casino", to target the Complainant in the relevant online gambling sector. Consequently, the Panel is convinced that the Respondent has registered the disputed domain name in bad faith.

The fact that the disputed domain name has probably not resolved to an active website so far does not prevent a finding of bad faith.

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 misleading composition of the disputed domain name, and the unlikelihood of any good faith use of the disputed domain name and finds that in the circumstances of this case, the passive holding of the disputed domain name does not prevent a finding of bad faith under the Policy.

Consequently, and taking all facts of the case into consideration, the Panel has no reason to doubt that 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 <casino-leon-gr1.com> be transferred to the Complainant.

*/Kaya Köklü/*

**Kaya Köklü**

Sole Panelist

Date: July 22, 2025