

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

Elec Games Ltd and Ninja Global OÜ v. Alvaro Arroyo Lara
Case No. D2025-2155

1. The Parties

The Complainant are Elec Games Ltd, Malta, and Ninja Global OÜ, Estonia, represented by Wiggin LLP, United Kingdom.

The Respondent is Alvaro Arroyo Lara, Spain.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <boostcasinoo.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 June 2, 2025. On June 3, 2025, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On June 3, 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 / REDACTED FOR PRIVACY) 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 amendment to the Complaint on June 4, 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 June 6, 2025. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was June 26, 2025. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Parties of the Respondent’s default on June 27, 2025.


The Center appointed Ingrida Kariņa-Bērziņa as the sole panelist in this matter on July 2, 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 Complainants are Elec Games Ltd (“Elec Games”), a company established in Malta in 2008, and Ninja Global OÜ (“Ninja Global”) a company established in Estonia in 2020. Both are subsidiaries of the Entain Group, an international online betting and gaming concern. The Complainants are hereinafter collectively referred to as the “Complainant”.

The Complainant operates an online betting platform at the domain name <boostcasino.com>. This website features the BOOST CASINO marks and a yellow color scheme.

The Complainant Elec Games is the proprietor of, among others, European Union Trade Mark No. 17754681 for BOOST CASINO (word mark), registered on May 18, 2018 for goods and services in classes 9, 38 and 41.

The Complainant Ninja Global is the proprietor of, among others, Estonian Trade Mark No. 60838 for  (BOOST CASINO 24/7 SAADAVAL KONTOVABA MEELELAHUTUS), registered on March 11, 2022 for services in class 41.

The disputed domain name was registered on May 5, 2025. At the time the Complaint was filed and at the time of this Decision, it resolved to a Finnish-language website that purports to offer online gaming services under the BOOST CASINO mark. The website displays an image of a “Boost Casino” mark and features a yellow color scheme. At the time, the Complaint was filed, the website also displayed links to various online casinos, including those operated by companies related to the Complainants. Moreover, the website featured a disclaimer in the bottom, that stated as follows: “[t]he site boostcasinoo.com is not related to the brand. Any images and information belong to their rightful copyright holder. The site boostcasinoo.com does not accept payments and does not organize gambling”. The Complainant has also provided evidence showing that the disputed domain name redirected to a third-party website displaying links to various online casinos, including the Complainant’s.

Other than a name and address, no information is available about the Respondent.

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 states that its parent company Entain Group operates casinos in more than 40 territories under numerous brands. The betting platform at <boostcasino.com> was registered in March 2015. The disputed domain name incorporates the Complainant’s BOOST CASINO mark in its entirety. The additional letter “o” is a common misspelling. The Complainant has no relationship with the Respondent, who registered the disputed domain name without the Complainant’s consent. The disputed domain name redirects to a third-party website that lists various online casinos, including the Complainant’s casino operated by the Entain Group. Clicking on the link for “Boost Casino” redirects users to yet another third-party website. The Respondent’s website displays the Complainant’s BOOST CASINO stylized logo.

B. Respondent

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

6. Discussion and Findings

Paragraph 4(a) of the UDRP requires the Complainant to make out all three of the following:

- (i) the disputed domain name is identical or confusingly similar to a trademark or service mark in which the Complainant has rights; and
- (ii) the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the disputed domain name; and
- (iii) the Respondent has registered and is using the disputed domain name in bad faith.

Under 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".

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 BOOST CASINO mark is reproduced within the disputed domain name. Moreover, in comparing the Complainant's mark with the disputed domain name, the Panel finds that the disputed domain name, with an additional terminal letter "o", is a deliberate misspelling of the Complainant's trademark. See [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), sections 1.7 and 1.9. Accordingly, the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to the mark for the purposes of the Policy

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 notes that the disputed domain name comprising the Complainant's trademark and the addition of the letter "o", coupled with the use of the disputed domain name to resolve to a website offering online gambling services and featuring a logo nearly identical to that of the Complainant, indicates an awareness of the Complainant and carries a risk of Internet user confusion (that seemingly being the Respondent's aim). The Respondent has not proved rights or legitimate interests. There is no evidence that the Respondent is commonly known by the disputed domain name, or that there are any circumstances or activities that would establish the Respondent's rights therein. The disputed domain name redirects Internet users to a third-party website featuring the Complainant's mark and links to other competing third-party websites. Such use cannot establish rights or legitimate interests. Furthermore, the Panel finds that the presence of the easily overlooked disclaimer at the website which the disputed domain name resolved to does not render the Respondent's activities bona fide under the Policy. When users had a chance to read the disclaimer they have already been attracted to the Respondent's website under the impression that the disputed domain name is associated with the Complainant.

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 intentionally attempted to attract, for commercial gain, Internet users to its website by creating a likelihood of confusion with the Complainant's mark. The disputed domain name was registered several years after the Complainant established rights in its BOOST CASINO trademark. It reflects a deliberate misspelling of the Complainant's mark. Under these circumstances, the Panel finds that the Respondent has registered the disputed domain name in bad faith.

The available evidence demonstrates that the Respondent used the disputed domain name inter alia to redirect Internet users to a third-party website, including containing links to other online casinos.

Further, the Complainant has shown that the disputed domain name resolved to a website that offered online gambling services, displayed an image of a "Boost Casino" mark nearly identical to the Complainant's figurative mark, and featured a yellow color scheme, which, in the Panel's view, mimicked the appearance of the Complainant's own betting platform. Panels have held that the use of a domain name for illegitimate activity (here, claimed impersonation/passing off, or other types of fraud) 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 <boostcasinoo.com> be transferred to the Complainants.

/Ingrīda Kariņa-Bērziņa/

Ingrīda Kariņa-Bērziņa

Sole Panelist

Date: July 11, 2025