

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

Ninja Global OÜ v. Alvaro Arroyo Lara
Case No. D2025-2192

1. The Parties

The Complainant is 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 <ninjacasinofi.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 4, 2025. On June 5, 2025, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On June 5, 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 10, 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 10, 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 12, 2025. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was July 2, 2025. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent’s default on July 7, 2025.

The Center appointed Jane Lambert as the sole panelist in this matter on July 9, 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 part of the Entain Group, one of the world's largest sports betting, gaming and interactive entertainment groups. Entain is licensed in over 40 territories and generated substantial net gaming revenues in 2023. Entain owns and operates some of the world's best-known sports-betting and gaming brands, including Ninja Casino, bwin, Ladbrokes, Coral, Gala, Foxy, PartyPoker and SportingBet. Entain Plc, the parent company of the Entain group, is listed on the London Stock Exchange. It is also a constituent of the FTSE 100 Index. The Complainant operates a betting platform at <ninjacasino.com>.

The Complainant is the registered proprietor of the following trademarks for NINJA CASINO (together, the "Protected Marks"):

Jurisdiction	Number	Mark	Application	Registration	Classes
European Union ("EU")	015743685	NINJACASINO	August 10, 2016	November 28, 2016	9, 41
EU	017754516	 NINJA CASINO	January 30, 2018	May 14, 2018	9, 38, and 41
EU	017754573	 NINJA CASINO	January 30, 2018	May 14, 2018	9, 38, 41
Estonia	60846	 NINJA CASINO <small>Võlgemaksed 5 minutiga!</small>	December 2, 2021	March 11, 2022	41
Estonia	60845	 NINJA CASINO <small>Võlgemaksed 5 minutiga!</small>	December 2, 2021	March 11, 2022	41

All that is known about the Respondent are the name, email and postal addresses and telephone number that the Registrar disclosed to the Center on June 5, 2025. The Complainant claims that they are the same contact details that the Complainant received in respect of *Elec Games Ltd and Ninja Global OÜ v. Alvaro Arroyo Lara*, WIPO case [D2025-2155](#) for <boostcasinoo.com>. BOOST CASINO is a brand that belongs to another member of the aforementioned group of companies.

The disputed domain name was registered on May 5, 2025. At the time of filing of the Complaint, it redirects to a website "www.rivoli.fi" which lists various online casinos, including the Complainant's. The Complainant has also provided evidence showing that the disputed domain name had earlier resolved to a website discussing the Complainant's NINJA CASINO services, displaying the trade mark and a logo very similar to the Complainant's as well as a link inter alia to "New Best Online Casinos". In the bottom the site contained the following disclaimer in small font: "The site ninjacasino.fi is not related to the brand [...]."

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 "very highly similar to" (sic) the Protected Marks as it comprises or includes the words "NINJA CASINO". The disputed domain name incorporates those words in their entirety. Referring to *AT&T Corp v William Gormally*, WIPO Case [D2005-0758](#), the Complainant submits that the incorporation of a trade mark in its entirety in a disputed domain name is sufficient to show that the disputed domain name is identical or confusingly similar to the trademark. Citing *bwin Services AG v. Casino Seiten Design*, WIPO Case [D2011-0697](#) where it was held that the combination of the term "Türkiye" with the corporate name "bwin" did not diminish the likelihood of confusion but rather increased it, the Complainant argues that the addition of a two letter country code "fi" does not negate the possibility of confusion in this case. On the contrary, the inclusion of those letters is likely to lead Internet users to believe that the disputed domain name is intended for use with its Finnish customers. Referring to *Accor v. Noldc Inc.*, WIPO Case No. [D2005-0016](#), the Complainant contends that the Top-Level Domain ".com" can be ignored when assessing the identity or similarity of a trade mark and domain name.

The Complainant notes that it was held in *Research in Motion Limited v One Star Global LLC*, WIPO Case [D2009-0227](#) that the words "confusingly similar" impose a low threshold test to assess whether a complainant has a locus standi for bringing a complaint. As all the trade mark registrations were in existence at the time of filing and before the registration of the disputed domain name, the Complainant submits that the existence of the trade mark registrations clearly satisfies the threshold requirement of having trade mark rights for the purposes of standing to file a UDRP complaint.

In relation to its obligation to prove that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the disputed domain name, the Complainant quotes from the decision in *Accor v. Eren Atesmen*, WIPO Case [D2009-0701](#) that "a complainant must show a prima facie case that a respondent lacks rights or legitimate interests in a disputed domain name, after which the burden of rebuttal passes to the respondent." The Complainant states that it has no relationship with the Respondent and that the disputed domain name was registered without the Complainant's consent.

The Complainant states that the disputed domain name redirects to a website at the domain name <rivoli.fi>, a page that lists various online casinos including the Complainant's NINJA CASINO, the aforementioned BOOST CASINO and other online platforms owned and operated by the Entain Group. Clicking on "NINJA CASINO" redirects to a website at the domain name <amonbet83.com>, a site with which the Complainant has no connection.

The Complainant submits that the registration of the disputed domain name must have been made with the specific intent of diverting users from the Complainant's legitimate platform to an unconnected third party platform. Given that the Complainant is the owner of the Protected Marks and the domain name <ninjacasino.com>, it contends that the disputed domain name must have been chosen for its clearly confusing similarity to each of the Protected Marks. The Complainant further submits that as the content on the website is clearly intended to imitate the website of the Complainant, the unauthorized reproduction of the Protected Marks within the content found at the disputed domain name inevitably amounts to an infringement of the Complainant's intellectual property rights. Referring to section 2.13 of the WIPO Overview of WIPO Panel Views on Selected UDRP Questions, Third Edition ("WIPO Overview 3.0"), the Complainant argues that UDRP panels have routinely held that the use of a domain name for illegal activity (such as counterfeiting and/or impersonation/passing off) can never confer rights or legitimate interests on a respondent.

Citing section 2.5.1 of the [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), the Complainant observes that panels have found that domain names that are identical to a complainant's trade mark carry a high risk of implied affiliation. Given that the Complainant holds multiple trade mark registrations, and the domain name <ninjacasino.com>, there is a high risk of implied affiliation in this case.

The Complainant concludes that the Respondent can never have rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name for all of the above reasons.

In support of its contention that the disputed domain name was registered and is being used in bad faith, the Complainant alleges that the disputed domain name is being used in connection with a website that holds itself out as being directly connected with the Complainant's NINJA CASINO platform. In the Complaint, the Complainant reproduced logos on its own and the Respondent's site. When the logo from the Respondent's site is compared with those on the Complainant's the Respondent's logo is virtually indistinguishable from the Complainant's.

The Complainant submits that it is inconceivable that the Respondent was unaware of the Complainant and its website at <ninjacasino.com> and that the registration of the disputed domain name was intended to target that website, in its submission, there is no other obvious reason for the registration of a domain name that is so similar to the Protected Marks. The Complainant concludes that the Respondent is using, without permission, the Protected Marks to generate traffic to separate websites and platforms to obtain commercial gain from the false impression of a potential connection with the Complainant. Further, this activity may also disrupt the Complainant's business (in particular by diverting consumer attention from its legitimate platform) and tarnishing the Protected Marks.

The Complainant concludes that in registering the disputed domain name, the Respondent has intentionally tried to:

- I. Create the impression that it is or is connected to the Complainant when it is not;
- ii. Disrupt the business of the Complainant by attracting Internet users who may be confused and believe that the website is held, controlled by, or somehow affiliated with or related to the Complainant, all for the Respondent's commercial gain;
- iii. Attract for commercial gain, Internet users to the website, by creating a likelihood of confusion with the Complainant's Protected Marks as to the source, sponsorship, affiliation, or endorsement of the content found hosted at the disputed domain name; and
- iv. Infringe the Complainant's intellectual property rights.

For all these reasons, the Complainant submits that the disputed domain name was registered and is being used in bad faith.

B. Respondent

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

6. Discussion and Findings

The agreement to register the disputed domain name incorporated the following provision of the Policy:

"..... You are required to submit to a mandatory administrative proceeding in the event that a third party (a "complainant") asserts to the applicable Provider, in compliance with the Rules of Procedure, that
(i) your domain name is identical or confusingly similar to a trademark or service mark in which the complainant has rights; and

(ii) you have no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the domain name; and

(iii) your domain name has been registered and is being used in bad faith.

In the administrative proceeding, the complainant must prove that each of these three elements are present."

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 3.0](#), section 1.7.

The Complainant has shown rights in respect of a trade mark 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, "fi" may bear on assessment of the second and third elements, the Panel finds the addition of such a 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.

A respondent's use of a complainant's mark to redirect users to a competing site would not support a claim to rights or legitimate interests. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 2.5.3. The composition of the disputed domain name comprising the Complainant's trademark and the term "fi", a country code for Finland, falsely suggests to Internet users the mistaken belief that they may find a Finland-based distributor or operator of the Complainant's services. Coupled with the use of the disputed domain name to resolve to a website displaying the Complainant's trade mark and a similar logo, as well as a link inter alia to "New Best Online Casinos", this affirms, in the Panel's view, the Respondent's intention of taking unfair advantage of the likelihood of confusion between the disputed domain name and the Complainant as to the origin or affiliation of the website at the dispute domain name. Furthermore, the Panel finds that the presence of the easily overlooked disclaimer at the website which the disputed domain name previously resolved to does not render the Respondent's activities bona fide under the Policy, but rather may be considered as an admission by the Respondent that Internet users may be confused.

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. One of those circumstances is “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.”

In the present case, the Panel finds that the Respondent has used the disputed domain name which the Panel has held to be confusingly similar to a trade mark in which the Complainant has rights to redirect Internet users to a competing website at the domain name <rivoli.fi> and to resolve to a website displaying the Complainant’s trade mark and logo, as well as a link inter alia to “New Best Online Casinos”, which supports a finding that the Respondent has registered the disputed domain name to attract Internet users by creating a likelihood of confusion with the Complainant’s mark as to the source, sponsorship, affiliation, or endorsement of the Respondent’s web site or the location of its service from which it could expect commercial gain.

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 <ninjacasinofi.com> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Jane Lambert/

Jane Lambert

Sole Panelist

Date: July 23, 2025