

## **ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION**

Granturo Platform Ltd v. Oleksandr Bashenko  
Case No. D2025-2238

### **1. The Parties**

The Complainant is Granturo Platform Ltd, Malta, represented by Wilmark Oy, Finland.

The Respondent is Oleksandr Bashenko, Ukraine.

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

The disputed domain name <wildz-online.casino> (the “Domain Name”) is registered with URL Solutions, Inc. (the “Registrar”).

### **3. Procedural History**

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the “Center”) on June 9, 2025. On June 10, 2025, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the Domain Name. On June 10, 2025, the Registrar transmitted by email to the Center its verification response disclosing registrant and contact information for the Domain Name which differed from the named Respondent (Not available) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on June 12, 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 18, 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 19, 2025. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was July 9, 2025. The Respondent sent an email communication to the Center on June 18, 2025, but did not submit a formal response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent’s default on July 11, 2025.

The Center appointed Mathias Lilleengen as the sole panelist in this matter on July 15, 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 to ensure compliance with the Rules, paragraph 7.

#### **4. Factual Background**

The Complainant iGaming company based in Malta. The Complainant operates several online casinos, one of them is named WILDZ. WILDZ is fast growing and has provided 200 million free spins in the last 1,5 years. Its biggest pay out in 2020 was over EUR 4 million.

The Complainant owns numerous trademark registrations for WILDZ in several jurisdictions, such as European Union trademark registration No. 017589813 (registered on April 25, 2018). The Complainant's trademark registrations predate the Respondent's registration of the Domain Name.

The Domain Name was registered on May 6, 2025. The Domain Name has resolved to a webpage that appears to offer gaming services, as well as to a webpage that claims WILDZ casino is of "low rating". The webpage has adverts for online casinos competing with the Complainant.

#### **5. Parties' Contentions**

##### **A. Complainant**

The Complainant provides evidence of trademark registrations and argues that the Domain Name incorporates the Complainant's trademark in its entirety with descriptive additions. The additions only increase the confusing similarity to the trademark.

The Complainant argues that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the Domain Name. The Respondent has no relation with the Complainant and its trademark. The Complainant argues that the use of the Respondent proves that Respondent knew of the Complainant's trademark and business at the time of the registration of the Domain Name.

The Complainant argues that the Respondent has registered the Domain Name to capitalize on the Complainant's reputation. The Respondent uses the Domain Name to confuse and mislead Internet users. It disrupts the Complainant's business.

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

The Respondent did not reply to the Complainant's contentions but has sent an informal email to the Center on June 18, 2025, stating "There is no need for WIPO. We are ready to transfer domains".

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

##### **6.1 Preliminary Matters**

The Panel notes that the Respondent's postal address is stated to be in Ukraine. 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.

Under paragraph 10 of the Rules, the Panel is required to ensure that the Parties are treated with equality and that each Party is given a fair opportunity to present its case, and also that the administrative proceeding takes place with due expedition.

The Panel notes that the courier was not able to deliver the written notice to the Respondent's address in Ukraine. However, the Notification of Complaint was delivered to the Respondent's email address provided by the Registrar without receiving any delivery failure response. Moreover, the Respondent has sent an informal email to the Center. The Respondent has not opposed the continuation of the proceeding. The Panel further notes that the use of the Domain Name has changed, indicating that the Respondent appears to have had control of the Domain Name. Moreover, as described below, the Panel believes the Respondent has registered the Domain Name in bad faith to target the Complainant and mislead consumers.

The Panel concludes that the Parties have been given a fair opportunity to present their case, and so that the administrative proceeding takes place with due expedition the Panel will proceed to a Decision accordingly.

### **A. Identical or Confusingly Similar**

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 Domain Name. WIPO Overview of WIPO Panel Views on Selected UDRP Questions, Third Edition, ("[WIPO Overview 3.0](#)"), section 1.7.

The Complainant has established that it has rights in the trademark WILDZ. In this case, the Domain Name incorporates the Complainant's trademark with the addition of "-online". The addition does not prevent a finding of confusing similarity between the Domain Name and the trademark. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 1.8. For the purpose of assessing under paragraph 4(a)(i) of the Policy, the Panel may ignore the generic Top-Level Domain ("gTLD"). [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 1.11.1.

The Panel finds that the Domain Name is confusingly similar to a trademark in which the Complainant has rights in accordance with paragraph 4(a)(i) of the Policy.

### **B. Rights or Legitimate Interests**

Paragraph 4(c) of the Policy provides a list of circumstances in which a respondent may demonstrate rights or legitimate interests in a disputed domain name.

While 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 often impossible 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. 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.

Based on the evidence, the Respondent is not affiliated or related to the Complainant in any way. There is no evidence that the Respondent has registered the Domain Name as a trademark or acquired trademark rights. There is no evidence of the Respondent's use of, or demonstrable preparations to use, the Domain Name or a name corresponding to the Domain Name in connection with a bona fide offering of goods or services. On the contrary, the use of the Domain Name is evidence of bad faith. Moreover, the Panel finds that the composition of the Domain Name carries a risk of implied affiliation with the Complainant.

The Panel finds that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the Domain Name in accordance with paragraph 4(a)(ii) of the Policy.

### **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.

The Respondent most likely knew of the Complainant when he registered the Domain Name. It follows from the composition and use of the Domain Name. As mentioned above, the Domain Name has been used for a website that mentions the Complainant's online casino and links to competing services. Under the circumstances, this represents evidence of bad faith use. The Panel agrees that the Respondent has registered the Domain Name in an attempt to unfairly take advantage of the Complainant's trademark. This has not been disputed by the Respondent.

Based on the available record, 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 the Domain Name <wildz-online.casino> be transferred to the Complainant.

*/Mathias Lilleengen/*

Mathias Lilleengen

Sole Panelist

Date: July 24, 2025