

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

Gaming Laboratories International, LLC v. Samuel Chan
Case No. D2025-2425

1. The Parties

Complainant is Gaming Laboratories International, LLC, United States of America ("United States"), represented by Fox Rothschild LLP, United States.

Respondent is Samuel Chan, China.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <gaminglaboratoriesinternational.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 June 19, 2025. On June 19, 2025, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On June 19, 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 (Privacy service provided by Withheld for Privacy ehf) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to Complainant on June 23, 2025, providing the registrant and contact information disclosed by the Registrar, and inviting Complainant to submit an amendment to the Complaint. Complainant filed an amendment to the Complaint on July 7, 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 Respondent of the Complaint, and the proceedings commenced on July 8, 2025. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was July 28, 2025. Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified Respondent's default on July 29, 2025.

The Center appointed Marina Perraki as the sole panelist in this matter on August 5, 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

Complainant offers testing and approval services of electronic gaming and lottery machines since 1989. Complainant offers its services to regulators, suppliers, and operators in over 500 jurisdictions worldwide. With 20 laboratories across Africa, Asia, Australia, Europe, North America, and South America, Complainant is, per Complaint, the only organization of its kind accredited under international standards. Complainant tests, reviews, and certifies gaming devices and systems against both its own standards and those of regulatory jurisdictions worldwide. Only products and services that meet these standards may be used in the relevant countries and jurisdictions.

Complainant owns trademark registrations for GAMING LABORATORIES INTERNATIONAL including the United States trademark registration No. 2781915, GAMING LABORATORIES INTERNATIONAL (word), filed on August 9, 2002 and registered on November 11, 2003 for services in international classes 35 and 42 and the European Union trademark registration No. 17989032, GAMING LABORATORIES INTERNATIONAL (word), filed on November 22, 2018 and registered on June 15, 2019 for goods and services in international classes 9, 35, 41, 42 and 45.

The disputed domain name was registered on August 22, 2024, and at the time of filing of the Complaint lead to a website impersonating Complainant and displaying Complainant's address and phone number at the bottom of each page (the Website). The Website consisted of stock images of medical testing with unrelated captions referring to Complainant's services, such as "Expert testing for gaming industry compliance and standards", "Innovative tools to enhance gaming operations and regulations", and "Trusted certification services for gaming suppliers and operators". Currently it leads to an inactive (suspended) website.

5. Parties' Contentions

A. Complainant

Complainant contends that it has satisfied each of the elements required under the Policy for a transfer of the disputed domain name.

B. Respondent

Respondent did not reply to Complainant's contentions.

6. Discussion and Findings

Paragraph 4(a) of the Policy lists the three elements which Complainant must satisfy with respect to the Domain Name:

- (i) the Domain Name is identical or confusingly similar to a trademark or service mark in which Complainant has rights;
- (ii) Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the Domain Name; and
- (iii) the Domain Name has been registered and is being used in bad faith.

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 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.

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 identical to the mark for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 1.7.

The generic Top-Level Domain ("gTLD") ".com" is disregarded, as TLDs typically do not form part of the comparison on the grounds that they are required for technical reasons only (*Rexel Developpements SAS v. Zhan Yequn*, WIPO Case No. [D2017-0275](#)). [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 1.11.1.

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 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 Complainant has established a prima facie case that Respondent lacks rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name. Respondent has not rebutted 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.

On the contrary, as Complainant demonstrated, the disputed domain name resolved to the Website impersonating Complainant.

Panels have held that the use of a domain name for illegitimate activity, here, claimed impersonation/passing off, or other types of fraud can never confer rights or legitimate interests on a respondent. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 2.13.1.

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) 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 Respondent has registered and used the disputed domain name in bad faith. Because Complainant's mark was used and registered at the time of the disputed domain name's registration, the Panel finds it more likely than not that Respondent had Complainant's mark in mind when registering the disputed domain name (*Parfums Christian Dior v. Javier Garcia Quintas and Christiandior.net*, WIPO Case No. [D2000-0226](#); *Société des Produits Nestlé SA v. Telmex Management Service*, WIPO Case No. [D2002-0070](#)).

Furthermore, the disputed domain name incorporates Complainant's mark in its entirety, while it used to lead to the Website, which impersonated Complainant.

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 Respondent's registration and use of the Domain Name constitutes bad faith under the Policy.

Given the Panel's findings above and the totality of the circumstances, the current inactive state of the Domain Name does not prevent a finding of bad faith. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 3.3.

The Panel finds that 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 <gaminglaboratoriesinternational.com> be transferred to Complainant.

/Marina Perraki/

Marina Perraki

Sole Panelist

Date: August 19, 2025