

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

Novomatic AG v. Evgeniy Pahlov
Case No. D2025-2524

1. The Parties

The Complainant is Novomatic AG, Austria, represented by Salomonowitz Attorneys-at-Law, Austria.

The Respondent is Evgeniy Pahlov, Thailand.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <admiral-slots.online> 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 27, 2025. On June 27, 2025, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On June 28, 2025, the Registrar transmitted by email to the Center its verification response confirming that the Respondent is listed as the registrant and providing the contact details.

The Center verified that 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 July 2, 2025. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was July 22, 2025. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent's default on July 23, 2025.

The Center appointed Andrea Jaeger-Lenz as the sole panelist in this matter on July 25, 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.

On August 13, 2025, the Panel issued Procedural Order No. 1, requesting the Complainant to provide further information and evidence by August 16, 2025. The Respondent was given until August 20, 2025, to reply.

On August 13, 2025, the Complainant submitted a reply accompanied by additional annexes in support of the Complaint, together with a further submission containing supplementary information. The Respondent did not file a reply.

4. Factual Background

The Complainant is Novomatic AG, a company belonging to the Novomatic Group of Companies, an international gambling company founded in 1980 and headquartered in Gumpoldskirchen, Austria (Annex 4 of the Complaint). The Complainant conducts business internationally and has locations in about 45 countries (Annex 5 of the Complaint). The Complainant is engaged in production as well as research and development in the gambling sector in various countries, including Germany and the United Kingdom (Annex 11 of the Complaint). The Complainant employs around 20,000 people and operates more than 1,600 gaming facilities worldwide (Annexes 5 and 11 of the Complaint), including over 200 locations in Austria under its ADMIRAL brand (Annexes 6 and 4 of the Complaint). The Complainants' portfolio includes, but is not limited to, gaming machines, terminals, and both offline and online casino solutions (Annexes 4, 5 and 11 of the Complaint).

The Complainant owns, among others, the following trademarks (Annex 3 of the Complaint):

- European Union Trademark registration no. 004134433 ADMIRAL (word), registered on August 14, 2006, for goods and services in Classes 9, 16, 28, 36, 37, 41, 42 and 43;
- European Union Trademark registration no. 015570005 ADMIRAL (fig.), registered on October 27, 2016, for services in Class 41;
- International ("IR") Trademark registration no. 598347 ADMIRAL (fig.), registered on December 17, 1992, for goods and services in Classes 9, 28, 36, 37, 41 and 42, designating the United Kingdom, Republic of Korea, Singapore, Albania, Armenia, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Bulgaria, Benelux Office for Intellectual Property, Belarus, Switzerland, China, Cuba, Czech Republic, Germany, Egypt, Spain, France, Croatia, Hungary, Italy, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Kazakhstan, Liechtenstein, Morocco, Monaco, Montenegro, North Macedonia, Mongolia, Poland, Portugal, Romania, Serbia, Russian Federation, Slovenia, Slovakia, San Marino, Ukraine, Viet Nam.

The Complainant – either itself or through affiliated companies – operates a number of domain names corresponding to or including the ADMIRAL trademark, including <admiral.ag>, <admiral-games.de>, <admiralbet.de>, <admiralbet.uk>, <admiral.hr>, and <admiralcasino.co.uk>, which resolve to websites offering gaming and betting services in various jurisdictions (Annexes 6 - 10 of the Complaint).

The disputed domain name was registered on June 19, 2025. It resolves to a website promoting an application (the "Application") titled "Casino Admiral Online" allegedly offered by "Fonbet" (screenshot provided by the Complainant did not display the disputed domain name, however, resolution of disputed domain name to screenshot is verified by Panel). The Application in question is described as a premium online casino experience originating from Austria, featuring inter alia digital slot machines and live casino games. The promotional content includes high-gloss imagery of a casino at night, colourful slot machines, dice as well as a fantasy-style female character.

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.

As to the first element, the Complainant submits that the disputed domain name incorporates its ADMIRAL trademark in its entirety and is therefore identical (in its distinctive part) to, or at least confusingly similar to its registered mark. The addition of the descriptive term "slots" does not avoid confusion, as it directly relates to the services offered under the disputed domain name. Regarding the its ADMIRAL trademark, the Complainant adds that it traces its origins to 1991, is one of its core trademarks, and is claimed to enjoy broad recognition in Europe, supported by its Austrian outlets, sponsorship of the Austrian football Bundesliga, and international presence both offline and online.

Concerning the second element, the Complainant argues that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the disputed domain name. The Complainant has not authorised the Respondent to use the ADMIRAL mark and is not aware of any relationship between the parties. The Respondent is neither commonly known by the disputed domain name nor does it hold any relevant trademark rights. Instead, so the Complainant claims – the disputed domain name is be used for unauthorized gambling services, including the promotion of a purported "Casino Admiral Online" Application that imitates the "Admiral" name and logo.

With regard to the third element, the Complainant asserts that the disputed domain name was registered and is being used in bad faith. The Complainant argues that its websites as well as the ADMIRAL trademarks are well known. The Complainant states that the Respondent must have been aware of the Complainant's rights at the time of registration. The Respondent, according to the Complainant, intentionally registered the disputed domain name to capitalise on the reputation of the ADMIRAL mark by misleading users and offering unauthorised or counterfeit gambling services. This conduct constitutes an attempt to attract Internet users for commercial gain by creating a likelihood of confusion with the Complainant's trademark, thereby impeding the Complainant's ability to use its trademark in a corresponding domain name. In support of its claim that the Respondent deliberately registered the disputed domain name with the Complainant in mind, the Complainant points to other UDRP proceedings between the Complainant and the Respondent involving other trademarks of the Complainant, namely *Novomatic AG v. Evgeniy Pahlov, NC*, WIPO Case No. [D2025-1984](#), and *Novomatic AG v. Evgeniy Pahlov, NC*, WIPO Case No. [D2025-2764](#).

B. Respondent

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

6. Discussion and Findings

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. It has demonstrated rights in the trademark ADMIRAL.

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, “-slots”, 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 mark for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 1.8.

It is also well established that the addition of a generic Top-Level Domain (gTLD), such as “.online” in the case at hand, is generally disregarded when evaluating confusing similarity, as it is a standard registration requirement. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 1.11.1 and section 1.11.2.

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 composition of the disputed domain name, which combines the Complainant’s trademark with the term “slot”, a term closely associated with the Complainant’s line of business suggests an implied affiliation. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 2.5.1.

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.

In the present case, the Panel notes that the Respondent had the Complainant in mind when registering the disputed domain name and used the same to create an online presence passing off as the Complainant thereby creating a likelihood of confusion with the Complainant

As to registration in bad faith, the Complainant claims its trademark is well-known, however whether or not it is true, is immaterial in this case. As evident by prior proceedings between the Parties, the composition of the disputed domain name and the design of the web presence to which it resolves, at least the Respondent knew about the Complainant and its activities upon registration. Even though the Complainant did not

provide direct evidence that the disputed domain name resolved to a web presence as reproduced by the Complainant in the Complaint and its complementary filing, the Panel, within its powers under the paragraph 10 of the UDRP Rules and taking note of consistent panels view as per [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 4.8, accessed the disputed domain name and verified the assertion put forth by the Complainant. As to use in bad faith, panels have held that the use of a domain name for illegitimate activity, here, claimed passing off as the Complainant, 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.

Accordingly, 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 <admiral-slots.online> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Andrea Jaeger-Lenz/

Andrea Jaeger-Lenz

Sole Panelist

Date: September 5, 2025