

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

Services aux Loteries En Europe v. LADAICIA MOHAMED
Case No. D2025-2727

1. The Parties

The Complainant is Services aux Loteries En Europe, Belgium, represented by MIIP MADE IN IP, France.

The Respondent is LADAICIA MOHAMED, Algeria.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <euromillions2024.com> is registered with Realtime Register B.V. (the "Registrar").

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the "Center") on July 10, 2025. On July 10, 2025, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On July 16, 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 (Redacted for Privacy) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on July 16, 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 July 16, 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 July 22, 2025. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was August 11, 2025. The Response was filed with the Center on July 28, 2025.

The Center appointed Lorenz Ehrlar as the sole panelist in this matter on August 8, 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, Services en Loteries en Europe (SLE), is a transnational lottery in which nine European countries participate, namely France, the United Kingdom (“UK”), Spain, Portugal, Belgium, Ireland, Austria, Switzerland, and Luxembourg. Each draw attracts approximately 20 million players. The Complainant operates in particular the lottery game “EuroMillions”.

The Complainant holds the following European Union trademarks:

- European Union trademark EUROMILLIONS (word and device), reg. no. 018799435, registered on April 19, 2023, under priority of the Maltese application No. 64538/64539/64540/64541/64542/64543 dated June 30, 2022, in classes 9,16,28,35,38, and 41; and
- European Union trademark EUROMILLIONS (word), reg. no. 002987568, registered on September 28, 2004, in classes 9,16,28,35,36,38, and 41.

The disputed domain name <euromillions2024.com> was registered on December 10, 2023. The disputed domain name resolves to a website using the Complainant’s trademark and purportedly offering lottery grid packages for sale.

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.

In particular, the Complainant contends that the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to its EUROMILLION trademarks.

Furthermore, the Complainant states that the Respondent is not affiliated or related to it in any way, and that it did not authorize the Respondent to use the trademark in question. The Complainant considers that the Respondent, not being an authorised reseller, is not entitled to use the EUROMILLIONS trademark in the disputed domain name that resolves to website on which lottery grid packages are purportedly offered for sale.

Lastly, the Complainant contends that the Respondent uses the disputed domain name and the website to create confusion with the Complainant’s trademark EUROMILLIONS, which in its view constitutes bad faith.

B. Respondent

In his short response (which does not meet all formal requirements applicable under the UDRP), the Respondent does not request that the Complaint should be denied but merely argues that he had no unlawful intentions as he was convinced that the disputed domain name was legally unproblematic as it was available for registration. He declares not being opposed to the disputed domain name being cancelled, but fails to address the remedy requested by the Complainant, namely the transfer of the disputed domain name.

6. Discussion and Findings

According to paragraph 4(a) of the Policy, the Complainant must prove that:

- (i) the disputed domain name registered by the Respondent 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 disputed 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 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 holds two European Union trademarks for EUROMILLIONS. These trademarks are sufficient to file the Complaint.

Under the UDRP, the identity or confusing similarity requirement under paragraph 4(a) of the Policy requires identity or confusing similarity between complainant's trademarks and respondent's domain name. There is no requirement of similarity of goods and/or services under the first element (e.g., *AIB-Vincotte Belgium ASBL, AIB-Vincotte USA Inc./Corporation Texas v. Guillermo Lozada, Jr.*, WIPO Case No. [D2005-0485](#)).

The existence of a confusing similarity within the meaning of paragraph 4(a) of the Policy makes no doubt in the present case, given that the Complainant's trademark EUROMILLIONS is reproduced in the disputed domain name. Considering that the trademark EUROMILLIONS is recognizable, the additional element of the disputed domain name, i.e. the word "2024", does not avoid a finding of confusing similarity. Therefore, the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to the Complainant's trademark.

The Panel finds that paragraph 4(a)(i) of the Policy is satisfied.

B. Rights or Legitimate Interests

The Complainant contends that the Respondent does not have any rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name. The Complainant has shown that it owns EUROMILLIONS trademarks, and it has explicitly contested having granted the Respondent any right to use its trademarks. The Complainant has thus made a prima facie showing that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name. In line with previous UDRP panel decisions, this means, in principle, that the burden of production shifts to the Respondent (e.g., *Belupo d.d. v. WACHEM d.o.o.*, WIPO Case No. [D2004-0110](#); *Croatia Airlines d.d. v. Modern Empire Internet Ltd.*, WIPO Case No. [D2003-0455](#)).

The Panel considers that the composition of the disputed domain name carries a risk of implied affiliation with the Complainant. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 2.5.1. Furthermore, as results from the case file, the Respondent offers for sale services identical or similar to those offered by the Complainant, and prominently uses the distinctive sign EUROMILLIONS on the website.

While, based on the available information, the Respondent's website does not contain any indications whatsoever clarifying the identity and the relationship of the Respondent with the Complainant (e.g., as an authorised distributor). To the contrary, its website creates the false impression that the Internet user is on the trademark owner's website, thus causing confusion. As a result, the *Oki Data Americas, Inc. v. ASD, Inc.*, WIPO Case No. [D2001-0903](#) do not show any legitimate use made by the Respondent if he is a distributor of EUROMILLIONS services.

The Panel reaches the conclusion that the Complainant has made a prima facie showing that the Respondent does not use the disputed domain name for legitimate noncommercial or fair use purposes.

The Respondent having failed to provide any relevant arguments in favour of any good faith use, this Panel concludes that the Respondent does not have any rights or legitimate interests with respect to the disputed domain name.

The Panel finds the second element of the Policy has been established.

C. Registered and Used in Bad Faith

Paragraph 4(a)(iii) of the Policy provides that the Complainant must, in addition to the matters set out above, demonstrate that the disputed domain name has been registered and is being used in bad faith.

The Complainant submits that the Respondent registered and is using the disputed domain name in bad faith. The undisputed prima facie evidence establishes that the Respondent is not affiliated with the Complainant and has no license or other authorisation to use the Complainant's trademark or name.

The Respondent registered the disputed domain name well after the Complainant's mark was in use and became known within its specific market. The Panel finds that the Respondent must have known about the Complainant's trademark and business when registering the disputed domain name. Given the use to which the Respondent put the disputed domain name, it seems totally impossible to this Panel that the Respondent was unaware of the Complainant's trademark at the time of the registration of the disputed domain name.

The Respondent's choice of the disputed domain name, which incorporated the EUROMILLIONS trademark, and its offering of services identical or similar to the Complainant's under the latter's trademark EUROMILLIONS, indicates indeed that the Respondent was aware of the existence of the Complainant's trademark EUROMILLIONS.

The disputed domain name resolves to a website prominently displaying the Complainant's device mark, and purportedly offering lottery grid packages for sale. Such use may mislead Internet users and consumers into thinking that the Respondent is, in some way or another, connected to, sponsored by or affiliated with the Complainant and its business, or that the Respondent's activities are approved or endorsed by the Complainant. This indicates bad faith (*Swarovski Aktiengesellschaft v. bingbing chen*, WIPO Case No. [D2011-1524](#)).

The Respondent has not submitted any evidence to rebut the Complainant's claims and assertions. In the absence of such evidence and based on the evidence submitted by the Complainant and having regard to all the relevant circumstances, the Panel accepts the Complainant's contentions that the disputed domain name was registered and is being used in bad faith within the meaning of paragraph 4(a)(iii) 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 <euromillions2024.com> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Lorenz Ehrler/

Lorenz Ehrler

Sole Panelist

Date: August 22, 2025