

## ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

### Formula One Licensing BV v. Oleg Osmanov and Limesco Limited Case No. D2025-2959

#### 1. The Parties

Complainant is Formula One Licensing BV, Netherlands (Kingdom of the), represented by Sheridans Solicitors LLP, United Kingdom.

Respondents are Oleg Osmanov, Russian Federation, and Limesco Limited, Ukraine.

#### 2. The Domain Names and Registrars

The disputed domain names <f1casino.club> and <f1casino31.club> are registered with NameCheap, Inc. (the “Registrar”).

The disputed domain name <f1casino1.online> is registered with NameSilo, LLC (the “Registrar”).

The Panel will refer to these three domain names collectively as “Disputed Domain Names.”

#### 3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the “Center”) on July 24, 2025. On July 25, 2025, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrars requests for registrar verification in connection with the Disputed Domain Names. On the same day, the Registrars transmitted by email to the Center their verification responses, disclosing registrant and contact information for the Disputed Domain Names which differed from the named Respondents and contact information in the Complaint.

The Center sent an email communication to Complainant on July 28, 2025, with the registrant and contact information of nominally multiple underlying registrants revealed by the Registrars, requesting Complainant to either file a separate complaint for the Disputed Domain Name associated with a different underlying registrant or alternatively, demonstrate that the underlying registrants are in fact the same entity and/or that all domain names are under common control. Respondent Limesco Limited sent an email communication to the Center on July 30, 2025. Complainant filed an amended Complaint on July 31, 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 Respondents of the Complaint, and the proceedings commenced on August 12, 2025. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was September 1, 2025.

The Center appointed Lawrence K. Nodine as the sole panelist in this matter on September 10, 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 uses F1 (hereinafter sometimes the “Mark”) (and derivatives, such as F1 CHAMPIONSHIP) as a trademark in connection with its Formula 1 automobile races. Complainant produces F1 Championship races annually in 24 different venues around the world. The races are broadcast in over 180 countries. Social media channels using the Mark have attracted over 97 million social media followers. In 2024, F1 racing attracted a cumulative audience of 1.6 billion viewers.

Complainant owns registrations for the Mark in many jurisdictions, including:

- United States of America registration No. 3337611 (registered November 20, 2007)
- European Union Registration No. 009250721 (registered October 28, 2012)

Complainant also owns trademark registrations for a logo version of the Mark:



See, e.g., United States of America Trademark registration number 5,694,535 (Registered March 12, 2019). Like similar registrations in other jurisdictions, this registration does not limit the registered logo to a specific color, but Complainant often displays the logo in red.



Complainant also owns trademark registrations for FORMULA 1. See, e.g., United States of America registration No. 5,457,509 (registered May 1, 2018).

Complainant has collaborated with many companies in the betting industry, such as the casino loyalty club with Caesars Rewards.

The Disputed Domain Names were registered on different dates:

- <f1casino.club> was registered on May 13, 2019
- <f1casino1.online> was registered on February 3, 2025
- <f1casino31.club> was registered on February 27, 2025

On the website associated with <f1casino1.online>, <sup>1</sup> in the website tab, the phrase “The official site F1 Casino . . .” appears, followed by a logo:



The site offers access to many online gambling games. Not all of them relate to auto racing, but the text states that, “F1 casino tournaments are the most exciting and interesting promotion on the project. You become a direct participant in the race. [ . . . ] Tournaments are designed in such a way that you become a participant in both free daily races, as well as powerful, large, weekly grand Race. For example, one of these is the BRAZILIAN GRAND PRIX.” The website displays an image the Brazilian Grand Prix racecourse.

There are many images on the website of race cars built by prominent brands:



The associated text recounts the history of the brand’s involvement with Formula 1 racing: “Daimler-Benz made a very successful debut in Formula 1 in 1954 [...]”; “Scuderia Ferrari takes part in Formula 1 races from 1950 to the present day . . . ” ; McLaren “made her debut in formula-1 in 1966” ; Williams “is the British Formula-1 team”.

There are no disclaimers. The website text encourages Internet visitors to “Play on the official F1 casino website!”

Access to the content of the websites associated with <f1casino31.club> and <f1casino.club> is geo-blocked.<sup>2</sup> However, the text and logo in the websites tabs is identical to the text and logo displayed in the website tab of the <f1casino1.online> domain name.

## 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 Names.

Notably, Complainant contends that all three websites are under common control. Complainant contends that there is a substantial risk of implied affiliation, noting Complainant’s history of partnering with various betting companies.

---

<sup>1</sup> The Panel bases its statement on the screenshots of the <f1casino1.online> website attached as an annex to the Complaint filed July 24, 2025. The current website is different, based on the Panel’s visit while deliberating this Decision. It now redirects to the domain name <fastone.club>.

<sup>2</sup> Both websites display the same message: “Dear User Due to legislation in your country, it is prohibited to you to access this website. We are sorry about that.”

## B. Respondents

On July 30, 2025, Respondent Limesco Limited submitted an informal Response on behalf of both Respondents, notably acknowledging that both Respondents are part of “the same group of affiliated individuals/entities managing a unified brand.” Respondents further claimed that they operate an online casino under the name “F1Casino”, where “F1” stands for “Fast One”, “representing the speed and reliability of [Respondents’] payment and withdrawal processes.” Respondents also acknowledged that “visual elements such as generic racing cars were previously used in the design of the site”. They stated, however, that the websites had never displayed any logos or imagery directly associated with Formula One nor have they promoted or associated themselves with Formula One, and all racing car visuals have since been removed by Respondents. Respondents concluded that they have legitimate interests in using the Disputed Domain Names.

## 6. Discussion and Findings

### 6.1. Consolidation: Multiple Respondents

The amended Complaint was filed in relation to nominally different domain name registrants. Complainant alleges that the Disputed Domain Names registrants are the same entity or mere alter egos of each other, or under common control. Complainant requests the consolidation of the Complaint against the multiple Disputed Domain Names registrants pursuant to paragraph 10(e) of the Rules.

Paragraph 3(c) of the Rules states that a complaint may relate to more than one domain name, provided that the domain names are registered by the same domain name holder.

In addressing Complainant’s request, the Panel will consider whether (i) the Disputed Domain Names or corresponding websites are subject to common control; and (ii) the consolidation would be fair and equitable to all Parties. See WIPO Overview of WIPO Panel Views on Selected UDRP Questions, Third Edition (“[WIPO Overview 3.0](#)”), section 4.11.2.

As regards common control, the Panel notes that <f1casino31.club> and <f1casino.club> are both owned by the same registrant - Limesco Limited. Most importantly, Respondents have admitted that they are part of a group of individuals/entities exercising common control over the Disputed Domain Names.

For completeness, the Panel notes, that the Terms of Use for the website at the domain name <f1casino1.online> states that “[a]ll the emails of management and support teams are from domains f1casino.club, f1casino.online and their subdomains . . .” The Panel also notes that the Disputed Domain Names have the same composition, namely all three include “F1” and “casino.” All three of the Disputed Domain Names display the same logo



in a website tab. This evidence is sufficient to demonstrate common control.

As regards fairness and equity, the Panel sees no reason consolidation of the disputes would be unfair or inequitable to any Party.

Accordingly, the Panel decides to consolidate the disputes regarding the nominally different Disputed Domain Names registrants (referred to below as “Respondent”) in a single proceeding.

## 6.2. Further Procedural Considerations

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. Since the mailing address of the Respondent Limesco Limited is stated to be in Ukraine (whether this is indeed accurate is not clear), which is subject to an international conflict at the date of this Decision that may impact case notification, it is appropriate for the Panel to consider, in accordance with its discretion under paragraph 10 of the Rules, whether the proceedings should continue.

Having considered all the circumstances of the case, the Panel is of the view that they should. The Panel has reached this conclusion in part because the Panel does not believe the Respondent's purported mailing address in Ukraine to be genuine. The Panel notes in particular the Complainant's evidence that the website hosted at the disputed domain name <f1casino1.online> displays contact details for a company Limesco Limited which include a postal address in Cyprus. The Panel also notes that the mentioned website is in the English language, which may further support an inference that the Respondent is not located in Ukraine. Lastly, and most importantly, the Respondent filed a Response and was able to present its position.

For completeness, it is noted that, for the reasons which are set out later in this Decision, the Panel has no serious doubt that the Respondent registered and has used the Disputed Domain Names in bad faith and with the intention of unfairly targeting the Complainant's goodwill in its trademark.

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

## 6.3. Substantive Issues

### 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 straightforward comparison between Complainant's trademark and the disputed domain name. [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 Panel finds the Mark is recognizable within each of the Disputed Domain Names. Accordingly, the Disputed Domain Names are 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, "casino" and the numbers "1" and "31", may bear on assessment of the second and third elements, the Panel finds the addition of such term does not prevent a finding of confusing similarity between the Disputed Domain Names 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 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 Names. 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 Names such as those enumerated in the Policy or otherwise.

Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in the <f1casino1.online> Disputed Domain Name because it falsely implies an affiliation with Complainant. The composition of this domain name coupled with its use itself implies that Respondent registered this Disputed Domain Name on account of its potential value based on the Mark rather than on the basis of a reference to "Fast One", as claimed by Respondent. In particular, several features contribute to this conclusion. This starts with the display in the website tab of Respondent's logo, which is similar to Complainant's logo:



Although these logos are not identical, the website is filled with explicit references to "Formula 1" racing and the display of photos of race cars. Respondent encourages Internet visitors to "Play on the official F1 casino website!" There are no disclaimers.

Respondent geo-blocked Complainant's access to the content of the websites associated with the <f1casino31.club> and <f1casino.club> Disputed Domain Names. The Panel nonetheless finds that it is more likely than not that the content of those webpages mirrors the content of <f1casino1.online>. This is likely, based on the balance of probabilities, because the three Disputed Domain Names are under common control and share a format "Mark + casino", and the website tab for each of the Disputed Domain Names displays the text ""The official site F1 Casino . . ." and the red logo, as described above. Furthermore, pursuant to the general powers of a panel articulated inter alia in paragraphs 10 and 12 of the Rules, the Panel has independently verified that the website at the Disputed Domain Name <f1casino31.club> at some point before filing the Complaint displayed the same red logo and seemingly offered gambling services.<sup>3</sup> Based on this evidence, the Panel finds Respondent lacks rights or a legitimate interests in these two domain names as well.

In its response, Respondent states that "F1" is derived from "Fast One, representing speed and reliability of our payment and withdrawal processes [ . . . ]. It is not related to Formula One or any motorsport." The evidence does not support Respondent. The words "Fast One" do not appear anywhere in the screenshots of the website associated with the Disputed Domain Names that Complainant submitted with the Complaint. But there are numerous references to "Formula 1" racing throughout the screenshots.

Respondent also states that, although generic racing cars were previously used in the design of the site, "[a]s a gesture of good faith, to avoid any potential confusion, we have removed all racing car visuals [ . . . ]." The Panel need not decide whether Respondent adequately removed elements that could cause confusion. The content of the websites on the date the Complaint was filed is relevant when deciding whether Complainant has met its burdens under the Policy. Corrections made after the commencement of the proceedings are not considered, noting especially the history of this case. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#) section 2.11.

---

<sup>3</sup> <https://web.archive.org/web/20250428022947/https://f1casino31.club/>"

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

### **C. Registered and Used in Bad Faith**

The Panel finds that Respondent registered and used the Disputed Domain Names in bad faith. The content of the <f1casino1.online> website makes explicit reference to Complainant's Formula-1 races so there is no disputing Respondent's awareness of Complainant and its rights. Manifestly, Respondent's motivating purpose when registering the Disputed Domain Names was to "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." Policy, paragraph 4(b)(iv).

Respondent also used the Disputed Domain Names in bad faith to attract Internet users to its online gambling websites for commercial gain.

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 Names <f1casino.club>, <f1casino1.online>, and <f1casino31.club> be transferred to Complainant.

*/Lawrence K. Nodine/*

**Lawrence K. Nodine**

Sole Panelist

Date: September 24, 2025