

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

Families Thrive, Inc. f/k/a/ Children Awaiting Parents, Inc. v. Loc Thi,
V9betmobile

Case No. D2025-3027

1. The Parties

The Complainant is Families Thrive, Inc. f/k/a/ Children Awaiting Parents, Inc., United States of America (“United States”), represented by Woods Oviatt Gilman LLP, United States.

The Respondent is Loc Thi, V9betmobile, Viet Nam.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <childrenawaitingparents.org> is registered with Sav.com, LLC (the “Registrar”).

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the “Center”) on July 29, 2025. On July 30, 2025, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On July 30, 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 (John Doe / Redacted for Privacy) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on August 6, 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 August 11, 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 August 13, 2025. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was September 2, 2025. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent’s default on September 3, 2025.

The Center appointed Andrew Brown K.C. as the sole panelist in this matter on September 9, 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 is Families Thrive, Inc. and was formerly known as Children Awaiting Parents, Inc. It is a non-profit corporation based in New York, United States. Beginning in 1975 it has continuously provided a variety of charitable services including adoption services, therapeutic foster services, coached visitation services and other associated services and programs.

The Complainant has used the CHILDREN AWAITING PARENTS trademark since 1990 in association with its adoption referral services.

The relevant rights of the Complainant comprise a registration of the CHILDREN AWAITING PARENTS trademark in the United States (the CHILDREN AWAITING PARENTS Trademark):

Mark	Country	Registration No.	Date of Registration	Services
CHILDREN AWAITING PARENTS	United States	1,722,793	October 6, 1992	Adoption referral services, namely recruiting and counseling

The disputed domain name was registered on October 9, 2024. The disputed domain name has a landing page. This displays an advertisement and online platform for sports betting, online casino and slot game services. It previously redirected to another betting and gambling website.

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.

Notably, the Complainant contends that the Respondent has used the entirety of its CHILDREN AWAITING PARENTS Trademark in the disputed domain name, followed by the ".org" generic Top-Level Domain. The Complainant asserts that the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to its CHILDREN AWAITING PARENTS Trademark.

The Complainant further states that it registered the domain name <childrenawaitingparents.org> on July 24, 2002, and continuously used it for 22 years until it inadvertently allowed the registration to expire on July 24, 2024.

The Complainant states that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name. The Complainant asserts that:

(a) The Respondent's use of the disputed domain name is not in connection with a bona fide offering of goods or services and that the website located at the disputed domain name does not offer any goods or services. The Complainant asserts that none of the links on that website are functional.

(b) The Respondent has never been commonly known by the disputed domain name and has nothing to do with the Complainant or its CHILDREN AWAITING PARENTS Trademark.

(c) No part of the disputed domain name is connected in any way with the name of the Respondent's organization (V9betmobile) or the name associated with the disputed domain name registration.

The Complainant states that the Respondent has registered and used the disputed domain name in bad faith. As regards both of these requirements, the Complainant relies on the fact that the disputed domain name incorporates completely and in its entirety the Complainant's CHILDREN AWAITING PARENTS Trademark and that the registration is unrelated to any legitimate business being conducted by the Respondent.

The Complainant further asserts that the Respondent has, by using the disputed domain name, intentionally attempted to attract for commercial gain Internet users to the website located there by creating a likelihood of confusion with the Complainant's CHILDREN AWAITING PARENTS Trademark. The Complainant's concern is that Internet users will believe that the Complainant has endorsed or is affiliated with the gambling website located at the disputed domain name.

The Complainant also relies on the fact that as early as May 2025 the Respondent was using the disputed domain name to redirect users to a betting and gambling website associated with another domain name <valenciatrader.com> in another country.

Finally, the Complainant relies on the Respondent's registration of the disputed domain name "immediately" after lapse of the Complainant's registration of the same domain name as evidencing bad faith registration and use. The Complainant had continuously used the disputed domain name for 22 years before inadvertently allowing the domain name to expire on July 24, 2024.

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 Panel notes that the trademark owner in the United States Patent and Trademark Office database is listed as "Children Awaiting Parents, Inc." Noting in particular the general powers of a panel articulated inter alia in paragraphs 10 and 12 of the Rules (see [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 4.8), the Panel verified independently the Complainant's corporate history as annexed to the Complaint, and is satisfied that the Complainant changed names from "Children Awaiting Parents, Inc." to its current name on April 1, 2024. The Panel therefore finds that 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.

The entirety of the Complainant's CHILDREN AWAITING PARENTS Trademark is reproduced within the disputed domain name. Accordingly, the disputed domain name is identical to that trademark for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 1.7.

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 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 finds that the disputed domain name has been registered in bad faith for the following reasons.

The Complainant has clearly demonstrated that it has rights to its CHILDREN AWAITING PARENTS Trademark and that its registered trademark in the United States was registered in 1992, some 32 years prior to registration of the disputed domain name. In this regard, the Panel notes the Complainant was the previous owner of the disputed domain name from 2002 - mid-2024.

The Panel is satisfied that the Complainant’s trademark and the domain name itself had achieved goodwill and recognition well prior to the date of current registration of the disputed domain name as a result of the Complainant’s long-standing use of both the trademark and the disputed domain name (prior to its expiry on July 24, 2024).

It is also a reasonable inference that the Respondent knew of or became aware of the Complainant’s CHILDREN AWAITING PARENTS Trademark before registration of the disputed domain name. In this regard the Panel relies on the combination of:

- (a) The identical nature of the disputed domain name and the CHILDREN AWAITING PARENTS Trademark;
- (b) The actions of the Respondent in registering the disputed domain name soon after (i.e., two and a half months after) the lapsing of the same disputed domain name as a result of the Complainant’s inadvertent failure to renew it;
- (c) The Respondent’s failure to respond to the Complaint and to present a credible evidence-based rationale for registration of the disputed domain name – particularly when the website located at the disputed domain name contains content comprising totally different subject matter (online betting) unrelated to any dictionary meaning of the terms comprising the disputed domain name.

The Panel also finds that the Respondent has used the disputed domain name in bad faith. In the absence of any explanation, the Panel is satisfied that the Respondent's intent was to profit from and to exploit the Complainant's CHILDREN AWAITING PARENTS Trademark by attracting Internet users (familiar with the Complainant) to the disputed domain name and to take unfair advantage of the likelihood of confusion between the complainant's mark and the disputed domain name (and the content located there) as to the origin, endorsement or affiliation of the website located at the disputed domain name.

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

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 <childrenawaitingparents.org> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Andrew Brown K.C./

Andrew Brown K.C.

Sole Panelist

Date: September 22, 2025