

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

Caesars License Company, LLC v. Timucin Devirmis
Case No. D2025-3215

1. The Parties

The Complainant is Caesars License Company, LLC, United States of America, represented by Greenberg Traurig, LLP, United States of America ("United States").

The Respondent is Timucin Devirmis, Türkiye.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <caesarso.com> is registered with GoDaddy.com, LLC (the "Registrar").

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the "Center") on August 11, 2025. On August 12, 2025, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On August 12, 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 (Registration Private / Domains by Proxy, LLC) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on August 13, 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 26, 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 27, 2025. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was September 16, 2025. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent's default on September 17, 2025.

The Center appointed Fabrizio Bedarida as the sole panelist in this matter on September 19, 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 the owner of the CAESARS, CAESARS ENTERTAINMENT, and CAESARS PALACE trademarks. Through affiliated companies, including Caesars Entertainment Corporation which is listed on NASDAQ, the Complainant owns and operates the renowned CAESARS PALACE casino hotel in Las Vegas, Nevada, United States as well as CAESARS-branded casinos and casino hotels in several countries. According to the Complainant, on average approximately 1.5 million people stay at Caesars Palace in Las Vegas each year, with millions more visiting the casino annually from around the world.

The Complainant has provided full listings of trademarks that correspond to and/or include CAESARS, CAESARS ENTERTAINMENT, and CAESARS PALACE registered in numerous jurisdictions worldwide, including in Türkiye, where the Respondent is purportedly located.

The Complainant is, inter alia, the owner of:

United States Trademark Registration number 954684 for the CAESARS (word) trademark, registered on March 6, 1973.

United States Trademark Registration number 954637 for the CAESARS (device) trademark, registered on March 6, 1973.

United States Trademark Registration number 3944625 for the CAESARS ENTERTAINMENT (device) trademark, registered on April 12, 2011.

The Complainant is also the owner of the domain name <caesars.com>, which hosts the Complainant's primary website ("Caesars Website"), in addition to other domain names incorporating the CAESARS and CAESARS PALACE trademarks, such as <caesarspalace.com> (which redirects to the Caesars Website) and <caesarsgames.com>.

The disputed domain name was registered on June 10, 2025 and is currently inactive. However, based on the evidence submitted by the Complainant, the disputed domain name previously resolved to a website that displayed the Complainant's trademarks and copyrighted images, and closely resembled the Complainant's Caesars Website.

On August 18, 2025, the Complainant sent a cease and desist letter to the Respondent. According to the case file, the letter remains unanswered.

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 mere addition of the letter "o" in the disputed domain name does not avoid confusion with the Complainant's trademark; that the Respondent's use of the disputed domain name for a website displaying the Complainant's CAESARS trademark and trade name, in an apparent attempt to impersonate the Complainant or to suggest an affiliation with the Complainant, does not give rise

to rights or legitimate interests; and that bad faith registration and use should be found, as the Respondent registered the disputed domain name and used the Complainant's CAESARS trademark on the corresponding website while being aware of the Complainant's trademark rights, with the intent to take advantage of and capitalize on the Complainant's well-known trademark.

The Complainant specifically asserts that the Respondent used the disputed domain name to divert Internet traffic to an impostor website that prominently displays the Complainant's well-known CAESARS and CAESARS REWARDS trademarks and purported to be the Complainant's official Caesars Website. The Complainant further contends that a comparison between the Caesars Website and the Respondent's website clearly shows that the latter is a near replica of the Complainant's site, including the direct copying of images. Notably, the title of the Respondent's website is "Caesars Entertainment Hotels, Casinos, and Experiences," and it prominently features the Complainant's trademark in the same location—the top left corner—as it appears on the Complainant's website.

The Complainant also highlights that it has invested many millions of United States dollars in advertising and promoting its casino hotels. Due to its location, quality of service, and scale, the Caesars Palace casino and hotel have enjoyed, and continues to enjoy, widespread recognition and commercial success. It is regarded as one of the most famous hotels in the world.

B. Respondent

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

6. Discussion and Findings

In order for the Complainant to obtain a transfer of the disputed domain name, paragraph 4(a) of the Policy requires that the Complainant must demonstrate to the Panel that:

- (i) the disputed domain name 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 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 CAESARS mark is incorporated entirely and recognizable 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, the letter "o", 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 name 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 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.

Panels have held that the use of a domain name for illegitimate activity, here claimed to be impersonation, 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.

Owing to the distinctiveness of the Complainant’s trademarks and reputation, the misspelling nature of the disputed domain name, and its use in connection with a website impersonating the Complainant’s official Caesars Website, the Panel considers it reasonable to infer that the Respondent registered the disputed domain name with full knowledge of the Complainant’s rights. Accordingly, the Panel finds, on the balance of probabilities, that the Respondent was aware of the Complainant’s trademarks when registering the disputed domain name.

Furthermore, panels have consistently found that the mere registration of a domain name that is almost identical (particularly domain names comprising typos) to a famous or widely-known trademark by an unaffiliated entity can by itself create a presumption of bad faith. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 3.1.4.

Further, by using the disputed domain name, the Panel notes that the Respondent has intentionally attempted to attract, for commercial gain, Internet users to its website by creating a likelihood of confusion with the Complainant’s trademark. Such use constitutes bad faith pursuant to paragraph 4(b)(iv) of the Policy.

Finally, the bad faith registration and use of the disputed domain name are further supported by the fact that the Respondent did not respond to the Complainant’s cease and desist letter, nor did it deny the assertions of bad faith made by the Complainant in these proceedings.

The disputed domain name is currently inactive. Panels have found that the non-use of a domain name (including a blank or “coming soon” page) would not prevent a finding of bad faith under the doctrine of passive holding. Although panelists will look at the totality of the circumstances in each case, factors that have been considered relevant in applying the passive holding doctrine include: (i) the degree of distinctiveness or reputation of the complainant’s mark, (ii) the failure of the respondent to submit a response or to provide any evidence of actual or contemplated good faith use, (iii) the respondent’s concealing its identity or use of false contact details (noted to be in breach of its registration agreement); and (iv) the implausibility of any good faith use to which the domain name may be put. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 3.3. Having reviewed the available record, the Panel notes that in the circumstances of this case the current passive holding of the disputed domain name does not prevent a finding of bad faith under the Policy.

The Panel finds that the Respondent’s registration and use of the disputed domain name constitutes bad faith under 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 <caesarso.com> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Fabrizio Bedarida/

Fabrizio Bedarida

Sole Panelist

Date: September 30, 2025