

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

Granturo Platform Ltd v. kan acce
Case No. D2025-3321

1. The Parties

Complainant is Granturo Platform Ltd, Malta, represented by Wilmark Oy, Finland.

Respondent is kan acce, United Kingdom.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <wildz-de.com> is registered with Gname.com Pte. Ltd. (the "Registrar").

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the "Center") on August 18, 2025. On August 19, 2025, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On August 27, 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 Complainant on September 3, 2025, providing the registrant and contact information disclosed by the Registrar, and inviting Complainant to submit an amendment to the Complaint. Complainant filed an amendment to the Complaint on September 4, 2025.

The Center verified that the Complaint together with the amendment to 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 Respondent of the Complaint, and the proceedings commenced on September 8, 2025. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was September 28, 2025. Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified Respondent's default on September 30, 2025.

The Center appointed Stephanie G. Hartung as the sole panelist in this matter on October 6, 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 is a company organized under the laws of Malta that is active in the e-gaming industry; it operates several online casinos offering online games of chance, inter alia, the online casino named "Wildz".

Complainant has provided evidence that it is the registered owner of numerous trademarks relating to its brand WILDZ, inter alia, but not limited to, the following:

- word trademark WILDZ, European Union Intellectual Property Office (EUIPO), registration number: 017589813, registration date: April 25, 2018, status: active;
- word trademark WILDZ, International Registration, registration number: 1443415, registration date: June 13, 2018, status: active.

Moreover, Complainant has demonstrated to own the domain name <wildz.com>, through which it operates its online casino WILDZ at "www.wildz.com".

Respondent, according to the Registrar verification, is located in the United Kingdom. The disputed domain name was registered on June 20, 2025. By the time of the rendering of this Decision, it redirects to a commercially active website at "www.1go-de.com", which is set up in the German language, and which is used to operate an online casino under the designation "1GO Casino". By the time of the filing of the Complaint, it appears from Complainant's contentions that the disputed domain name resolved to a website at "www.wildz.com" discussing Complainant's "Wildz" casino and containing links redirecting to a site at "www.mbet701.xyz", used to operate an online casino, too.

Complainant requests that the disputed domain name be transferred to Complainant.

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 name. Notably, Complainant contends that its WILDZ online casino is highly successful internationally, being the fastest growing online casino in the last couple of years and having provided 200 million free spins to its customers in approximately 1.5 years.

Complainant submits that the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to Complainant's WILDZ trademark, as it reproduces the latter in its entirety and the term "de" is only descriptive. Moreover, Complainant asserts that Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the disputed domain name since (1) Respondent has not received any license, permission or other authorization to use Complainant's WILDZ trademark, (2) Respondent is not commonly known by the disputed domain name and it does not have any trademark rights in the terms "wildz" or "wildz-de", (3) Respondent is not making a legitimate noncommercial or fair use of the disputed domain name, and (4) given the fame of the WILDZ online casino, it is reasonable to assume that Respondent was aware thereof at the time of registration of the disputed domain name and that Respondent is opportunistically using the goodwill of Complainant's WILDZ trademark in order to attract Internet users to its own website. Finally, Complainant argues that Respondent has registered and is using the disputed domain name in bad faith since (1) the latter identically reproduces Complainant's WILDZ trademark and is used for identical services, i.e. online casino services, and

(2) therefore, it is likely that Respondent selected the disputed domain name and uses it not for a bona fide business purpose, but rather to mislead Internet users in an attempt to generate commercial gain.

B. Respondent

Respondent did not reply to Complainant's contentions.

6. Discussion and Findings

Under paragraph 4(a) of the Policy, Complainant carries the burden of proving:

- (i) that the disputed domain name is identical or confusingly similar to a trademark or service mark in which Complainant has rights; and
- (ii) that Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the disputed domain name; and
- (iii) that the disputed domain name has been registered and is being used in bad faith.

Respondent's default in the case at hand does not automatically result in a decision in favor of Complainant, however, paragraph 5(f) of the Rules provides that if Respondent does not submit a response, in the absence of exceptional circumstances, the Panel shall decide the dispute solely based upon the Complaint. Further, according to paragraph 14(b) of the Rules, the Panel may draw such inferences from Respondent's failure to submit a Response as it considers appropriate.

A. Identical or Confusingly Similar

First, 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 Complainant's WILDZ 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.

Complainant has shown rights in respect of its WILDZ trademark for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 1.2.1. Moreover, the entirety of such trademark is reproduced within the disputed domain name, simply added by the term "de" together with a hyphen. Accordingly, the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to Complainant's WILDZ trademark for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 1.7. Although the addition of other terms (here, the term "de" referring to Germany) 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 Complainant's WILDZ trademark for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 1.8.

The Panel, therefore, holds the first element of the Policy has been established.

B. Rights or Legitimate Interests

Second, 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 name. 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 name such as those enumerated in the Policy or otherwise.

In particular, Respondent has neither been granted a license nor has it been otherwise authorized by Complainant to use its WILDZ trademark, either as a domain name or in any other way. Also, there is no reason to believe that Respondent's name somehow corresponds with the disputed domain name, and Respondent does not appear to have any trademark rights associated with the fanciful term "wildz" on its own. Finally, by the time of the rendering of this Decision, the disputed domain name redirects to a commercially active website at "www.1go-de.com", which is set up in the German language and is used to operate an online casino under the designation "1GO Casino", thus offers online casino services in direct competition to those offered by Complainant; formerly, by the time of filing of the Complaint, it appears from Complainant's contentions that the disputed domain name resolved to a website at "www.wildz.com" discussing Complainant's "Wildz" casino and containing links redirecting to a site at "www.mbet701.xyz", used to operate an online casino, too. Such use of the disputed domain name, either in the present or in the past, neither qualifies/qualified as bona fide nor as legitimate noncommercial or fair within the meaning of paragraph 4(c) of the Policy.

The Panel, therefore, finds that Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the disputed domain name and that the second element of the Policy has been established, too.

C. Registered and Used in Bad Faith

Third, 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.

The circumstances of this case leave no doubt that Respondent was fully aware of Complainant's online casino business and its rights in the WILDZ trademark when registering the disputed domain name and that the latter clearly is directed thereto. Moreover, using the disputed domain name to redirect to/run a website hosting links to third-party sites offering online casino services that are identical to and in direct competition with those offered by Complainant is a clear indication that Respondent intentionally attempted to attract, for commercial gain, Internet users to its own website by creating a likelihood of confusion with Complainant's WILDZ trademark as to the source, sponsorship, affiliation or endorsement of Respondent's website. Such circumstances are evidence of registration and use of the disputed domain name in bad faith within the meaning of paragraph 4(b)(iv) of the Policy.

The Panel, therefore, finds that Complainant has established the third element of the Policy, too.

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, <wildz-de.com>, be transferred to Complainant.

/Stephanie G. Hartung/

Stephanie G. Hartung

Sole Panelist

Date: October 20, 2025