

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

Aplus Limited v. Chan Soluch
Case No. D2025-3365

1. The Parties

The Complainant is Aplus Limited, Marshall Islands, represented by JusTec Brand Protection, United States of America ("United States").

The Respondent is Chan Soluch, Cambodia.

2. The Disputed Domain Name and Registrar

The Disputed Domain Name <8xbet68.net> is registered with Dynadot Inc (the "Registrar").

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the "Center") on August 21, 2025. On August 21, 2025, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the Disputed Domain Name. On August 22, 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 (Super Privacy Service LTD % Dynadot) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on August 22, 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 and a further amendment to the Complaint on August 22, 2025.

The Center verified that the Complaint together with and amended Complaint and the further 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 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 18, 2025.

The Center appointed Marilena Comanescu as the sole panelist in this matter on September 25, 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 active in the business of online gambling and betting services.

The Complainant owns trademark rights for 8XBET, such as the United States Trademark Registration number 7485266 for 8XBET (word), filed on May 16, 2023, registered on August 27, 2024, with claimed use in commerce since January 1, 2022, covering services in International Class 41.

The Complainant conducts its online services under the domain name <8xbet.com>.

The Complainant is currently the sponsor of the Man City Football Club which competes in the Premier League in the United Kingdom ("UK").

The Disputed Domain Name was registered on January 15, 2024, and, at the time of filing the Complaint, it redirected to a commercial website at the domain name <8xbet1.co> promoting online gambling services provided by various providers. Also, the website displayed the Complainant's trademark, colors, videos and imagery from the Complainant's website, as well as images of players of the Football Club sponsored by the Complainant. Also, on the website the Respondent claimed copyright protection.

The Complainant holds unregistered trademark rights in the 8XBET.COM trademark since at least 2023. See *978 Tech N. V. v. seo, Senh Sam*, WIPO Case No. [D2023-4092](#).¹

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: it has used the 8XBET marks continuously since at least January 2022 and the "www.8xbet.com" website is currently the largest gambling website in Asia; the 8XBET trademark has acquired widespread consumer recognition and has become a distinctive identifier that consumers associate with the Complainant's goods and services, all predating the Respondent's registration of the Disputed Domain Name; the Disputed Domain Name is confusingly similar to its trademark; the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in the Disputed Domain Name; the Respondent registered and is using the Disputed Domain Name in bad faith mainly because: the website under the Disputed Domain Name purports to offer the same gambling services as those offered by the Complainant, and, makes use of the Complainant's website content in an attempt to deliberately mislead users into believing that the Disputed Domain Name is owned by or affiliated with the Complainant; the Respondent registered the Disputed Domain Name after the Complainant's announcement of its affiliation with the UK Football Club and is attempting to use the Complainant's reputation and good standing in the market to lure unsuspecting individuals to gamble on a site that is largely unregulated and this is a clear case of website content trading off the Complainant's reputation; the Respondent is using the Disputed Domain Name exclusively with the intent of commercial gain, misleadingly diverting consumers to its website by infringing on the Complainant's

¹The Complainant states that the 8XBET mark was transferred from 978 Tech N.V. to it by the CEO of both companies. Therefore, it is appropriate to consider that the Complainant has unregistered trademark rights in the 8XBET.COM trademark recognized by a prior panel.

8XBET marks and other intellectual property rights, while the Complainant's intellectual property rights are also tarnished and diluted as a result of their use by the Respondent to divert Internet traffic to the Respondent's website, which has no legitimate connection with the Complainant's marks, intellectual property, or its authorized goods and services; further, the Respondent's website contains no identity or contact details relating to its operator, and the Respondent registered the Disputed Domain Name with an anonymous privacy service.

B. Respondent

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

6. Discussion and Findings

Under the Policy, the Complainant is required to prove on the balance of probabilities that:

- (i) the Disputed Domain Name is identical or confusingly similar to a trademark or service mark in which the Complainant has rights;
- (ii) the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in 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. See WIPO Overview of WIPO Panel Views on Selected UDRP Questions, Third Edition ("[WIPO Overview 3.0](#)"), section 1.7.

Based on the available record, the Panel finds 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 8XBET mark is 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/numbers, here "68", may bear on assessment of the second and third elements, the Panel finds the addition of such element 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.

According to the evidence, the Respondent has used the Disputed Domain Name in connection with a website promoting services similar to those of the Complainant, displaying the Complainant's trademark, colors and images from the Complainant's website, without providing any disclaimer regarding the relationship (in fact the lack thereof) between the Respondent and the Complainant. UDRP panels have held that the use of a domain name for illegal activity (such as claimed impersonation/passing off, or other types of fraud) 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.

In the present case, the Panel notes that the Disputed Domain Name was registered in bad faith, with knowledge of the Complainant and its trademark particularly because the Complainant's unregistered trademarks, as well as its claimed trademark use in commerce, predate the registration of the Disputed Domain Name with about two years, the 8XBET trademark has acquired recognition in its industry, and the composition of the Disputed Domain Name itself, comprising the 8XBET trademark, followed by non-distinctive element. Further, the use of the Disputed Domain Name reinforces such finding.

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.

Paragraph 4(b)(iv) of the Policy provides that the use of a domain name to intentionally attempt "to attract, for commercial gain, Internet users to [the respondent's] website or other online location, by creating a likelihood of confusion with the complainant's mark as to the source, sponsorship, affiliation, or endorsement of [the respondent's] website or location or of a product or service on [the respondent's] website or location" is evidence of registration and use in bad faith.

Creating a website displaying the Complainant's trademark, images and providing identical services to those provided by the Complainant under its 8XBET trademark, without providing any disclaimer, and redirecting the Disputed Domain Name to that website, in this Panel's view, the Respondent has intended to attract Internet users accessing the website who may be confused and believe that the website is held, controlled by, or somehow affiliated or related to the Complainant, for its commercial gain.

The Respondent chose not to participate in these proceedings and provided an inaccurate/incomplete postal address at the registration of the Disputed Domain Name, because the Written Notice could not be delivered to the Respondent by courier service. Along with the other circumstances in this case, this may be a further sign of bad faith.

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, <8xbet68.net>, be transferred to the Complainant.

/Marilena Comanescu/

Marilena Comanescu

Sole Panelist

Date: October 2, 2025