

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

BIFTIKENA LTD v. Registration Private, Privacy service provided
Case No. D2025-4130

1. The Parties

The Complainant is BIFTIKENA LTD, Cyprus, represented by Christoforos Paraskevidis, Cyprus.

The Respondent is Registration Private, Privacy service provided, United States of America ("United States").

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <goldpariagent.com> is registered with NameCheap, Inc. (the "Registrar").

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the "Center") on October 9, 2025. On October 9, 2025, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On October 9, 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, Privacy service provided by Withheld for Privacy ehf) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on October 10, 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 amendment to the Complaint on October 13, 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 the Respondent of the Complaint, and the proceedings commenced on October 28, 2025. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was November 17, 2025. The Respondent sent an email communication to the Center on October 10, 2025. The Center sent Commencement of Panel Appointment Process on November 26, 2025.

The Center appointed Mireille Buydens as the sole panelist in this matter on December 1, 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 operates a betting platform under the brand name "GOLDPARI", for which it owns the European Union Trade Mark No. 018959664, covering the sign GOLDPARI (word and device mark), registered on March 21, 2024, in classes 35, 38, 41 and 42 (hereafter "the GOLDPARI Trademark" or "the Trademark").

The Complainant also owns and operates a website under the domain name <goldpari.com>.

The disputed domain name was registered on October 3, 2024. According to the Complaint, it resolves to a website reproducing the Complainant's logos and trademark and offering to customers to become "a betting agent mobile cashier". The website under the disputed domain name presents itself as endorsed or run by the Complainant, as it depicts the GOLDPARI Trademark on the upper left side of the website and mentions "The GoldPari agent program is a great opportunity to become a betting agent mobile cashier" and "GOLDPARI OFFERS AGENTS TOOLS AND FEATURES, SUPPORT FOR VARIOUS CURRENCIES [...] TO ATTRACT GLOBAL PLAYERS".

At the date of this decision, the disputed domain name resolves to an error page.

After the filing of the Complaint, the Respondent sent an email to the Center on October 10, 2025 explaining that he made a mistake in registering the disputed domain name and was willing to correct the mistake. The Complainant answered on October 14, 2025 that the disputed domain name was violating the Complainant's right and that the website under the disputed domain name was misleading Internet users into the false belief that they were dealing with the Complainant or its authorized agent. The Complainant required the transfer of the disputed domain name and the immediate closure of the website. The Respondent answered on the same day that he was only providing hosting services for the Respondent but that he was willing to sell the disputed domain name to the Complainant for "a certain price".

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.

First, the Complainant asserts that it owns a trademark registration for the sign GOLDPARI and that the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to the GOLDPARI Trademark, as it includes the Trademark in its entirety with the mere addition of the generic and descriptive term "agent".

Second, the Complainant asserts that the Respondent lacks rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name. The Respondent is not a licensee of the Complainant, nor affiliated with the Complainant in any way and the Complainant has not authorized the Respondent to make any use of its GOLDPARI Trademark. There is no evidence to suggest that the Respondent is commonly known by the disputed domain name. The Complainant further contends that the Respondent's website does not provide any bona fide offering of goods or services. Instead, the website under the disputed domain name is intended to mislead Internet users and divert traffic away from the Complainant's official website <goldpari.com>.

Third, the Complainant asserts that the disputed domain name was registered and is being used in bad faith. The Complainant contends that the Respondent has registered and is using the disputed domain name incorporating its well-known GOLDPARI Trademark to falsely associate itself to the Complainant's brand. By registering and using the disputed domain name, the Respondent attempts to attract Internet users for commercial gain by creating confusion as to the source, sponsorship, affiliation or endorsement of the Respondent's website. The Complainant further asserts that the website under the disputed domain name reproduces the Complainant's logo and Trademark, falsely implying a connection with, or endorsement by, the Complainant. The Complainant further contends that the Respondent had actual or constructive knowledge of its Trademark because it predates the registration of the disputed domain name.

B. Respondent

On October 10, 2025, the Respondent explained that he made a mistake in registering the disputed domain name and was willing to correct the mistake. On October 14, 2025, the Respondent further wrote that he was only providing hosting services and that he was willing to sell the disputed domain name to the Complainant for "a certain price".

6. Discussion and Findings

Paragraph 4(a) of the Policy provides that the Complainant proves each of the following three elements in order to succeed in its Complaint:

- (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 entirety of the GOLDPARI Trademark is reproduced within the disputed domain name. Accordingly, the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to the Trademark for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 1.7.

Although the addition of another term, here the word "agent", 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. The Respondent did not claim to be commonly known by the disputed domain name. The Respondent does not contest, in his communications of October 10 and 14, 2025, that he is not a licensee of the Complainant, nor affiliated with the Complainant in any way, nor authorized in any way to file and use the disputed domain name and does not claim to have rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name.

Besides, the Panel notes that the disputed domain name reproduces the GOLDPARI Trademark in its entirety with the mere addition of the descriptive term “agent”, and as such carries a risk of implied affiliation, which cannot constitute fair use as it suggests sponsorship or endorsement by the Complainant. The Panel further notes the impersonating nature of the website under the disputed domain name, which depicts the Complainant's logo and the GOLDPARI Trademark while explaining “The GoldPari agent program is a great opportunity to become a betting agent mobile cashier” and “GOLDPARI OFFERS AGENTS TOOLS AND FEATURES, SUPPORT FOR VARIOUS CURRENCIES [...] TO ATTRACT GLOBAL PLAYERS”. As a result, the website is actually impersonating the Complainant and the Respondent induces Internet users into falsely believing that the disputed domain name resolves to a website operated or endorsed by the Complainant. Internet users visiting the website under the disputed domain name will falsely believe that they can enroll as the Complainant's agent through the website, which does not contain any information or disclaimer explaining that it is not linked to or endorsed by the Complainant. Panels have held that the use of a domain name for illegitimate activity, here, claimed impersonation/passing off, 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.

Having reviewed the record, the Panel finds the Respondent's registration and use of the disputed domain name constitutes bad faith under the Policy. The Panel notes that the Respondent has composed the disputed domain name by combining the Complainant's GOLDPARI Trademark with the descriptive term “agent” (the Complainant, as most companies, could have “agents” for marketing its services). Besides, as explained above, the website under the disputed domain name passes itself off as the Complainant, displaying explanations as if the website was operated by the Complainant and depicting the Complainant's Trademark and logo. This cannot be the result of mere chance. Besides, a quick search for the term “goldpari” online would have revealed to the Respondent the existence of the Complainant and its Trademark. As a result, the Panel finds that the Respondent was more likely than not aware of the Complainant's Trademark at the time of the registration of the disputed domain name. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 3.2.2.

Moreover, panels have held that the use of a domain name for illegitimate activity, here impersonating or passing off, constitutes bad faith. In the present case, the disputed domain name resolves to a website clearly impersonating the Complainant and offering services which could be offered by the Complainant (namely proposing to become a GOLPARI agent for gathering cash from players). This website does not contain any information allowing Internet users to identify the company operating the website. In light of this, it seems inconceivable that the Respondent would have registered and used the disputed domain name for a reason other than seeking to unduly benefit from the Complainant, its GOLDPARI Trademark, and associated goodwill.

Having reviewed the record, the Panel finds the Respondent's registration and use of the disputed domain name constitutes bad faith under the Policy.

The Panel finds that the 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 name <goldpariagent.com> be transferred to the Complainant.

*/Mireille Buydens/
Mireille Buydens
Sole Panelist
Date: December 10, 2025*