

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

Anneten Resources Limited and Blue Pepper B.V. v. Simon Routhier
Case No. D2025-4204

1. The Parties

The Complainants are Anneten Resources Limited, Cyprus, and Blue Pepper B.V., Curaçao, Netherlands (Kingdom of the), internally represented.

The Respondent is Simon Routhier, France, self-represented.

2. The Domain Names and Registrar

The disputed domain names <casinoyouwin.top>, <youwin.blog>, <youwin.cam>, <youwin.casino>, <youwin-casino.top>, <youwincasino.top>, <youwin.forum>, <youwin-giris.xyz>, <youwin.name>, <youwin-tr.com>, <youwin-tr.top>, and <youwin.wiki> are registered with NameCheap, Inc. (the “Registrar”).

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the “Center”) on October 13, 2025 by Anneten Resources Limited in relation to three disputed domain names: <youwin.blog>, <youwin.cam>, and <youwin.wiki>. On October 14, 2025, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with these disputed domain names. On October 15, 2025 the Registrar transmitted by email to the Center its verification response, disclosing the registrant and contact information for the disputed domain names which differed from the named Respondent (Unknown / 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 Complainants on October 21, 2025, disclosing the registrant and contact information revealed by the Registrar and inviting the Complainants to file an amendment to the Complaint. The Complainants filed the first amended Complaint on October 24, 2025, requesting to add the disputed domain names <casinoyouwin.top>, <youwin.casino>, <youwin-casino.top>, <youwincasino.top>, <youwin.forum>, <youwin-giris.xyz>, <youwin.name>, <youwin-tr.com>, and <youwin-tr.top> (“the Additional Disputed Domain Names”) to the proceedings. On October 24, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the Additional Disputed Domain Names. On October 24, 2025, the Registrar transmitted by email to the Center its verification response, confirming the Respondent as listed in the amended Complaint is the registrant of the Additional Disputed Domain Names and providing the contact details. The Respondent sent an email communication to the Center on October 26, 2025.

The Complainants filed the second amended Complaint on October 31, 2025 adding Blue Pepper B.V. as the co-Complainant to the proceedings.

The Center verified that the Complaint together with the amended Complaints 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 November 3, 2025. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was November 23, 2025. The Response was filed with the Center on November 23, 2025.

On November 26, 2025, the Complainants filed a Supplemental Filing. On November 27, 2025, the Respondent filed a Supplemental Filing further to the Complainants’ Supplemental Filing.

The Center appointed Zoltán Takács as the sole panelist in this matter on November 27, 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.

On December 10, 2025 the Panel issued the Procedural Order No. 1, requesting that (i) the Parties provide full correspondence between them regarding the disputed domain names, and (ii) inviting the Respondent to provide explanation and reliable evidence on the discrepancy in its domain name registration data. Both the Complainants and the Respondent have provided supplemental submissions to the Center by the established deadlines.

4. Factual Background

The Complaint outlines the following:

- the Complainant Anneten Resources Limited is among others owner of the:

a) European Union Trade Mark Registration (“EUTM”) No. 008832115 YOUWIN registered on February 9, 2011; and

b) figurative EUTM No. 008937146 YOUWIN registered on January 21, 2011; and

- the Complainant Blue Pepper B.V., among others, owns the domain name <youwin.com>.

The Complainants have produced a document dated August 25, 2025, by which the Complainant Anneten Resources Limited has – among others – authorized the Complainant Blue Pepper B.V. to initiate and manage proceedings brought under the UDRP and register and hold domain names incorporating the YOUWIN mark in their own name.

The disputed domain names were registered on the following dates: <youwin.wiki> on October 8, 2024; <youwin-tr.com> on November 4, 2024; <casinoyouwin.top>, <youwin-casino.top>, <youwincasino.top>, and <youwin-tr.top> on December 5, 2024; <youwin.forum> June 5, 2025; <youwin.name>, <youwin.blog>, <youwin.cam>, and <youwin-giris.xyz> on June 19, 2025; and <youwin.casino> on September 18, 2025.

The Complainants have provided the following evidence of use of the disputed domain names (disputed by the Respondent, as further discussed below): a printout dated October 23, 2025, of a Turkish language website at the disputed domain name <youwin-tr.com> which header displayed the following: “Youwin Casino ⚡ Giriş | Resmi Youwin web sitesine kaydolun” (in English – “Login | Register on the official Youwin

website”, and a copyright notice: “© Copyright 2025, Youwin Casino. All rights reserved.” The Complainants also provided a printout dated October 23, 2025, of a Turkish language website at the disputed domain name <youwin-tr.top> which header displayed the following: “Youwin Casino Giriş – Güvenli ve Eğlenceli Bir Casino Macerası” (in English – “Youwin Casino Login – A Safe and Fun Casino Adventure”). According to the printout submitted by the Complainants dated October 23, 2025, the disputed domain name <youwin.name> resolved to a landing page with pay-per-click (“PPC”) links in the Turkish language such as “Güneş Enerjisi” (in English – “Solar Energy”), “Güneş Enerjisi Paneli” (in English – “Solar Energy Panels”), and “Güneş Enerjisi Sistemi” (in English – “Solar Energy Systems”). The Complainants claim that when they captured these websites they were accessed via use of a Turkish IP address (VPN), without which they were not accessible.

Both Parties submitted copies of email correspondence exchanged prior to and immediately after filing of the Complaint. The Panel notes that after negotiating a sale of another domain name incorporating the Complainant’s mark, the Respondent inquired whether the Complainants would be interested in buying “other branded domains”, which he subsequently identified as the disputed domain names.

5. Parties’ Contentions

A. Complainants

The Complainants contend that they have satisfied each of the elements required under the Policy for the transfer of the disputed domain names.

Notably, the Complainants contend that:

- the disputed domain names are identical or confusingly similar to the YOUWIN trademark;
- the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the disputed domain names;
- the disputed domain names were registered long after the Complainant Anneten Resources Limited acquired trademark rights;
- the Respondent attempted on two occasions to sell the disputed domain names to the Complainants;
- the disputed domain name <youwin.casino> was created while there were ongoing settlement discussions between the parties regarding another domain name, proving the Respondent’s continued intent to exploit the Complainants’ goodwill and actions to secure additional domain names for further sale; and
- the Respondent’s use of the trademark to create confusion with the Complainants’ mark is evidenced by the fact that that disputed domain names <youwin.blog>, <youwin-tr.com> and <youwin-tr.top> were used to redirect to spoofed YOUWIN websites.

The Complainants request that the disputed domain names be transferred from the Respondent to the Complainant Blue Pepper B.V.

In their Supplemental Filing of November 26, 2025, the Complainants inter alia admitted that they had initiated contact with the Respondent regarding the sale of one of the disputed domain names, but argued that this fact did not demonstrate good-faith registration or use of the domain names.

B. Respondent

In its communication dated October 26, 2025, the Respondent stated that the disputed domain names are not actively used and consist of a “common phrase meaning “you won” / “you are the winner”.

In its Response, the Respondent among others contends that:

- it never approached the Complainants with any unsolicited offer to sell a domain name; instead, the Complainants initiated contact with the Respondent;
- the Turkish language screenshots submitted by the Complainants purporting to show web pages allegedly hosted under the disputed domain names are fabricated and must be disregarded;
- it never created any Turkish language content, nor has operated any website under the disputed domain names which have always returned 404 responses and remained inactive;
- the Complainants' trademark is not registered in Türkiye, nor known or recognized either in France (the Respondent's country of residence) or in Türkiye; and
- the Complainants provided no evidence that the Respondent was likely aware of the trademark at the time of registration of the disputed domain names.

In its Supplemental Filing dated November 27, 2025, Respondent requests that the Panel deny the Complaint and find Reverse Domain Name Hijacking ("RDNH").

6. Discussion and Findings

The Panel in its discretion decides that it is appropriate to admit and consider both Parties' Supplemental Filings insofar as they provide arguments relevant for the merits of the case and addressing the statements made in the Complaint and the Response. WIPO Overview of WIPO Panel Views on Selected UDRP Questions, Third Edition ("[WIPO Overview 3.0](#)"), section 4.6.

A complainant must evidence each of the three elements required by paragraph 4(a) of the Policy in order to succeed on the complaint, namely that:

- (i) the 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 respect of the domain name; and
- (iii) the 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 Complainants' trademark and the disputed domain names. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 1.7.

The Complainants have 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 disputed domain names <youwin.blog>, <youwin.cam>, <youwin.casino>, <youwin.forum>, <youwin.name> and <youwin.wiki> comprise the YOUWIN trademark without alterations or additions and are therefore identical to it. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 1.7.

The disputed domain names <casinoyouwin.top>, <youwin-casino.top>, <youwincasino.top>, <youwin-giris.xyz>, <youwin-tr.com> and <youwin-tr.top> reproduce the YOUWIN trademark alongside other terms, here "casino", "giris", and "tr", the addition of such terms does not prevent a finding of confusing similarity between the disputed domain names and the mark for the purposes of the Policy. Accordingly,

these disputed domain names are confusingly similar to the Complainants' trademark. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 1.8.

The Panel finds that 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.

Having reviewed the available record, the Panel finds that the Complainants have established a prima facie case that the Respondent lacks rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain names.

The Respondent has not come forward with any relevant evidence demonstrating rights of legitimate interests in the disputed domain names such as those enumerated in the Policy or otherwise.

The Respondent is not affiliated with the Complainants nor has any license, authorization, or other rights to use the YOUWIN trademark.

The Respondent is not commonly known by the disputed domain names or the YOUWIN trademark.

Further, there is no indication that the Respondent is making a noncommercial or fair use of the disputed domain names. In fact, the Respondent stated that "no website was ever hosted on the disputed domain [names]" and that at all relevant times the domain names resolved only to 404 error pages, no content was published, no redirection occurred, no PPC or monetization pages were used.

Noting also the further findings made under the third element of the Policy below, the Panel finds that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain names and that 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.

Taking into account the relatively limited scope of the UDRP the Panel finds that the following facts with relevance to the decision in this case have been established.

The YOUWIN mark was registered well over 10 years before registration of the earliest disputed domain name <youwin.wiki>.

Although the Complainants did not provide substantive information about the use of the YOUWIN mark, the Panel exercised its power articulated inter alia in paragraphs 10 and 12 of the Rules and undertook limited factual research regarding this issue, in this case by consulting the Internet Archive ("www.archive.org"). [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 4.8.

The historical web captures for the website at the Complainants' <youwin.com> domain name indicate that the YOUWIN mark has been extensively used for the corresponding services, that is online gambling since as early as 2011 (e.g. web capture dated October 6, 2011), such as that registration and use of the YOUWIN mark by a third party – for some disputed domain names in combination with the term "casino" – could be misleadingly perceived as attributed to the Complainants.

Despite its submissions as mentioned above, the Respondent did not provide any information as to why it registered multiple disputed domain names either comprising solely the YOUWIN mark or incorporating the YOUWIN mark in combination with the term “casino”, which is specific of the Complainants’ services. The Respondent claims the disputed domain names were registered because of their dictionary meaning and are inactive, but did not provide any evidence of any intended use.

Notably, absent any relevant explanation supported by evidence from the Respondent, the Panel considers, on balance, that it is more likely than not that the Respondent was aware of the YOUWIN mark at the time of registration of the disputed domain names and obtained them to target the YOUWIN mark through taking unfair advantage of a false association, which is evidence of bad faith. Paragraph 4(b)(iv) of the Policy; [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 4.2. Furthermore, the Panel notes from the copies of pre-Complaint email correspondence exchanged by the Parties provided to the Panel pursuant to the Procedural Order No. 1 that, as at September 1, 2025, the Parties were engaged in negotiating a sale of another domain name owned by the Respondent and incorporating the Complainants’ YOUWIN mark. The record therefore clearly shows that at least the disputed domain name <youwin.casino> – registered on September 18, 2025 – was registered by the Respondent with a clear knowledge of the Complainants’ rights. In addition, noting in particular the Complainants’ long-standing use of the domain name <youwin.com> prior to the registration of the disputed domain names, the Respondent’s offer to sell the disputed domain names to the Complainants, in the Panel’s view, the overall circumstances of this case tip the balance in the Complainants’ favour.

As to the use of the disputed domain names, the Complainants provided a printout dated October 23, 2025, of a Turkish language website at the disputed domain name <youwin-tr.com> which header displayed the following: “Youwin Casino ⚡ Giriş | Resmi Youwin web sitesine kaydolun” (in English – “Login | Register on the official Youwin website” and a copyright notice: “© Copyright 2025, Youwin Casino. All rights reserved.” The Complainants also provided a printout dated October 23, 2025, of a Turkish language website at the disputed domain name <youwin-tr.top> which header displayed the following: “Youwin Casino Giriş – Güvenli ve Eğlenceli Bir Casino Macerası” (in English – “Youwin Casino Login – A Safe and Fun Casino Adventure”). According to another printout dated October 23, 2025 submitted by the Complainants, the disputed domain name <youwin.name> resolved to a landing page with PPC links in the Turkish language such as “Güneş Enerjisi” (in English – “Solar Energy”), “Güneş Enerjisi Panelli” (in English – “Solar Energy Panels”), and “Güneş Enerjisi Sistemi” (in English – “Solar Energy Systems”). The Complainants claim that when they captured these websites they were accessed via use of a Turkish IP address (VPN), without which they were not accessible.

The Respondent disputes the Complainants’ above assertions and alleges that these printouts are fabricated and should be disregarded, which the Complainants vehemently deny.

Since the UDRP proceedings do not allow for discovery, the Panel is not in a position (as a court would be) to make any assessments on the authenticity of the Complainants’ above-mentioned assertions and documents submitted in evidence, and therefore does not make any findings on this issue. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 4.2.

When the Panel sought to access the disputed domain names at the time of rendering of this Decision, they appeared inactive.

In any case, even if the disputed domain names have never been used (as the Respondent alleges) it does not alter the Panel’s conclusions, since non-use of the disputed domain names in this case does not prevent a finding of bad faith under the doctrine of passive holding. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 3.3. In this context, the Panel notes the long-standing use of the YOUWIN mark and the above findings of the Respondent’s bad faith registration and lack of rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain names, and finds that in the circumstances of this case the passive holding of the disputed domain names does not prevent a finding of bad faith under the Policy.

The Panel finds that the Complainants have established the third element of the Policy.

The Panel notes the Respondent's request to find Reverse Domain Name Hijacking but, in the circumstances, does not consider it appropriate to address it.

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 names <casinoyouwin.top>, <youwin.blog>, <youwin.cam>, <youwin.casino>, <youwin-casino.top>, <youwincasino.top>, <youwin.forum>, <youwin-giris.xyz>, <youwin.name>, <youwin-tr.com>, <youwin-tr.top>, and <youwin.wiki> be transferred to the Complainant Blue Pepper B.V.

/Zoltán Takács/

Zoltán Takács

Sole Panelist

Date: December 20, 2025