

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

Bittech B.V. v. Dmitri Loguzonov
Case No. D2025-4209

1. The Parties

Complainant is Bittech B.V., Curaçao, Netherlands (Kingdom of the), internally represented.

Respondent is Dmitri Loguzonov, Kazakhstan.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain names <888starzmobile.com>, <888starzpoland.com>, and <888starzreviews.com> are registered with Spaceship, Inc. (the “Registrar”).

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the “Center”) on October 14, 2025. On October 14, 2025, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain names. On October 15, 2025, the Registrar transmitted by email to the Center its verification response disclosing registrant and contact information for the disputed domain names which differed from the named Respondent (Registrant data unavailable) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to Complainant on October 16, 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 October 16, 2025.

Respondent sent an email communication to the Center on October 16, 2025. On October 21, 2025, per Complainant’s request, the proceedings were suspended. On November 18, 2025, Complainant requested the proceedings to be reinstated, and the Center notified the Parties of the reinstitution of the proceeding on the same day.

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 November 19, 2025. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the

due date for Response was December 9, 2025. Respondent did not file any formal response. Accordingly, the Center notified the commencement of the panel appointment process on December 11, 2025.

The Center appointed Gabriel F. Leonardos as the sole panelist in this matter on December 17, 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 provider of online gambling services. Complainant's platform was created in 2020 and provides betting and gambling services mainly related to slots, live casinos and 1.000 sporting events for betting. Complainant's platform has acquired a global reach and has reached 200 thousand visits and eight million impressions in 2025.

As shown below, Complainant owns a trademark registration for 888STARZ, as well as the domain names <888starz.bet> and <888starz.partners>.

Registration Number	Trademark	Jurisdiction	International Class	Registration Date
1721031		International Registration Designated jurisdictions: Belarus, Kenya, and Portugal	35, 36, and 41	January 25, 2023

The disputed domain names <888starzpoland.com >, <888starzreviews.com>, and <888starzmobile.com> were all registered on May 23, 2025, and used to resolve to a webpage reproducing Complainant's trademark and logo. Complainant has also provided evidence showing that Respondent's websites contain links redirecting Internet users to Complainant's competitors' websites.

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 names.

Notably, Complainant contends that the disputed domain names are confusingly similar to its 888STARZ trademark. According to Complainant, the key element of its trademark is the "888starz" term, which is used by Respondent in the disputed domain names. The addition of elements such as "poland", "reviews", and "mobile" would not be sufficient to prevent the similarity and confusion.

Therefore, according to Complainant, the disputed domain names are confusingly similar with Complainant's trademark 888STARZ, fulfilling paragraph 4(a)(i) of the Policy.

Complainant affirms that it has not licensed or authorized Respondent to register or use the disputed domain names. Furthermore, the use of the websites to impersonate Complainant and confuse Internet users could not be considered as a bona fide offering of goods or services.

In this manner, Complainant state that Respondent lacks rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain names, fulfilling paragraph 4(a)(ii) of the Policy.

Finally, Complainant urges that the disputed domain names were registered and are being used in bad faith. According to Complainant, Respondent knew about Complainant's rights and reproduced the trademarks in bad faith. The disputed domain names were registered after Complainant's trademark gained recognition and were registered with the intention of taking advantage of Complainant's reputation and financially profit from the confusion.

Thus, according to Complainant, the requirements for a finding of bad faith registration and use of the disputed domain names have been fulfilled, pursuant to paragraphs 4(a)(iii) and 4(b) of the Policy. Accordingly, Complainant requests the disputed domain names <888starzpoland.com>, <888starzreviews.com>, and <888starzmobile.com> be transferred to Complainant.

B. Respondent

Although Respondent sent an email communication to the Center on October 16, 2025, stating "[t]hese domains have been deregistered", Respondent did not formally reply to Complainants' contentions.

6. Discussion and Findings

To succeed in a UDRP complaint, Complainant must demonstrate that all the elements listed in paragraph 4(a) of the Policy have been satisfied, as following:

- (i) the disputed domain name is identical or confusingly similar to a trademark or service mark in which Complainant has rights;
- (ii) 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.

The burden of proving these elements is upon Complainant.

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 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.

Based on the available record, the Panel finds 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 trademark 888STARZ is reproduced within the disputed domain names. The addition of the terms "poland", "reviews" and "mobile" does not prevent a finding of confusing similarity between the disputed domain names and the mark for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 1.8.

Accordingly, the disputed domain names are confusingly similar to the mark for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 1.7. Therefore, based on the available record, 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 Respondent may demonstrate rights or legitimate interests in a disputed domain name.

Although the overall burden of proof in UDRP proceedings is on 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 Respondent lacks rights or legitimate interests, the burden of production on this element shifts to Respondent to come forward with relevant evidence demonstrating rights or legitimate interests in the domain name (although the burden of proof always remains on Complainant). If Respondent fails to come forward with such relevant evidence, 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 names. 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.

The Panel notes that the disputed domain names were used for websites offering the same services offered by Complainant while reproducing the Complainant’s logo. Panels have held that the use of a domain name for illegitimate activity, here claimed as passing off, can never confer rights or legitimate interests on a Respondent. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 2.13.1.

Based on the available record, Respondent is not entitled to any trademark, trade name, or any other right associated with the disputed domain names. Additionally, Respondent has not been authorized by Complainant to use the 888STARZ trademark, and there is no commercial relationship between the Parties.

Respondent is not commonly known by the disputed domain names, and the Panel notes that Respondent is making an illegitimate use of the disputed domain name. In light of these circumstances, the Panel finds that no rights or legitimate interests can be found on behalf of Respondent.

Accordingly, 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 Respondent has registered the disputed domain names that are confusingly similar to Complainants’ trademark 888STARZ. Also, based on the available record, it was established that Respondent has no affiliation with Complainant and its trademarks, nor has it sought authorization or a license to utilize the referred trademarks. Also, based on the available record, Respondent does not own any trademarks containing the term “888starz” nor showed any rights over the trademarks or any relating terms.

Respondent evidently knew or should have known of the existence of Complainant’s prior trademark rights and domain names, which were matters of public record, before registering the disputed domain names. The registration of the disputed domain names was carried out by Respondent, who had the responsibility to verify the existence of the referred trademarks.

Considering Complainant’s activities and the form the disputed domain names were registered and used, it may be inferred that the registration of the disputed domain names was intentionally done with plans of passing off as Complainant and unduly benefit of the notoriety associated with Complainant’s trademark, since the disputed domain names used to resolve webpages that reproduced Complainants’ trademarks and logo and had descriptions that intentionally directed Internet users into an association of its content with Complainant’s activities.

Therefore, the Panel finds that the circumstances of the present case allow for a finding of bad faith in the registration and use of the disputed domain names, since Respondent intended to financially profit by passing off as Complainant through the use of confusingly similar disputed domain names and the reproduction of Complainant's marks in its related websites.

Based on the available record, the Panel finds that 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 names <888starzpoland.com >, <888starzreviews.com>, and <888starzmobile.com> be transferred to Complainant.

/Gabriel F. Leonardos/

Gabriel F. Leonardos

Sole Panelist

Date: December 31, 2025.