

## **ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION**

The Sporting Exchange Ltd v. LIGA ET, AGIT  
Case No. D2025-4266

### **1. The Parties**

The Complainant is The Sporting Exchange Ltd, United Kingdom, represented by SafeNames Ltd., United Kingdom.

The Respondent is LIGA ET, AGIT, Indonesia.

### **2. The Disputed Domain Name and Registrar**

The Disputed Domain Name <betfair.news> 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 17, 2025. On October 20, 2025, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the Disputed Domain Name. On October 20, 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 Purposes) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on October 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 on October 24, 2025.

The Center verified that the Complaint together with the amended 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 29, 2025. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was November 18, 2025. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent’s default on November 19, 2025.

The Center appointed Marilena Comanescu as the sole panelist in this matter on November 26, 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, established in 2000 and headquartered in the United Kingdom, is an online gambling company that operates one of the world's largest sports betting exchanges. The Complainant has established a global presence through its services available in various countries across Europe, Asia, the Americas, and Oceania. The Complainant has a network of offices in Italy, Portugal, and the United Kingdom, and employs over 600 employees.

The Complainant's offerings under the BETFAIR trademark predominantly pertain to online gaming services such as sportsbook, casino, poker, and exchange betting.

The Complainant owns numerous domain names incorporating BETFAIR, such as <betfair.com> operating since 2000, <betfair.ie>, <betfair.it>, and <betfair.uk>.

Notwithstanding the jurisdictional restrictions applicable to online gambling services, the BETFAIR platform has developed a significant user base. Between July and September 2025, the Complainant averaged 10.8 million users per month on its website "www.betfair.com".

The Complainant's BETFAIR Sports Betting app operates for downloads to iOS and Android, and has been downloaded over one million times. The Complainant's app has received significant recognition, ranking among the top 15 mobile betting apps in 2025 in the United Kingdom.

The Complainant has partnerships with and sponsors various sports clubs, and has established a strong social media presence.

The Complainant uses the BETFAIR mark as part of its company logo to distinguish its service offerings and has developed a significant amount of goodwill and global recognition through the use of its logo.

The Complainant owns multiple registered trademarks for or including BETFAIR, such as the following:

- the Indonesian trademark registration number IDM000173077 for BETFAIR (stylized), filed on January 16, 2007, registered on August 11, 2008, covering goods in International Class 9;
- the International Trademark Registration number 821510 for BETFAIR (word), registered on December 11, 2003, covering goods and services in International Classes 9, 41; and
- the United Kingdom Trademark Registration number UK00002226730 for BETFAIR (word), filed on March 22, 2000, registered on April 6, 2001, covering goods and services in International Classes 9, and 41.

The Disputed Domain Name was registered by the Respondent on September 9, 2025.

The Complainant previously owned and used the Disputed Domain Name from 2015 to 2025.

At the time of filing of the Complaint, the Disputed Domain Name was used to host a news webpage with identical content to that hosted on the domain name when the Complainant owned it (such content being currently displayed on the Complainant's website at the domain name <betfair.it>), including the copyright statement in the footer of the website stating: "Copyright © 2000-2024 The Sporting Exchange Limited", and without providing any disclaimer to clarify the lack of relationship between the Disputed Domain Name holder and the Complainant.

Also, the website under the Disputed Domain Name featured Cookie and Privacy Policy links, where Internet users were redirected to an Indian shopping website.

According to evidence annexed to the Complaint, Mail Exchange (“MX”) servers have been configured at the Disputed Domain Name, and the Respondent (its name and/or email address) is recorded as registrant for other domain names targeting third-party trademarks.

Before commencing the present proceeding, on September 23 and 30, 2025, the Complainant sent a cease-and-desist letter to the Respondent, through the Registrar. No response was received.

## **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 the following: (i) the BETFAIR brand has accrued substantial goodwill and global recognition in the online betting industry since its establishment in 2000; (ii) the Disputed Domain Name is identical to its BETFAIR mark as it encompasses it in its entirety without additions or amendments; and the generic Top-Level Domain (“gTLD”) “.news” should be disregarded under the first element test; (iii) the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in the Disputed Domain Name; (iv) the Respondent registered and is using the Disputed Domain Name in bad faith mainly because: the Complainant’s trademark registrations predate the creation date of the Disputed Domain Name by 24 years; the Respondent is using the Disputed Domain Name to host previous content used by the Complainant, and has replicated the copyright notice without any prominent disclaimer and these give Internet users a false impression that the site is controlled and authorised by the Complainant; the Respondent is using the Disputed Domain Name to redirect users to an unrelated online store where they can input their personal details and such use puts an online user’s personal data at risk; the Disputed Domain Name has active MX records, and thus, the Respondent has the capability to engage in phishing activity through email distribution and to cause disruption to the Complainant; additionally, the Respondent has engaged in a pattern of abusive conduct by registering domain names that encompass the marks of third-party brands since the Respondent’s email address and name are recorded on other domain names targeting third-party brands.

### **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. 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 BETFAIR mark is reproduced within the Disputed Domain Name. Accordingly, the Disputed Domain Name is identical to the mark for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 1.7.

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 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 provided in the Complaint, the Respondent has used the Disputed Domain Name in connection with a copycat version of the Complainant’s official website, including the copyright notice and also displaying links which redirected Internet users to a third-party commercial website. Panels have held that the use of a domain name for illegitimate activity (e.g., impersonation/passing off, phishing, or other types of fraud) can never confer rights or legitimate interests on a respondent. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 2.13.1.

Further, the composition of the Disputed Domain Name carries a high risk of implied affiliation, being identical to the Complainant’s mark, and being highly similar to the Complainant’s domain names. UDRP panels have largely held that such composition cannot constitute fair use if it effectively impersonates or suggests sponsorship or endorsement by the trademark owner. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 2.5.1.

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 it reproduces the Complainant’s trademark exactly, and the Complainant’s trademark predates the registration of the Disputed Domain Name by more than 24 years and is well-known worldwide. The use of the Disputed Domain Name enforces 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 copycat version of the Complainant's official website, replicating the copyright notice without any prominent disclaimer, and providing links to a third party's commercial website, is a clear indication that the Respondent intentionally attempted to attract Internet users accessing the website corresponding to the Disputed Domain Name 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.

Also, the use of a domain name for illegitimate activity such as impersonation/passing off can never confer rights or legitimate interests on a respondent and it is considered evidence of bad faith. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 3.4.

The Respondent chose not to participate in these proceedings, has provided incomplete contact information to the relevant Registrar, appears to have MX records associated with the Disputed Domain Name, and has engaged in a pattern of abusive conduct by registering domain names that incorporate third parties' trademarks. All these facts, under the circumstances of this case, are further signs of bad faith.

Previous UDRP panels have found that the mere registration of a domain name that is identical or confusingly similar to a widely known trademark by an unaffiliated entity can, by itself, create a presumption of bad faith for the purpose of Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 3.1.4.

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, <betfair.news>, be transferred to the Complainant.

*/Marilena Comanescu/*

**Marilena Comanescu**

Sole Panelist

Date: December 10, 2025