

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

GinjaBet Limited v. Stepan Stasenko, Name Redacted¹
Case No. D2025-4343

1. The Parties

The Complainant is GinjaBet Limited, Nigeria, represented by Victoria Chambers, Nigeria.

The Respondent is Stepan Stasenko, Ukraine.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <ginjabet.org> 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 23, 2025. On October 24, 2025, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On October 24, 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 and contact information in the Complaint.

The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant with the registrant and contact information revealed by the Registrar, inviting the Complainant to file an amendment to the Complaint. The Complainant filed an amendment to the Complaint on November 4, 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”).

¹ The Respondent appears to have used the name of a country when registering the disputed domain name. The Panel has redacted the Respondent’s registrant organization from this Decision. However, the Panel has attached as Annex 1 to this Decision an instruction to the Registrar regarding transfer of the disputed domain name, which includes the name of the Respondent. The Panel has authorized the Center to transmit Annex 1 to the Registrar as part of the order in these proceedings, and has indicated Annex 1 to this Decision shall not be published due to the exceptional circumstances of this case. See *Banco Bradesco S.A. v. FAST 12785241 Attn. Bradescourgente.net / Name Redacted*, WIPO Case No. [D2009-1788](#).

In accordance with the Rules, paragraphs 2 and 4, the Center formally notified the Respondent of the Complaint, and the proceedings commenced on November 6, 2025. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was November 26, 2025. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent's default on November 27, 2025.

The Center appointed Anna Carabelli as the sole panelist in this matter on December 5, 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 a Nigerian sport betting company, offering online betting services under the trademark GINJABET through its website at the domain name <ginjabet.com> which was registered on August 8, 2024.

The Complainant filed several Nigerian trademark applications for GINJABET, including No. NG/TM/O/2024/355838, GINJABET & DEVICE, on December 5, 2024, in Class 41².

The Complainant also claims unregistered trademark rights in GINJABET.

The disputed domain name was registered on July 16, 2025.

The disputed domain name resolves to a platform advertising sport gaming displaying GINJABET, a logo similar to the Complainant's, and a link "Register at Ginja Bet". According to the undisputed allegations in the Complaint, the platform indicates it was founded in 2025 and holds a Curaçao, Netherlands (Kingdom of the) eGaming license, and upon clicking on the "Register/Login" icons the users were redirected to the gaming platform "Lucky Star" soliciting deposits in cryptocurrency.

At the time of this Decision the disputed domain name still resolves to the website described above.

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:

- The Complainant has been operating under the GINJABET name and has built goodwill in that mark through extensive use and marketing efforts;
- GINJABET is a coined brand name which has acquired distinctiveness and secondary meaning firmly associated with the Complainant;
- The disputed domain name is confusingly similar to the Complainant's GINJABET trademark;
- The Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the disputed domain name since: (i) the Complainant has no commercial relationship with the Respondent, (ii) the Respondent is not commonly known by the name "Ginjabet", and (iii) the Respondent's use of the disputed domain name is not a bona fide offering of goods or services, but rather impersonation of the Complainant. In this connection the

²The Panel was unable to independently verify, in accordance with its general powers articulated by paragraphs 10 and 12 of the Rules, the status of those applications.

Complainants points out that the disputed domain name resolves to a gaming platform using the GINJABET trademark and logo, with links redirecting to a crypto gaming platform.; and

- The disputed domain name was registered and is being used in bad faith. The Respondent has registered the disputed domain name which includes the GINJABET trademark to divert Internet traffic to the Respondent's gaming platform and to capitalize on the goodwill of the Complainant.

Based on the above the Complainant requests the disputed domain name be transferred to the Complainant.

B. Respondent

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

6. Discussion and Findings

Paragraph 15(a) of the Rules instructs the Panel to decide the Complaint based on the statements and documents submitted and in accordance with the Policy, the Rules and any rules and principles of law that it deems applicable.

Under paragraph 4(a) of the Policy, the Complainant must prove each of the following:

- (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 respect of the disputed domain name; and
- (iii) the disputed domain name has been registered and is being used in bad faith.

Paragraph 4(b) of the Policy sets out four illustrative circumstances, which for the purposes of paragraph 4(a)(iii) of the Policy, shall be evidence of registration and use of a domain name in bad faith.

Paragraph 4(c) of the Policy sets out three illustrative circumstances any one of which, if found by the Panel, shall be evidence of the Respondent's rights to or legitimate interests in a disputed domain name for the purposes of paragraph 4(a)(ii) of the Policy above.

6.1. Preliminary Matters

The Panel notes that the Respondent's postal address is stated to be in Ukraine and that no communication has been received from the Respondent. Noting that Ukraine is subject to an international conflict at the date of this Decision that may impact case notification, the Panel is to consider, in accordance with paragraph 10 of the Rules, whether the proceedings should continue.

Having considered the circumstances of the case, the Panel is of the view that they should. The Panel notes that the Center has used the Respondent's email address as provided by the Registrar for the purpose of notifying the Complainant to the Respondent. There is no evidence that the Notification of the Complaint email to this email address was not successfully delivered. The Panel also notes that the website hosted at the disputed domain name is in the English language, which may support an inference that the Respondent is not located in Ukraine.

It is moreover noted that, for the reasons which are set out later in this Decision, the Panel has no serious doubt (albeit in the absence of any Response) that the Respondent registered and has used the disputed domain name in bad faith and with the intention of unfairly targeting the Complainant's goodwill in its trademark.

The Panel concludes that the Parties have been given a fair opportunity to present their case, and so that the administrative proceedings take place with due expedition the Panel will proceed to a Decision accordingly.

6.2. Substantive Matters

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.

Based on the unrebutted record presented, the Panel finds that the Complainant has established unregistered rights in the GINJABET mark. In support of its claimed rights, the Complainant has provided copies of media publications, its social media pages and other evidence that include promotion of its services that feature GINJABET to show that it has become distinctive of the Complainant's services such that the Panel finds that the unrebutted evidence filed by the Complainant prove that GINJABET has acquired sufficient relevant secondary meaning in connection with the Complainant's services to confer trademark rights on the Complainant. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 1.3. The use of the disputed domain name also supports the Panel's finding that its GINJABET mark has achieved significance as a source identifier.

The entirety of the mark is reproduced within the disputed domain name which consists precisely of the mark GINJABET followed by the Top-Level Domain ("TLD") ".org". Accordingly, the disputed domain name is identical to the mark for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 1.7.

The addition of the generic TLD, such as ".org" is viewed as a standard registration requirement and as such is typically disregarded under the first element confusing similarity test. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 1.11.1.

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 composition of the disputed domain name (identical to the Complainant's GINJABET trademark) and the content of the Respondent's website (which prominently featured the Complainant's trademark in a stylized font similar to that used by the Complainant and advertised services identical or similar to those of the

Complainant) affirm the Respondent's intention of taking unfair advantage of the likelihood of confusion for Internet users between the disputed domain name and the Complainant as to the origin or affiliation of the website.

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 content of the Respondent's website as described above, suggests both the Respondent's actual knowledge of the Complainant's rights as at the date of registration of the disputed domain name, and the Respondent's intention to take unfair advantage of those rights.

On the balance of probabilities, and in the absence of any evidence to the contrary, the Panel concludes that the Respondent set out to target the Complainant's mark and to mislead users by adopting a domain name identical to the Complainant's trademark and nearly identical to the Complainant's own domain name <ginjabet.com>, with an intention to divert Internet users to its website for commercial purposes, by creating a likelihood of confusion with the Complainant's mark as to the source, sponsorship, affiliation, or endorsement of its website. This is evidence of bad faith under paragraph 4(b)(iv) of the Policy.

Having reviewed the available record, in the Panel's view the Respondent's registration and use of the disputed domain name constitute 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 <ginjabet.org> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Anna Carabelli/
Anna Carabelli
Sole Panelist
Date: December 19, 2025