

## **ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION**

Tamaris (Gibraltar) Limited v. Beka Karanadze  
Case No. D2025-4632

### **1. The Parties**

The Complainant is Tamaris (Gibraltar) Limited, United Kingdom, represented by Wiley Rein LLP, United States of America.

The Respondent is Beka Karanadze, Georgia.

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

The disputed domain name <pragmatic.bet> is registered with GoDaddy.com, LLC (the “Registrar”).

### **3. Procedural History**

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the “Center”) on November 6, 2025. On November 10, 2025, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On November 10, 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 (REGISTRATION PRIVATE) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on November 11, 2025, providing the registrant and contact information disclosed by the Registrar, and inviting the Complainant to submit an amendment to the Complaint. The Respondent sent an informal communication on the same date. The Complainant filed an amended Complaint on November 14, 2025.

The Respondent sent another informal communication on November 14, 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 November 17, 2025. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was December 7, 2025. The Respondent did not submit any response. The Center notified the commencement of panel appointment process on December 8, 2025.

The Center appointed Deanna Wong Wai Man as the sole panelist in this matter on December 15, 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 leading provider of mobile and desktop casino games for the online gaming industry. Since at least 2016, Complainant and its predecessors-in-interest has been actively developing, offering, and supplying games under the PRAGMATIC PLAY mark to operators in various jurisdictions.

The Complainant owns an international trademark portfolio for the PRAGMATIC PLAY and PRAGMATICPLAY marks, including but not limited to the following marks: European Union Trademark Registration Number 017891041, filed on April 23, 2018 and registered on September 1, 2018 and United States of America Trademark Registration Number 6848492, filed on February 19, 2021 and registered on September 13, 2022. The Complainant also provides evidence that it owns trademark applications for other related marks such as PRAGMATIC CASINO (European Union Trademark Registration Number 019135594), PRAGMATIC GAMES (European Union Trademark Registration Number 019135552), and PRAGMATIC SLOTS (European Union Trademark Registration Number 019135583), as well as a pending trademark application for the mark PRAGMATIC BET.

The disputed domain name was registered on August 28, 2024, and, according to the Complainant's evidence, it resolves to a page with pay-per-click links about betting as well as to redirections to random sites such as automobile sales, and (on certain devices) a page stating that the device has been infected and antivirus software is required.

The Respondent is a self-represented individual located in Georgia, and is according to his statements, buying and selling domain names as part of his business.

#### **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 it has extensive registered and unregistered rights in the PRAGMATIC PLAY mark and related PRAGMATIC-formative marks, arising from longstanding, continuous, and global use in connection with online gaming and gambling services, supported by significant marketing, promotional activities, and industry recognition. The Complainant refers to its holds numerous trademark registrations for PRAGMATIC PLAY and related marks, as well as additional PRAGMATIC-formative registrations and applications covering closely related services. The Complainant argues that the disputed domain name consists solely of the dominant element "PRAGMATIC" combined with the ".bet" gTLD, which is directly associated with betting and gaming services, thereby reinforcing the likelihood of confusion and falsely suggesting an association with the Complainant.

Further, the Complainant asserts that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name. The Respondent is not affiliated with, licensed by, or otherwise authorized by the Complainant to use its marks, nor is the Respondent commonly known by the disputed domain name. The Complainant argues that the Respondent has expressly admitted that he acquired the disputed domain name purely as an "investment" and not for any bona fide offering of goods or services or for any legitimate noncommercial or fair use. Instead, the disputed domain name has been used to host pay-per-click links

relating to betting and gambling services, which compete with or trade on the Complainant's goodwill and do not confer any rights or legitimate interests under the Policy.

As to bad faith, the Complainant argues that the disputed domain name was registered and is being used in bad faith. Given the distinctiveness and reputation of the Complainant's PRAGMATIC marks, the Respondent's selection of the ".bet" gTLD, and the gambling-related pay-per-click content displayed on the associated website, the Respondent knew or should have known of the Complainant and its rights at the time of registration. The Respondent's conduct further demonstrates bad faith through repeated attempts to sell the disputed domain name to the Complainant for amounts far exceeding his out-of-pocket costs, including escalating the price after learning of the Complainant's identity. The Complainant also points to the Respondent's use of a privacy service to conceal his identity as additional evidence supporting a finding of bad faith registration and use.

## **B. Respondent**

The Respondent did not formally reply to the Complainant's contentions, but sent a number of email communications in which he essentially stated that he had purchased the disputed domain name purely as an investment with the intention of reselling it, that he paid a substantial sum to acquire it through GoDaddy, that he had not used the disputed domain name in any operational manner, and that any objectionable content or redirections appearing on the associated website were not intentionally placed by him and occurred without his knowledge or consent, while also asserting that the registrar's post-registration restrictions temporarily prevented transfer of the disputed domain name and expressing dissatisfaction with the conduct by the Complainant and its representatives.

## **6. Discussion and Findings**

### **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 Panel finds that the Complainant's PRAGMATIC PLAY mark is clearly recognizable within the disputed domain name, as the disputed domain consists entirely of the primary and dominant element of Complainant's PRAGMATIC PLAY and other PRAGMATIC-formative marks. Accordingly, the disputed domain name is confusingly similar 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 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.

Moreover, the Panel finds that the Respondent is not commonly known by the disputed domain name, has not been licensed or otherwise authorized by the Complainant to use the PRAGMATIC PLAY mark or any of the Complainant's other PRAGMATIC-formative marks, and has failed to adduce any evidence of use of, or demonstrable preparations to use, the disputed domain name in connection with a bona fide offering of goods or services. The Panel further notes that the disputed domain name resolves to a webpage displaying apparent pay-per-click advertising relating to gaming services that compete with those of the Complainant (along with redirections to other random webpages). In the Panel's view, such use does not confer rights or legitimate interests within the meaning of the Policy (see [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 2.9).

As regards the Respondent's assertion that he acquired the disputed domain name purely as an "investment" with a view to resale, the Panel notes that "pragmatic" is also a dictionary term. However, the Panel agrees with the Complainant that the generic Top-Level Domain ".bet." selected by the Respondent, is likely to be perceived as a reference to the Complainant's services, namely providing games of chance, creating a misleading impression of association.

In addition, the Panel notes that it is well established under the UDRP that the registration and holding of domain names for resale, notably those comprising dictionary words or acronyms, is not *per se* illegitimate. However, panels have consistently held that, to support a finding of rights or legitimate interests on the basis of a domain name's dictionary meaning, the respondent must show that the domain name is genuinely used, or at least demonstrably intended to be used, in connection with that dictionary meaning, and has not been registered seeking to trade on the trademark rights of a third party (see [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 2.10). In the present case, the Panel finds no evidence that the Respondent's registration and use of the disputed domain name were directed to any such legitimate purpose. To the contrary, on the balance of probabilities, the Panel considers that the Respondent targeted the Complainant's intensively used and distinctive marks through the registration of the disputed domain name, with a view to obtaining an unfair advantage from the inclusion of the Complainant's mark therein. On the basis of the foregoing, the Panel concludes that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name.

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 Respondent, who is entirely unaffiliated with the Complainant, registered the disputed domain name, which is confusingly similar to the Complainant's prior, used trademarks that had been registered for several years before the registration of the disputed domain name. The conclusion that the Respondent targeted the Complainant is further reinforced by the Respondent's choice of the ".bet" generic Top-Level Domain, which is specifically associated with the games of chance and betting sector and which directly overlaps with the Complainant's field of commercial activity. The Panel further notes from the media articles provided by the Complainant that even a cursory Internet search at the time of registration would have likely revealed the Complainant's prior trademark rights in PRAGMATIC

PLAY. Having regard to these factors, the Panel finds that the disputed domain name was registered in bad faith.

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.

As regards use of the disputed domain name in bad faith, the Panel notes, based on the Complainant's evidence, that the disputed domain name resolves to a webpage displaying pay-per-click links relating to betting services, as well as redirections to unrelated third-party websites. In this regard, the Respondent contends that any objectionable content or redirections were not intentionally placed by him and occurred without his knowledge or consent. However, panels applying the UDRP have consistently held that a respondent cannot disclaim responsibility for the content appearing on a website to which its domain name resolves (see [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 3.5). In the present case, the Panel finds that the use of the disputed domain name to host what are evidently pay-per-click links relating to betting services that compete with the Complainant's offerings, constitutes an attempt to attract Internet users for commercial gain by creating a likelihood of confusion with the Complainant's marks as to the source, sponsorship, affiliation, or endorsement of the disputed domain name. Such conduct amounts to evidence of bad faith use within the meaning of paragraph 4(b)(iv) of the Policy.

In addition, the case record, including the Respondent's own statements, shows that the Respondent has sought to sell the disputed domain name for a sum likely in excess of his out-of-pocket registration costs. On the balance of probabilities, the Panel considers that the Respondent registered and is using the disputed domain name primarily for the purpose of selling it to the Complainant, as the owner of the corresponding PRAGMATIC PLAY trademark, or to a competitor of the Complainant, in order to obtain an unjustified financial gain. The Panel finds that this conduct constitutes further evidence of bad faith under paragraph 4(b)(i) of 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 <pragmatic.bet> be transferred to the Complainant.

*/Deanna Wong Wai Man/*

**Deanna Wong Wai Man**

Sole Panelist

Date: December 22, 2025