

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

BML Group Limited v. Host Master, Njalla Okta LLC
Case No. D2025-4728

1. The Parties

Complainant is BML Group Limited, Malta, represented by Abion GmbH, Switzerland.

Respondent is Host Master, Njalla Okta LLC, Saint Kitts and Nevis.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name is <betson-argentina.com> which is registered with Tucows Domains Inc. (the "Registrar").

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the "Center") on November 14, 2025. On November 17, 2025, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On November 17, 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 those in the Complaint (REDACTED FOR PRIVACY, REDACTED FOR PRIVACY). The Center sent an email communication to Complainant on November 19, 2025, providing the registrant and contact information disclosed by the Registrar, and inviting Complainant to submit an amendment to the Complaint. Complainant filed an amended Complaint on November 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 Respondent of the Complaint, and the proceedings commenced on November 24, 2025. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was December 14, 2025. Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified Respondent's default on December 15, 2025.

The Center appointed Gerardo Saavedra as the sole panelist in this matter on December 18, 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, a Malta entity, is a subsidiary of Betsson AB and part of the Betsson Group. The Betsson Group is engaged in the gaming entertainment business.

Complainant has rights over the BETSSON mark for which it holds, among others, (i) Argentina registration No. 3175200, registered on June 1, 2021, in class 42, and (ii) Benelux registration No. 781698, registered on December 6, 2005, in class 25. Complainant also has rights over the BETSSON figurative mark for which it holds European Union registration No. 016198822, registered on April 7, 2017, in classes 9, 41 and 42.

Complainant appears as the registrant of the domain names <betsson.com> created on March 3, 2001, and <betssongroup.com> created on June 18, 2011.

The disputed domain name was registered on April 26, 2024. Before the Complaint was filed, the website linked to the disputed domain name showed, among others, “betson argentina”, “Iniciar sesión”, “Crear cuenta”, “Betsson en Argentina”, “Betsson ofrece una amplia variedad de apuestas deportivas”, “¡Apuesta ya!”, “Betsson ofrece atractivos bonos de bienvenida tanto para nuevos apostadores deportivos como para jugadores de casino”, “El proceso de registro en Betsson (<https://betson-argentina.com/betsson-registrarse/>) es sencillo. Los nuevos usuarios deben visitar el sitio web, hacer clic en “Registrarse” y completar el formulario con su información personal, incluyendo nombre completo, fecha de nacimiento, correo electrónico y número de teléfono”, “Betsson ofrece varias opciones de pago convenientes para los usuarios argentinos”, “aunque Betsson puede brindar una experiencia emocionante, su reputación cuestionable implica que puede no ser la mejor opción para todos”, “Divulgación: Queremos que estés completamente informado sobre cómo funciona nuestro sitio web. betson-argentina.com está dedicado exclusivamente a la marca Betsson en Argentina. Para brindarte la información más actualizada y los materiales más útiles sobre Betsson, colaboramos estrechamente con esta compañía. Esta asociación nos permite acceder a materiales exclusivos, promociones y otros beneficios que nos complace compartir con nuestros visitantes”.

5. Parties' Contentions

A. Complainant

Complainant contends that it has satisfied each of the elements required under the Policy and requests that the disputed domain name be transferred to Complainant. Complainant's most relevant assertions may be summarized as follows.

The Betsson Group is one of the world's largest gaming groups, having provided gaming entertainment for over fifty years. It provides a wide selection of digital and mobile gaming entertainment available for players anytime and anywhere, under multiple brands, as well as Sportsbook, Casino and other games via gaming licences in 23 countries. The Betsson Group employs around 2,200 people in 18 locations.

The disputed domain name is confusingly similar to Complainant's BETSSON mark. The disputed domain name incorporates a misspelled variation of the BETSSON mark by removing one of the two letters “s”, and, following an hyphen, the term “argentina”. The BETSSON mark is clearly recognizable in the disputed domain name. It is a typosquatting situation where said mark has been misspelled on purpose in order to capitalize on errors (in typing or reading) made by Internet users searching for, or trying to communicate with, Complainant on the Internet.

Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name. Complainant has not licensed or authorized Respondent to register or use the disputed domain name, nor is Respondent affiliated to Complainant in any form. There is no evidence that Respondent is known by the disputed domain name terms or owns any corresponding registered mark including the disputed domain name.

When conducting a search regarding the disputed domain name terms “betson argentina” on a popular search engine, all of the returned results relate to Complainant, its business, and presence in the corresponding region/market.

The disputed domain name - incorporating a misspelled variation of the BETSSON mark, followed by “-argentina”, - reveals that Respondent’s intention in registering the disputed domain name was to refer to Complainant, its mark, and business activity, and to create an association, and a subsequent likelihood of confusion, with Complainant and its mark in Internet users’ minds.

The website linked to the disputed domain name uses Complainant’s orange color scheme, its BETSSON mark, and a sign confusingly similar to the BETSSON mark, and namely “betson argentina”, in prominent positions around the website.

Said website allegedly provides information regarding Complainant and its products, and claims, in the Disclosure section, that “betsonargentina.com is dedicated exclusively to the Betsson brand in Argentina. To provide you with the most up-to-date information and useful materials about Betsson, we collaborate closely with this company. This partnership allows us access to exclusive materials, promotions, and other benefits that we are happy to share with our visitors.”, which is not the case.

Such website invites Internet users to perform several actions, such as to “login”, “register”, “take advantage of your offer”, and to “place your bet now!”, only for users to then be re-directed to third party websites unaffiliated with Complainant which request sensitive information from users, such as phone numbers, email addresses, and passwords.

The disputed domain name was registered and is being used in bad faith. The BETSSON mark is widely known, especially in the field of gaming. The Betsson Group has a strong presence online and is very active via its official websites as well as on social media (LinkedIn, Facebook, Instagram and TikTok).

Respondent registered the disputed domain name having the BETSSON mark in mind and with the clear intention to take advantage of its reputation, especially when considering the content to which the disputed domain name resolves.

The disputed domain name resolves to a website that copies Complainant’s colour scheme, reproduces the BETSSON mark in several instances, and features the confusingly similar sign “betson argentina”, while falsely presenting itself as an official partner by claiming to provide exclusive information, materials, and promotions, which clearly demonstrates bad faith use.

By incorporating in the disputed domain name a misspelled variation of Complainant’s mark, Respondent intentionally created a domain name that misleadingly suggests an association with Complainant. The website linked to the disputed domain name indicates an intentional effort to deceive users by creating a false impression of affiliation with Complainant and clearly shows the underlying intent to gain an unfair commercial advantage, by creating a likelihood of confusion with Complainant’s mark as to the source, sponsorship, affiliation, or endorsement of the website and the disputed domain name.

The website linked to the disputed domain name encourages users to “login”, “register”, “take advantage of your offer”, and “place your bet now!”, only to redirect them to unrelated third-party pages that request sensitive personal data such as phone numbers, email addresses, and passwords. That clearly highlights the intent to obtain an undue commercial gain with the disputed domain name.

B. Respondent

Respondent did not reply to Complainant’s contentions.

6. Discussion and Findings

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

The lack of response from Respondent does not automatically result in a favorable decision for Complainant (WIPO Overview of WIPO Panel Views on Selected UDRP Questions, Third Edition ("[WIPO Overview 3.0](#)"), section 4.3). The burden for Complainant, under paragraph 4(a) of the Policy, is to show: (i) that the disputed domain name is identical or confusingly similar to a trademark or service mark in which Complainant has rights; (ii) that 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.

A. Identical or Confusingly Similar

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 disputed domain name almost identically reproduces the BETSSON mark, omitting one of its "s" letters and adding "-argentina". The Panel finds the mark is recognizable within the disputed domain name and that the lack of said "s" letter and the addition of "-argentina" in the disputed domain name do not avoid a finding of confusing similarity between them for the purposes of the Policy ([WIPO Overview 3.0](#), sections 1.7, 1.8, 1.9 and 1.11.1).

The Panel finds the first element of the Policy has been established.

B. Rights or Legitimate Interests

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).

Paragraph 4(c) of the Policy provides a list of circumstances in which Respondent may demonstrate rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name. There is no evidence in the case file of any of those, or of any other circumstances giving rise to a possible right to or legitimate interest in the disputed domain name by Respondent, but rather the opposite may be validly inferred.

In the Panel's view, the typosquatting nature of the disputed domain name, which almost identically reflects Complainant's mark, cannot confer rights or legitimate interests upon Respondent.¹ Further, the record shows that the website linked to the disputed domain name conveys the false impression of being somewhat affiliated with Complainant. The content of the "*Divulgación*" ("disclosure") section, at the end of the corresponding web page, also leads Internet visitors to falsely believe that such website may be sanctioned by Complainant. All that demonstrates neither a bona fide offering of goods or services nor a legitimate or fair use of the disputed domain name.

The Panel finds Complainant has established a prima facie case that Respondent lacks rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name. 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.

Based on the available record, the Panel finds the second element of the Policy has been established.

¹See *Belmont Village, L.P. v. Name Redacted*, WIPO Case No. [D2022-4895](#): "typosquatting is evidence of a lack of rights or legitimate interests in the Disputed Domain Name".

C. Registered and Used 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).

Having reviewed the case file, the Panel finds that Respondent's registration and use of the disputed domain name constitutes bad faith under the Policy. The overall evidence indicates that Respondent's choice of the disputed domain name was deliberate for its substantial similarity with, and with the likely intention to benefit from, Complainant's mark and potentially disrupt Complainant's business or deceive third parties, which denotes bad faith. The disputed domain name reflects Complainant's prior registered BETSSON mark in its entirety, albeit with just a minor typographical error variation (the lack of one letter "s") and followed by "-argentina", a classic case of typosquatting which has been deemed as a strong indicative of bad faith under a number of UDRP cases.²

As set forth above, the website associated with the disputed domain name conveys the false impression that it is approved by, or even somewhat associated with, Complainant. It seems to the Panel that in using the disputed domain name Respondent has sought to create a likelihood of confusion with Complainant's mark as to the sponsorship, source, affiliation, or endorsement of said website, when in fact there is no such connection. All that is indicative of bad faith.

Such likelihood of confusion, and the fact that said website operates a registration facility section which asks for personal contact details and payment methods, make the Panel consider that the disputed domain name may potentially be used for fraudulent activities.³

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 name <betson-argentina.com> be transferred to Complainant.

/Gerardo Saavedra/

Gerardo Saavedra

Sole Panelist

Date: January 1, 2026

²See *Redbox Automated Retail, LLC d/b/a Redbox v. Milen Radumilo*, WIPO Case No. [D2019-1600](#): "Typosquatting itself is evidence of relevant bad faith registration and use". See also *Go Daddy Software, Inc. v. Daniel Hadani*, WIPO Case No. [D2002-0568](#):

"Typosquatting is virtually *per se* registration and use in bad faith".

³See *Chevron Corporation and Chevron Intellectual Property LLC v. Shawn Bailey*, WIPO Case No. [D2023-3993](#), and section 3.4 of the [WIPO Overview 3.0](#).