

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

Didiane Ltd v. LXbet Africa, Balaronda Limited
Case No. D2025-4992

1. The Parties

The Complainant is Didiane Ltd, Cyprus, internally represented.

The Respondent is LXbet Africa, Balaronda Limited, British Virgin Islands, United Kingdom.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <lx.bet> is registered with NameCheap, Inc. (the “Registrar”).

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the “Center”) on December 2, 2025. On December 2, 2025, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On December 2, 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 (Privacy service provided by Withheld for privacy ehf) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on December 3, 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 December 4, 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 December 8, 2025. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was December 28, 2025. On December 8, 2025, the Complainant submitted an unsolicited supplemental filing. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent’s default on January 2, 2025.

The Center appointed W. Scott Blackmer as the sole panelist in this matter on January 14, 2026. 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 limited liability company registered in Cyprus, which is part of a group of companies operating international online sports betting, as well as lottery, bingo, and other gaming services under the brand name 1XBET. The Complainant group operates a principal website at “www.1xbet.com”, which is accessible in numerous countries where online gambling is legal.

The Complainant makes conclusory statements about the fame of its mark, but the Panel notes that the Wikipedia article on the Complainant offers some helpful detail, supported by published media reports¹: The Complainant was founded in 2007 and provides services in 60 languages, supported (in 2022) by some 5,000 employees. In 2023 *Sports Illustrated* characterized the Complainant as “probably the biggest sportsbook on the planet”. The Complainant sponsors professional football clubs in several countries. The Complainant also has attracted frequent media attention by winning industry awards and also becoming the subject of licensing investigations and suspensions. Thus, it is fair to conclude that the Complainant’s mark is both distinctive and well-known across much of the globe, in association with online sports betting.

The Complainant holds numerous 1XBET trademark registrations, including the following:

Mark	Jurisdiction	Reg. Number	Reg. Date	International Classes
1XBET (word)	United Kingdom	UK00914227681	September 21, 2015	35, 41, 42
1XBET (composite, number, letters, and design)	International (multiple designations)	1379235	July 21, 2017	35, 41, 42
1XBET (word)	International (multiple designations)	1817326A	September 3, 2024	35, 41, 42

The disputed domain name was created on August 13, 2025, and is registered to the Respondent, which gave its name as “LXbet Africa”, listing the Respondent’s organization as “Balaronda Limited”, with a contradictory postal address: a street address in Tortola, British Virgin Islands (to which the telephone number corresponds), but showing the country as “British Indian Ocean Territory”, which is nonsensical. The contact email address is given as “[xxx]@lxbet.org”, using a domain name that resolves to a SearchHounds landing page with Pay-Per-Click (“PPC”) third-party advertising links. The Panel notes that the online database of the British Virgin Islands Financial Services Commission includes no listing for a legal entity called “Balaronda Limited”. The disputed domain name itself does not currently resolve to an active website, and the Panel notes that the Internet Archive’s Wayback Machine has no archived screenshots associated with the disputed domain name. The Complainant provided a capture of the disputed domain name displaying pay-per-click (“PPC”) links unrelated to its activity.

¹ Noting the general powers of a panel articulated in paragraphs 10 and 12 of the Rules, it is commonly accepted that a panel may undertake limited factual research into matters of public record, as the Panel has done in these proceedings. WIPO Overview of WIPO Panel Views on Selected UDRP Questions, Third Edition ([“WIPO Overview 3.0”](http://www.wipo.int/edocs/pubdocs/en/wipo_pub_3000.pdf)), section 4.8.

The Complainant became aware of the disputed domain name in November 2025 and sent an Abuse Report and Request for Transfer through the Registrar. The Complainant received no reply.

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 disputed domain name is identical or confusingly similar to its registered 1XBET marks, merely substituting the lower-case “l” for the number “1”, which is similar in appearance. The Complainant states that the Respondent is not affiliated with the Complainant and has no permission to use its mark.

The Complainant emphasizes that the Respondent registered the disputed domain name years after the Complainant established “a dominant online presence” with its distinctive brand, such that a “simple search on popular search engines for the term ‘1xbet’ would inevitably inform the Respondent about the Complainant, its trademark, and business”. Although the Respondent has not yet published an associated website, the Complainant cites the doctrine of passive holding as articulated in *Telstra Corporation Limited v. Nuclear Marshmallows*, WIPO Case No. [D2000-0003](#), given the strong reputation of the Complainant’s mark.

B. Respondent

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

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 3.0](#), section 1.7.

The Complainant has shown rights in respect of a trademark or service mark (the registered 1XBET word marks and a composite mark with the textual element 1XBET) for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 1.2.1.

The Panel finds that the word mark and the textual element of the composite mark are recognizable within the disputed domain name, as the lower-case “l” is easily mistaken for the Arabic numeral “1”, and in this case the Top-Level Domain (“TLD”) “.bet” is (unusually) relevant because it is identical with a portion of the mark. Accordingly, the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to the marks for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), sections 1.7, 1.10, 1.11.3.

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. There is no indication that the Respondent has made preparations to use the disputed domain name for a bona fide commercial offering or in connection with a legitimate noncommercial fair use. The Panel notes that the Respondent has listed a name of “LXbet Africa, Balaronda Limited” when registering the disputed domain name, but, as noted in the Factual Background, the Panel was unable to uncover a registered company named “Balaronda Limited” and there is nothing in the record to suggest that the Respondent is commonly known by “LXbet Africa”, “Ix”, or “Ix.bet” for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 2.3.

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 Complainant’s mark is highly distinctive and globally well-established online, such that it is unlikely that the Respondent created the disputed domain name coincidentally. It does not appear that the Respondent has yet attempted to sell the disputed domain name to the Complainant, corresponding to one of the illustrations of bad faith given in the Policy, paragraph 4(b).

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.

The disputed domain name resolves to a page displaying PPC links. The Panel finds that the Respondent’s use of the disputed domain name is intended to attract, for commercial gain, Internet users by creating a likelihood of confusion with the Complainant’s 1XBET trademark. Having reviewed the available record, the Panel notes the distinctiveness and reputation of the Complainant’s trademark and the composition of the disputed domain name, which appears to be an instance of typosquatting with an easily mistaken character substitution, and finds that these circumstances support a finding of bad faith under the Policy.

The Panel finds further support for its inference of bad faith from the facts that the Respondent furnished patently incorrect registration details in registering the disputed domain name, made no reply to the Complainant’s communications, and submitted no Response in this proceeding to offer an alternative explanation for its conduct.

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 <lx.bet> be transferred to the Complainant.

/W. Scott Blackmer/

W. Scott Blackmer

Sole Panelist

Date: January 26, 2026