

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

Sunwin Information Technology LLC v. Srdan Anđelković, Sunwin Vibes Limitada, Sunwin Vibes, Sunwin Vibes Content Writing Service, Srdan Anđelković, Sunwin Vibes Limitada
Case No. D2025-5040

1. The Parties

Complainant is Sunwin Information Technology LLC, United Arab Emirates, internally represented.

Respondents are Srdan Anđelković, Sunwin Vibes Limitada, Costa Rica, Sunwin Vibes, Sunwin Vibes Content Writing Service, Philippines, Srdan Anđelković, Sunwin Vibes Limitada, Serbia, self-represented.

2. The Domain Names and Registrars

The disputed domain name <sunwin.casino> is registered with GoDaddy.com, LLC, <sunwinz.top>, <sunwin1.world>, and <sunwin79.pro> are registered with Nicenic International Group Co., Limited, <sunxv.net> 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 3, 2025. On December 4, 2025, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain names. On December 5, 2025, the Registrar transmitted by emails to the Center its verification response disclosing registrant and contact information for the disputed domain names which partially differed from the named Respondent (Sunwin Vibes Limitada) and contact information in the Complaint.

The Center sent an email communication to Complainant on December 10, 2025 with the registrant and contact information of nominally multiple underlying registrants revealed by the Registrar, requesting Complainant to either file separate complaint(s) for the disputed domain names associated with different underlying registrants or alternatively, demonstrate that the underlying registrants are in fact the same entity and/or that all domain names are under common control. Complainant filed an amended Complaint on December 20, 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 Respondents of the Complaint, and the proceedings commenced on December 24, 2025. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was January 13, 2026. The Response was filed with the Center on January 13, 2026. Complainant filed an unsolicited supplemental filing on January 17, 2026.

The Center appointed Marina Perraki as the sole panelist in this matter on January 20, 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

Complainant is active in the online gaming industry through licensing of its trademarks, logos and other intellectual property rights for SUNWIN. Complainant's online gaming services under the SUNWIN brand were first offered in Viet Nam in 2019. Complainant is currently offering its services through websites, such as "www.sun.win", "www.sunwin.info" and "www.sunwin.fun".

Complainant owns trademark registrations for SUNWIN including the United States of America trademark registration No. 7913235, A A A SUN .WIN (figurative), filed on October 1, 2024 and registered on August 26, 2025, with first use on January 1, 2024 and first use in commerce on April 28, 2024 for services in international class 41 and the United Arab Emirates trademark registration No. AE/447027, SUNWIN (figurative), filed on April 3, 2025 and registered on July 4, 2025, for services in international class 41.

The disputed domain names were registered as follows:

- a. <sunwin.casino> on January 8, 2024;
- b. <sunxv.net> on June 30, 2025;
- c. <sunwinz.top> on October 25, 2025;
- d. <sunwin1.world> on October 25, 2025; and
- e. <sunwin79.pro> on November 2, 2025.

Per Complainant, the disputed domain names lead at the time of filing of the Complaint to websites ("the Websites") mimicking that of Complainant and prominently displaying Complainant's SUNWIN trademark and logo but also featuring copyrighted content, layouts, designs and other UI assets from Complainant's website, including the names of the games. Currently the first disputed domain name <sunwin.casino> leads to a website mimicking that of Complainant and the other four disputed domain names lead to inactive websites. Complainant sent a cease and desist letter to Respondent on August 30, 2025.

5. Parties' Contentions

A. Complainant

Complainant contends that it has satisfied each of the elements required under the Policy for a transfer of the disputed domain names. Complainant alleges that it consistently and extensively uses the SUNWIN trademarks and logo in connection with its business activities, including on its websites, while it also maintains a strong social media presence, including on Facebook, while its services are promoted across the globe. Per Complainant, it has used its SUNWIN trademarks since 2019 on its online platforms and websites under the domain names <sunwin.sx>, <sunwin.fun>, <sunwin.info> and <sun.win>. Complainant contends that the Websites copy the trademarks and other intellectual property rights of Complainant and that there is every reason to believe that Respondent can use the Websites for phishing. Furthermore, Complainant asserts that Respondent engages in a pattern of registering domain names that are identical or confusingly similar to the registered trademarks of Complainant and third parties, especially online gaming brands. In reply to Respondent, it states that the website "www.sun.win" was operational prior to April 2024, that Respondent's Vietnamese trademark application has been opposed by Complainant, that the alleged

third party registrations and uses of “Sunwin” in Viet Nam are actually either of Complainant or of Respondent and that Respondent was aware of Complainant and its rights when registering the disputed domain names.

B. Respondent

Respondent contends that Complainant has not satisfied all three of the elements required under the Policy for a transfer of the disputed domain names. Respondent does not object to the consolidation and does not deny that it is the same Respondent for all of the disputed domain names. The Response is signed by “Mr. Srdan Anđelković, on behalf of Sunwin Vibes Limitada”. Furthermore, even though Respondent does not dispute the similarity of the disputed domain names with Complainant’s marks, it states that Complainant did not start to use its trademark until April 2024. It states that both Complainant and Respondent are active only in the Vietnamese market, which has the particularity of being an unregulated market for gaming services. Per Respondent, in the Vietnamese market the name “Sunwin” has a long history of use since at least 2020. Respondent claims that “Sunwin” in the Vietnamese market became more of a name, referring to a specific sphere of business, rather than the trade name, associated with a specific services provider. Respondent claims that in Viet Nam it has prior rights to those of Complainant because Respondent filed in this country a trademark application for SUNWIN prior to Complainant. Furthermore, per the Response, Respondent has been using various domain names with the same root word “sunwin” in connection with gaming services for a significant period of time and in particular since 2022 when it registered the domain name <sunwin.vc> and the domain name <sunwin.limo> which has been “in active use in connection with the mentioned services since as early as of August 27th 2023”. Therefore Respondent asserts that it has legitimate interests stemming from the trademark application in Viet Nam which is 2 months prior to the one of Complainant in the same country and from the use in commercial activity of the brand name “Sunwin” which was “registered in 2022”.

6. Discussion and Findings

Paragraph 4(a) of the Policy lists the three elements which Complainant must satisfy with respect to the disputed domain names:

- (i) the disputed domain names are identical or confusingly similar to a trademark or service mark in which Complainant has rights;
- (ii) Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the disputed domain names; and
- (iii) the disputed domain names have been registered or are being used in bad faith.

Consolidation: Multiple Respondents

The amended Complaint was filed in relation to nominally different domain name registrants. Complainant alleges that the domain name registrants are the same entity or mere alter egos of each other, or under common control. Complainant requests the consolidation of the Complaint against the multiple disputed domain name registrants pursuant to paragraph 10(e) of the Rules.

The disputed domain name registrants did not comment on Complainant’s request.

Paragraph 3(c) of the Rules states that a complaint may relate to more than one domain name, provided that the domain names are registered by the same domain name holder.

In addressing Complainant’s request, the Panel will consider whether (i) the disputed domain names or corresponding websites are subject to common control; and (ii) the consolidation would be fair and equitable to all Parties. See WIPO Overview of WIPO Panel Views on Selected UDRP Questions, Third Edition ([“WIPO Overview 3.0”](#)), section 4.11.2.

As regards common control, the Panel notes that:

1. Respondent has not disputed the consolidation and has filed a Response in relation to all disputed domain names.
2. The administrative/billing contact details of <sunxv.net> and registrant details of <sunwinz.top>, <sunwin1.world> <sunwin79.pro> are the same i.e., Srdan Anđelković.
3. The email address given under administrative/billing contact of <sunxv.net> and email address given under registrant contact for <sunwin.casino> is the same i.e. [...] @gmail.com which belongs to Srdan Anđelković, who is recorded as registrant of <sunwinz.top>, <sunwin1.world>, and <sunwin79.pro>.
4. The administrative/billing contact address of <sunxv.net> is similar as the registrant address given for <sunwin.casino>.
5. Per Complainant, the Websites have a similar layout and similar way of using the SUNWIN trademark.

As regards fairness and equity, the Panel sees no reason why consolidation of the disputes would be unfair or inequitable to any Party.

Accordingly, the Panel decides to consolidate the disputes regarding the nominally different disputed domain name registrants (referred to below as “Respondent”) in a single proceeding.

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.

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.

As regards the disputed domain names <sunxv.net>, <sunwinz.top>, <sunwin1.world>, and <sunwin79.pro>, the Panel finds the mark is recognizable within these disputed domain names. Accordingly, these disputed domain names are confusingly similar to the mark for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 1.7.

Although the addition of other terms here, the letters “xv” instead of “win”, “z”, the numbers “1” and “79”, as the case may be, may bear on assessment of the second and third elements, the Panel finds the addition of such terms does not prevent a finding of confusing similarity between these disputed domain names and the mark for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 1.8.

As regards the disputed domain name <sunwin.casino>, this is identical to the SUNWIN trademark of Complainant. The Panel notes that Complainant has not proved any, prior to the disputed domain name <sunwin.casino> registration, registered trademark rights. All trademarks invoked by Complainant are subsequent to the date of registration of this disputed domain name, while the domain name registrations invoked by Complainant are not in Complainant’s name and the use made by Complainant has not been shown to be continuous from 2019 to the date of registration of this disputed domain name. Namely, Complainant has not shown continuous use from 2019 to January 8, 2024 but only use in 2019, while Respondent does not dispute Complainant’s use since April 2024. However, as Panels have found ([WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 1.1.3) the fact that a domain name may have been registered before a complainant has acquired trademark rights does not by itself preclude a complainant’s standing to file a UDRP case, nor a panel’s finding of identity or confusing similarity under the first element. It is just that where a domain name has been registered before a complainant has acquired trademark rights, only in exceptional cases would a complainant be able to prove a respondent’s bad faith.

The generic Top-Level Domains (“gTLD”) “.casino”, “.net”, “.top”, “.world”, “.pro” are disregarded, as gTLDs typically do not form part of the comparison on the grounds that they are required for technical reasons (*Rexel Developpements SAS v. Zhan Yequn*, WIPO Case No. [D2017-0275](#); *Hay & Robertson International Licensing AG v. C. J. Lovik*, WIPO Case No. [D2002-0122](#)).

In view of the above, 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 Complainant has established a prima facie case that Respondent lacks rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain names.

Respondent invoked a trademark application in Viet Nam for SUNWIN of April 9, 2025, which is prior to Complainant’s application for SUNWIN in the same country, to justify his alleged legitimate interest. However, Respondent’s Vietnamese application is posterior to Complainant’s trademarks, including the United States of America trademark registration No. 7913235, A A A SUN .WIN (figurative), filed on October 1, 2024 and registered on August 26, 2025, with first use on January 1, 2024 and first use in commerce on April 28, 2024 and the United Arab Emirates trademark registration No. AE/447027 SUNWIN (figurative), filed on April 3, 2025 and registered on July 4, 2025, for services in international class 41. Furthermore, Respondent acknowledges that he was aware of and had effected searches for the name “Sunwin”. Respondent alleged that there was no use of “Sunwin” by Complainant in 2019, however as Complainant demonstrated this is not true. Respondent produced wayback machine snapshots allegedly showing that the website of Complainant “sun.win” was “not operational in August 2019” however the snapshot is of “web.sun.win” and Complainant has submitted snapshots of “www.sun.win” showing use of the website in August 2019.

As regards Respondent’s allegation of use of “Sunwin” by various parties in Viet Nam, this further shows Respondent’s good knowledge of the market and use of the Complainant’s SUNWIN brand. As Complainant demonstrated most of the domain names of the websites listed by Respondent are either owned previously or currently by Complainant.

Furthermore, Respondent has alleged that in the Vietnamese online entertainment market there are various “sunwin” domain names owned by various third parties. However he has not named such third parties nor provided proof of their ownership. At the same time Complainant stated that Respondent has listed his own infringing domain names and falsely stated that these belong to different operators. Per Complainant, it is only Respondent that has been copying the trademark of Complainant in registering various identical or confusingly similar domains. In any case any use by third parties does not, as such, have any bearing in the present dispute between the named Parties.

Respondent further alleges that he has been the rightful owner of various domain names, containing the word “sunwin” and used in connection with provision of gaming services since 2022, by registering the domain <sunwin.vc> and, for example, <sunwin.limo> which has been, per Respondent, in “active use” in

connection with the mentioned services since as early as of August 27, 2023. However, Respondent has not produced any evidence that the domain names are in his name or otherwise connected to him nor of the use of the <sunwin.limo> domain name since August 27, 2023. On the contrary, the website owner appeared per the Panel's independent research on the wayback machine on that date, as no relevant evidence was submitted by Respondent, to be a "LAS VEGAS SANDS CORPORATION". Furthermore, no continuous use of the domain name up to the registration of the disputed domain names was proven. Therefore, the allegations of Respondent relying on <sunwin.limo> have not proved anything in relation to his legitimate interests. Since this domain name and website was the only concrete allegation of Respondent for use prior to the notice of the dispute, the Panel finds that Respondent has not managed to prove legitimate interests in the disputed domain names.

Furthermore, Respondent did not prove that he was commonly known by the disputed domain names prior to the notice of the dispute.

In view of the above, there is no evidence on record giving rise to any rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain names on the part of Respondent within the meaning of paragraphs 4(c)(ii) and 4(c)(iii) of the Policy. Any prior to the notice of the dispute use by Respondent does not appear to be bona fide under the terms of the Policy, as Respondent was, as he acknowledged, aware of Complainant and its use, when he registered the disputed domain names.

Last, Respondent is not making a legitimate noncommercial or fair use of the disputed domain names but instead admits to using the disputed domain names for commercial purposes. The allegation of Respondent that in the Vietnamese market the name "Sunwin" has become more of a name, referring to a specific sphere of business, rather than a trade name, associated with a specific services provider, is not convincing. Respondent did not provide sufficient evidence to support this allegation, namely that "Sunwin" has become a generic commercial term. Furthermore, Respondent does not specify what exactly this term denotes and has not alleged or proved that this term is used in a descriptive manner in the disputed domain names and the Websites. Therefore, his allegation does not establish any legitimate interests.

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.

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 similarity of the disputed domain names to Complainant's SUNWIN mark suggests that Respondent's intent in registering the disputed domain names was to unfairly capitalize on Complainant's registered or nascent (typically as yet unregistered) trademark rights.

Respondent stated in his Response he was fully aware of the use of the SUNWIN mark at the time of the disputed domain name registrations and since at least April 2024. Respondent alleged that there was no use in 2019 by Complainant of the SUNWIN mark but his allegation has proven to be untrue per the analysis under the second element. Therefore, any use by Respondent that may have occurred after 2019 and before April 2024 – which was in any case not proved – would be subsequent to Complainant's use which took place in 2019. From the above it follows that Respondent was aware of Complainant's domain names and use prior to the registration of the disputed domain names.

In view of the above the Panel finds sufficient evidence on record that Respondent registered the disputed domain names in bad faith targeting Complainant. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), sections 3.8.1. and 3.8.2.

As regards use, panels have held that the use of a domain name for illegitimate activity, here, claimed impersonation/passing off, constitutes bad faith. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 3.4. Having reviewed the record, the Panel finds Respondent's registration and use of the disputed domain names constitute bad faith under the Policy.

Under these circumstances and on this record, the Panel finds that Respondent has registered and used the disputed domain names in bad faith.

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 names <sunwin.casino>, <sunwinz.top>, <sunwin1.world>, <sunwin79.pro>, and <sunxv.net> be transferred to Complainant.

/Marina Perraki/

Marina Perraki

Sole Panelist

Date: February 3, 2026