

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

Quickspace Marketing Management LLC v. Sunwin Vibes Limitada
Case No. D2025-5044

1. The Parties

The Complainant is Quickspace Marketing Management LLC, United Arab Emirates, internally represented.

The Respondent is Sunwin Vibes Limitada, Costa Rica.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain names <play-hit1.club>, <789-club1.app> and <789club.app> (each a “Disputed Domain Name”, together the “Disputed Domain Names”) are registered with Nicenic International Group Co., Limited (the “Registrar”).

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the “Center”) on December 4, 2025. On December 4, 2025, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the Disputed Domain Name. On December 5, 2026, the Registrar transmitted by email to the Center its verification response disclosing registrant and contact information for the Disputed Domain Names which differed from the named Respondent (Unknown Registrant) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on December 9, 2026, 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 11, 2026.

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 30, 2025. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was January 19, 2026. The Response was filed with the Center on January 19, 2026.

The Center appointed Nick J. Gardner as the sole panelist in this matter on January 22, 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.

On January 27, 2026, the Complainant filed an unsolicited further filing (the “Complainant’s First Supplemental Filing”). It is discussed below.

On January 30, 2026, the Panel issued a Procedural Order (the “Procedural Order”) in the following terms:

“The Panel has reviewed the submissions from the Parties in this case and notes the Respondent’s contention that the terms ‘hit.club’ and ‘789club’ are for historical reasons in widespread use among third party operators of gaming websites directed at the Vietnamese market. It also notes the Respondent’s contentions about the time that the Complainant’s websites have been active.

Pursuant to paragraphs 10 and 12 of the UDRP Rules, the Panel issues the following order:

1. The Respondent is requested to translate any documents that it wishes the Panel to take into account which are in Vietnamese into English by February 4, 2026.
2. The Complainant is requested to comment on the Response and translations by February 9, 2026.
3. The Respondent is invited to comment on the Complainant’s submission by February 14, 2026.

The Parties’ further submissions should be limited to the above request.

The Decision due date is extended until February 15, 2026.”

The Parties filed further material in accordance with the Procedural Order save that the Respondent did not file any further comments on the Complainant’s submission. The material filed is discussed below.

On February 14, 2026, the Complainant sent an email to the Center asking the Panel to take into account the earlier case of *Sunwin Information Technology LLC v. Srdan Andelkovic, Sunwin Vibes Limitada, Sunwin Vibes, Sunwin Vibes Content Writing Service, Srdan Andelkoic, Sunwin Vibes Limitada*, WIPO Case No. [D2025-5040](#). That decision had issued subsequent to the date the present Complaint was filed.

4. Factual Background

The Complainant operates an entertainment gaming platform and mobile application offering a variety of games to customers. The Complainant says it has used the domain name <789.club> since 2014 and the domain name <hit.club> since 2020 in connection with its gaming services. The Complainant’s services are operated under the brand names “HitClub” and “789Club”.

The Complainant owns a number of trademark registrations for marks relating to these brand names, including the following:

Mark	Office/No.	Classes	Date Granted	Territory
HIT CLUB	EUIPO 019188206	9, 41, 42, 43	August 31, 2025	EU
HITCLUB	EUIPO 019188318	9, 41, 42, 43	August 31, 2025	EU
HIT.CLUB	EUIPO 019188307	9, 41, 42, 43	August 31, 2025	EU
789.CLUB	EUIPO 019211565	9, 41, 42	November 14, 2025	EU
789 CLUB	DPMA 302025110857	9, 41, 42	July 18, 2025	Germany
789CLUB	DPMA 302025110858	9, 41, 42	June 25, 2025	Germany

The Complainant holds further related EUIPO and German (DPMA) registrations for variations of the HIT CLUB and 789 CLUB marks. All of the Complainant's trademark registrations date from 2025, with the earliest German registrations granted in July 2025 and the EUIPO registrations granted between August and November 2025. The Complainant owns registrations for a stylized logo including the words "HIT CLUB" see for example EUIP 019188308 granted on September 3, 2025. This is referred to as the "HIT CLUB logo" in this decision. The Complainant owns a registration for a stylized logo including the words "789.CLUB" - EUIP DPMA 302025111218 granted on June 27, 2025. This is referred to as the "789.CLUB logo" in this decision.

In September 2025, the Complainant sent a cease-and-desist letter to the Respondent regarding the Respondent's use of a similar trademark and registration of domain names identical to "789.CLUB". The Respondent's legal representatives replied in October 2025, confirming that the Respondent would withdraw its EUIPO trademark application No. 019199513 for "789.CLUB" (logo). That application was withdrawn on October 15, 2025. In November 2025, the Complainant sent a further cease-and-desist letter regarding the HITCLUB mark.

The Disputed Domain Names were registered as follows: <play-hit1.club> on October 16, 2025; <789-club1.app> on October 30, 2025; and <789club.app> on November 7, 2025. All three are registered in the name of the Respondent.

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 Names.

In particular, the Complainant contends that the Disputed Domain Names are identical or confusingly similar to its registered trademarks "HitClub" and "789Club", differing only by the addition of a number, hyphen, prefix, or in the case of <789club.app>, a misspelling of "club" as "clud". The Complainant says the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in the Disputed Domain Names, having never been authorized to use the Complainant's marks, and that the Respondent is engaged in typosquatting and using the Disputed Domain Names to offer similar gaming services, misleading consumers into believing there is an association with the Complainant. The Complainant contends the Disputed Domain Names were registered and are being used in bad faith, pointing to the Respondent's pattern of registering confusingly

similar domain names, the Respondent's withdrawal of a competing EUIPO trademark application after a cease-and-desist letter, and the Respondent's use of the Disputed Domain Names for allegedly unlicensed gambling activities using the Complainant's trademarks and logos.

The Complainant says the websites at the Disputed Domain Names display content using the Complainant's trademarks and logos, and offer gaming services similar to those of the Complainant, creating the impression of an association with the Complainant.

B. Respondent

The Respondent contends that the Complainant has not satisfied the elements required under the Policy. The Respondent's principal arguments are as follows.

The Respondent says the Complainant's sites at <www.hit.club> and <www.789.club> are primarily Vietnamese-language and geo-restricted to Vietnam. The Respondent says that the terms "hit club" and "789 club" are widely used in the Vietnamese online gambling market by numerous unrelated operators, and are effectively generic indicators of gambling services rather than distinctive marks belonging to the Complainant. The Respondent produces evidence of other websites which it says support its case. That evidence is discussed below.

The Respondent challenges the Complainant's claimed dates of use, relying on Wayback Machine evidence to argue that <789.club> was not active until February 2024 (not 2014 as claimed) and <hit.club> only became active in December 2023 (not 2020).

Regarding rights or legitimate interests, the Respondent contends it has been the rightful owner of domain names containing the same root words since well before the Complainant's trademark registrations, including <hitclub.ltd> since June 2023, <hitclub.ac> since September 2024, and <gamebai789.club> since November 2024. The Respondent holds a gambling licence from Anjouan (Anjouan is an autonomous volcanic island in the Comoro Islands in the southwestern Indian Ocean, part of the Union of the Comoros). The Respondent says it operates its services on a legitimate basis.

On bad faith, the Respondent argues that none of the paragraph 4(b) factors are established. The Respondent contends it has a longstanding history of operations predating the Complainant's trademark registrations, that the Complainant's trademarks were obtained in 2025 primarily to pursue UDRP proceedings, and that the Complainant is attempting unfair monopolization of common gambling terminology.

6. Discussion and Findings

Preliminary Issue – Admissibility of Supplemental Filings

No provision concerning supplemental filings is made in the Rules or Supplemental Rules, except at the request of the panel according to paragraph 12 of the Rules, which states the panel, in its sole discretion, may request any further statements or documents from the parties it may deem necessary to decide the case. It follows that filings made pursuant to the Procedural Order are admitted.

So far as the Complainant's First Supplemental Filing is concerned, UDRP panels generally accept supplemental filings only when they provide material new evidence or a fair opportunity to respond to arguments that could not reasonably have been anticipated. See, for example, *Welcomemat Services, Inc. v. Michael Plummer Jr., MLP Enterprises Inc.*, WIPO Case No. [D2017-0481](#). The Panel considers that the Complainant's First Supplemental Filing deals with matters raised in the Response that the Complainant could not necessarily have anticipated, namely the allegation that the Complainant's trademarks are in effect generic and in common use in Viet Nam. The Panel will therefore allow the filing. The Panel will also allow reference to be made to the earlier case of *Sunwin Information Technology LLC v. Srdan Anđelković, Sunwin Vibes Limitada, Sunwin Vibes, Sunwin Vibes Content Writing Service, Srdan Anđelković, Sunwin Vibes*

Limitada, WIPO Case No. [D2025-5040](#) as that case is a matter of public record and in any event issued after the Complaint was filed.

Substantive Issues

To succeed, in accordance with paragraph 4(a) of the Policy, the Complainant must satisfy the Panel that:

- (i) the Disputed Domain Names are identical with 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 Names;
- (iii) the Disputed Domain Names have been registered and are being used in bad faith.

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 Select UDRP Questions, Third Edition, Revision 1 ("[WIPO Overview 3.1](#)"), section 1.7.

The Complainant has shown rights in respect of registered trademarks for HIT CLUB (and variants including HITCLUB and HIT.CLUB) and 789.CLUB (and variants including 789CLUB and 789 CLUB). Turning to the comparison between the marks and the Disputed Domain Names, the Panel considers each in turn. The Disputed Domain Name <play-hit1.club> incorporates the Complainant's HIT CLUB mark with the addition of the prefix "play-" and the numeral "1". The mark HIT CLUB is clearly recognizable within the Disputed Domain Name. The Disputed Domain Name <789-club1.app> incorporates the Complainant's 789 CLUB mark with the addition of a hyphen and the numeral "1". The mark 789 CLUB is recognizable within the Disputed Domain Name. The Disputed Domain Name <789clud.app> incorporates the Complainant's 789CLUB mark with a deliberate misspelling of "club" as "clud". In each case, the addition of other terms, numbers, hyphens, or misspellings does not prevent a finding of confusing similarity. See [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.8. See also [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.9. "Is a domain name consisting of a variation of the complainant's trademark confusingly similar to the complainant's mark? A domain name which consists of a variation of a trademark (typically a common, obvious, or intentional misspelling, referred to as typosquatting) is considered by panels to be confusingly similar to the relevant mark for purposes of the first element."

Accordingly the Panel finds that each Disputed Domain Name is confusingly similar to one of the Complainant's trademarks and hence the first condition of paragraph 4(a) of the Policy has been fulfilled.

B. Rights or Legitimate Interests

Paragraph 4(c) of the Policy provides a list of circumstances any of which is sufficient to demonstrate that a respondent has rights or legitimate interests in a domain name:

- (i) before any notice to the respondent of the dispute, use of, or demonstrable preparations to use, the domain name or a name corresponding to the domain name in connection with a bona fide offering of goods or services; or
- (ii) the respondent has been commonly known by the domain name, even if the respondent has acquired no trademark or service mark rights; or
- (iii) the respondent is making a legitimate noncommercial or fair use of the domain name, without intent for commercial gain to misleadingly divert consumers or to tarnish the trademark or service mark at issue.

The Respondent in effect says that paragraph 4(c)(i) is potentially applicable. The issue then is as to the meaning of “bona fide”. It seems to the Panel that paragraph 4(c)(i) cannot simply apply if a business exists which has deliberately adopted another person’s trademark as its name, otherwise the Policy would be inapplicable to all cases in which a respondent was operating a business, which is clearly not its intention. The words “bona fide” must encompass the Respondent’s knowledge and motives in choosing the name in question – if done deliberately to trade off, or take advantage of the Complainant’s name or reputation, then the “bona fide” requirement is not met.

This issue then involves consideration of the Respondent’s main point – its argument that the terms “hit club” and “789 club” have been adopted by a large number of participants in the Vietnamese gaming market and hence are no longer associated (at least not exclusively) with the Complaint. The Panel will assess this issue by considering the evidence the Respondent relies upon. This is best done by reference to the numbered Annexes using, where available, those which comprise translations into English of various screen shots.

The translated material is as follows.

ANNEX 1 - Screenshot of website at “www.789club.top”. 403 Forbidden/geo-blocked page stating the website is not available in the user’s location. 789 Club logo used.

ANNEX 2 – Live capture of the website at “hitclub.tv”. geo-blocked page for “HIT.CLUB”, with “HIT CLUB” logo used. Says it is operated by Turnl B.V., a Curaçao-registered company

ANNEX 3 - Wayback Machine capture of the website at “hit23.club”, dated November 10, 2023, with 21 captures between May 2022 and March 2025. The page promotes “HITCLUB” / “Hit Club” as “the most popular card game 2023”.

ANNEX 4 – Wayback Machine capture of <hitclub.asia> dated February 24, 2024 with 44 captures between April 2023 and November 2025. “HITCLUB–HIT CLUB” game portal advertising card games, lottery, betting, and casino services with “HIT CLUB” logo used.

ANNEX 5 - Wayback Machine capture of the website at “hitclub.icu” dated January 27, 2023 with 127 captures between January 2023 and October 2025. No prominent branding.

ANNEX 6 – No translation provided. Vietnamese original appears to be a Wayback Machine capture of the website at “hitclub.red” dated July 15, 2023, with 18 captures between June 2023 and March 2025. Hit Club Logo used.

ANNEX 7 – No translation provided. Vietnamese original appears to be a Wayback Machine capture of the website at “hitclub1.games” dated December 7, 2023, with 3 captures between December 2023 and November 2024. No substantive content visible.

ANNEX 8 - Wayback Machine capture of the website at “hitclub5.vip” dated December 3, 2023, with 19 captures between March 2023 and March 2025. Appears to be a “Hit Club” download page. No prominent branding.

ANNEX 9 – table entitled “SERP overview” for “hitclub” (August 10, 2023). Appears to be search engine results data showing multiple “Hit Club” domain names with backlink/traffic metrics.

ANNEX 10 – No translation provided. Vietnamese original appears to be a Wayback Machine capture of the website at “789clubhay.com” dated December 3, 2021, with 3 captures between March 2021 and December 2021. Very little substantive content visible. Some text in Vietnamese.

ANNEX 11 - Wayback Machine capture of the website at "789game.club" (September 29, 2022) with 25 captures between November 2021 and July 2025. Appears to be a "789 Club" game portal with links to articles about gameplay. No prominent branding.

ANNEX 12 - Wayback Machine capture of the website at "game789.club" dated October 20, 2021, with 39 captures between September 2020 and December 2024. Appears to be a user login page. No prominent branding.

ANNEX 13 – Google search results for "68 Club". Shows links to various sites relating to "68 club". Unclear what relevance this has.

ANNEX 14 - Google search results for "79club". Shows links to various sites relating to "79 club" or "79club". Unclear what relevance this has.

ANNEX 15 – Google search results for "789 bet". Shows links to various sites relating to "789 bet". Unclear what relevance this has.

ANNEX 16 - Google search results for "789 win". Shows links to various sites relating to "789 win". Unclear what relevance this has.

ANNEX 17 – No translation provided. Vietnamese original appears to be a Wayback Machine capture of the website at "plays-789.club" dated May 9, 2024, with 8 captures between May 2024 and February 2025. No substantive content visible.

ANNEX 18 – table entitled "SERP overview" for "789club" (Aug 2023). Appears to be search engine results data showing multiple "789Club" or "789 Club" domain names with backlink/traffic metrics.

ANNEX 19 – No translation provided. Vietnamese original appears to be a Wayback Machine capture of the website at "136.cm" dated August 4, 2018. The Panel does not understand the relevance of this item.

ANNEX 20 - Wayback Machine capture of the website at "789.club" dated February 28, 2024, with 83 captures between March 2017 and January 2026. Features "789 Club" logo used.

The Complainant says as follows "With respect to Annexes 3–9 and 10–18 submitted by the Respondent, the majority of the listed domain names were previously or are currently owned by the Complainant. And the remaining domain names were registered by the Respondent itself. The ownership proofs of the domain names, <hit23.club>, <hitclub.icu>, <hitclub.red>, <hitclub5.vip>, <789game.club> <game789.club>, <789win.club>, mentioned in the Annex 3-9 and Annex 10-18 of the Respondent, which were registered and own/owned by the Complainant are bundled together, annexed and marked as Annex S-4". The referenced Annex appears to support what the Complainant says. It comprises multiple invoices for the registration of a very large number of domain names featuring the terms "hitclub" or "789", including those identified above. In total over 100 such domain names are shown.

The Complainant also says as follows. "Respondent under its annexures also listed its own infringing domains identical to the Complainant and falsely stated that these belong to different operators. The Complainant strongly asserts that considering almost all the domains are registered recently, and are registered by the same registrar under which the subject domains are registered, these domains belong to the Respondent itself and no other third operator is engaged or involved. The copies of WHOIS data Records of Respondent's additional infringing and registered domains filed in with its Response, having the same Registrar, similar details of Registrant are annexed and marked as Annex S-5." This annex shows Whois details for <plays-789.club> and < hitclub1.games>. details of the underlying registrant are not shown but as the Complainant says the details that are disclosed suggest these names may be registered by the Respondent. Further the Panel notes the Respondent has not denied this allegation.

Taking this evidence as a whole the Panel is not satisfied that the Respondent has established that third parties are using the Complainant's trademarks or that those trademarks have become generic. It seems to the Panel that it is more likely than not that most, if not all, of the websites identified by the Respondent are operated by either the Complainant or the Respondent. Further apart from identifying websites the Respondent has not actually identified any other person who it alleges is responsible for the alleged use. In any event if some websites operated by third parties are also using domain names confusingly similar to the Complainant's trademarks that does not mean the terms in question have become generic, or that the Complainant has lost the ability to enforce its rights, including by means of complaints under the Policy.

In the absence of sufficient evidence to show that the Complainant's trademarks are in common use by third parties or have become generic, a legitimate interest is not established by using confusingly similar domain names to divert traffic to competing websites.

Accordingly the Panel finds that the Respondent has failed to produce sufficient evidence to establish its rights or legitimate interests in the Disputed Domain Names. Accordingly the Panel finds the Respondent has no rights or any legitimate interests in the Disputed Domain Names and the second condition of paragraph 4(a) of the Policy has been fulfilled.

C. Registered and Used in Bad Faith

In the present circumstances the Respondent does not dispute that the Disputed Domain Names resolve to websites which provided services which compete with the Complainant. Given the Panels reasoning (above) that the Respondent has not established that the Complainant's trademarks are not in common use by third parties and are not generic, this leads the Panel to conclude the registration and use were in bad faith.

Under paragraph 4(b) of the Policy a non-exhaustive list of factors evidencing registration and use in bad faith comprises:

(i) circumstances indicating that you have registered or you have acquired the domain name primarily for the purpose of selling, renting, or otherwise transferring the domain name registration to the complainant who is the owner of the trademark or service mark or to a competitor of that complainant, for valuable consideration in excess of your documented out-of-pocket costs directly related to the domain name; or

(ii) you have registered the domain name in order to prevent the owner of the trademark or service mark from reflecting the mark in a corresponding domain name, provided that you have engaged in a pattern of such conduct; or

(iii) you have registered the domain name primarily for the purpose of disrupting the business of a competitor; or

(iv) by using the domain name, you have intentionally attempted to attract, for commercial gain, Internet users to your web site or other on-line location, by creating a likelihood of confusion with the complainant's mark as to the source, sponsorship, affiliation, or endorsement of your web site or location or of a product or service on your web site or location.

In the present circumstances the Panel agrees with the Complainant that factor (iv) applies as the Respondent was seeking to achieve commercial gain by diverting customers looking for the Complainant's services to competing websites.

In reaching this conclusion it is necessary to consider the Respondent's arguments on timing. Complainant's trademark registrations all date from 2025. The Complainant says: "The Complainant has used the trademark and domain 789.club since 2014, and the second domain hit.club with the trademark (logo and word mark) since 2020." The Respondent disputes these dates. It states as follows: "The Complainant confirms that he has been using the domain 789.club since 2014 while following the screenshot of the web.archive stating the activity of the mentioned domain confirms that it remained not active in August 2019

(ANNEX 19), and became active only in February 2024 (ANNEX 20), the overall data of the available snapshots confirm this activity (ANNEX 21). The same situation is with the domain hit.club, which became active only in December 2023 (ANNEX 22) and overall tracked activity confirms this position (ANNEX 23). Therefore, from the information available and recorded about the domains of the Complainant it can be mentioned that he has misrepresented the start date of operation for both of his domains...” Annex 19 is a screen shot from the Wayback Machine (“www.archive.org”) which appears to relate to the domain name <136.cm>. The Panel does not understand its relevance. Annex 20 is a screenshot from Wayback Machine relating to <789.club> showing a capture in February 2024. That does not establish that no earlier snapshots exist nor that the date concerned is when the domain name was first used. Annex 21 (which the Respondent has not mentioned) is a further screenshot from the Wayback Machine relating to <789.club> which shows that the Wayback Machine has taken snapshots of “www.789.club” 83 times between March 14, 2017 and January 15, 2026. Annex 22 is a further screenshot from the Wayback Machine relating to <hit.club> which shows that the Wayback Machine has taken snapshots of “www.hit.club” 94 times between December 4, 2021 and January 4, 2026. Annex 23 appears to be a duplicate of Annex 22. It is quite clear to the Panel that on this evidence the Complainant’s website activity significantly predates the Respondent’s registration of the Disputed Domain Names all of which were registered in October or November 2025. If the Respondent is trying to suggest that it registered the Disputed Domain Names prior to the Complainant commencing any activity in relation to either <hit.club> or <789.club> that is manifestly incorrect. In any event it is clear that the Complainant had registered trade marks for both HIT.CLUB and 789.CLUB that predate the Respondent’s registration of the Disputed Domain Names (see table above). The Respondent’s arguments on timing are without merit.

The Panel also does not think the fact that the Respondent has registered other domain names with variations of “hitclub” or “789 club” included in the name (see above) assists the Respondent. They all postdate the likely date the Complainant’s activities commenced and all seem likely to be intended to take advantage of the Complainant’s successful business. Indeed they seem part of a pattern of activity by the Respondent – see below.

The Panel also considers its finding is supported by the Respondent having engaged in a pattern of such behavior. The Complainant’s evidence shows Respondent has registered a significant number of domain names including the term “go88” or variations thereof and “sunwin” or variations thereof. The evidence shows “go88” is a trademark belonging to a third party and “sunwin” is a trademark belonging to Sunwin Information Technology LLC. Of course “sunwin” also forms part of the Respondent’s name. That would appear to be an opportunistic choice designed to confer legitimacy - see the earlier case of *Sunwin Information Technology LLC v. Srdan Andelkovic, Sunwin Vibes Limitada, Sunwin Vibes, Sunwin Vibes Content Writing Service, Srdan Andelkoic, Sunwin Vibes Limitada*, WIPO Case No. [D2025-5040](#). This case concerned the domain names <sunwin.casino>, <sunwinz.top>, <sunwin1.world>, and <sunwin79.pro>. The facts of the case and the arguments advanced by the Respondent in that case are strikingly similar to the present case. So in that case the panel stated: “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 found the complainants in that case succeeded. The Panel reaches the same conclusion in the present case. The Respondent has registered the Disputed Domain Names intended to take advantage of the Complainant’s trademarks and their reputation and divert traffic from the Complainant’s websites to those of the Respondent. The issues raised by the Respondent are, when examined closely, simply inaccurate obfuscation.

Accordingly, the Panel finds that the Disputed Domain Names have each been registered and are being used in bad faith and the third condition of paragraph 4(a) of the Policy has been fulfilled.

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 <play-hit1.club>, <789-club1.app> and <789clud.app> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Nick J. Gardner/

Nick J. Gardner

Sole Panelist

Date: February 26, 2026