

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

Caesars License Company, LLC v. Rua Abel
Case No. D2025-5077

1. The Parties

The Complainant is Caesars License Company, LLC, United States of America ("United States"), represented by Greenberg Traurig, LLP, United States.

The Respondent is Rua Abel, Brazil.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <horseshoe-casino.com> is registered with Gname.com Pte. Ltd. (the "Registrar").

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the "Center") on December 5, 2025. On December 8, 2025, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On December 9, 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 (Redacted for privacy) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on December 10, 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 11, 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 15, 2025. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was January 4, 2026. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent's default on January 8, 2026.

The Center appointed Alistair Payne as the sole panelist in this matter on January 16, 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 the owner and operator of the HORSESHOE casino hotel in Las Vegas, Nevada as well as Horseshoe Casinos or casino hotels located in Baltimore, Hammond, Council Bluffs, Bossier City, Tunica, Indianapolis, and Lake Charles in the United States. For many years, the Complainant has owned and operated the domain name <caesars.com>, the Complainant's primary website, which offers general information about Horseshoe Casinos, including locations and casino promotions. The Complainant also owns and operates the domain name <horseshoeonlinecasino.com> which Caesars uses to host the online Horseshoe casino where visitors can play casino games including slots, table games, poker-style games, and more online.

The Complainant owns various trademark registrations including its HORSESHOE mark including United States federal trademark registration number 1839688 for the word mark HORSESHOE registered on June 14, 1994, United States federal trademark registration number 7875590 for HORSESHOE ONLINE CASINO and horseshoe device registered on July 29, 2025 and Brazilian trademark registration number 933681658 registered on October 7, 2025.

The disputed domain name was registered on July 18, 2025 and resolves to a website branded as the "Horseshoe Casino" which features the HORSESHOE mark and appears to provide online gaming services from a business address in Williamsburg, Kentucky in the United States.

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 incorporates Complainant's HORSESHOE mark in full and is therefore confusingly similar to it. It submits that the inclusion of a hyphen at the end and of the generic term "casino" before the generic Top-Level Domain ("gTLD") ".com", does not preclude a finding of confusing similarity.

The Complainant submits that the Respondent is not commonly known by the disputed domain name, has not used or prepared to use the disputed domain name in connection with a bona fide offering of goods or services and has not been authorised, licensed, or otherwise permitted by the Complainant to register and/or use the disputed domain name. It says further that the Respondent registered the disputed domain name for the purpose of impersonating the Complainant and defrauding Internet users seeking the Complainant's website. It submits that the Respondent's use of the disputed domain name does not constitute a legitimate non-commercial or fair use of the disputed domain name. Instead, says the Complainant, the Respondent is using the disputed domain name to divert Internet traffic to an imposter website that prominently displays the Complainant's HORSESHOE mark and falsely purports to be the Complainant's official Horseshoe Online Casino Website, even though it purports to be located at an address that is not one of the locations of the Complainant's Horseshoe casinos. Accordingly, says the Complainant, the Respondent lacks rights to and legitimate interests in the disputed domain name.

The Complainant submits that the Respondent was clearly aware of the Complainant's rights in its HORSESHOE mark when the Respondent acquired the disputed domain name, noting that the Complainant's United States mark was registered long before the disputed domain name was registered and

based on the fact that the Respondent incorporated the HORSESHOE mark into the disputed domain name and re-directed it to an online gaming website that features the Complainant's HORSESHOE mark and pretends to belong to the Complainant. Therefore, says the Complainant, the Panel should find that Respondent's registration of the disputed domain name was undertaken knowingly and in bad faith.

As far as use in bad faith is concerned, the Complainant submits that the disputed domain name has been used opportunistically to host a website passing itself off as the Complainant's website which, at best defrauds consumers by purporting to contain information about the Complainant and at worst fools consumers into thinking they are transacting with the Complainant putting their personal and financial information at risk. This conduct falls squarely under paragraph 4(b)(iv) of the Policy according to the Complainant. The Complainant also asserts that the use of the disputed domain name by the Respondent to pretend that it is the Complainant or that it is associated with Complainant brings the case within the provisions of paragraph 4(b)(iii) of the Policy, in that it shows the Respondent registered the domain name primarily for the purpose of disrupting the business of a competitor, namely the Complainant.

The Complainant further submits that the business address displayed on the website at the disputed domain name is false and is rather the address for The Mint Gaming Hall Cumberland, a casino/gaming hall which is in no way connected with the Complainant. The Complainant submits that the fact that the Respondent included false contact information on the website at the disputed domain name is further evidence of bad faith registration and use of the disputed domain name in bad faith.

Additionally, says the Complainant, it appears that the Respondent has provided false contact information in the registration of the disputed domain name. It says that "Rual Abel" is a common street name in Brazil, and therefore that it strains credulity that "Rua Abel" is the Respondent's legal name. Further, based on the Complainant's investigation, it appears that Respondent has combined three separate Brazil addresses into one. The Complainant submits that prior panels have routinely held that the provision of false contact information by respondents is evidence of bad faith registration and use of disputed domain names.

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 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 entirety of the mark is reproduced within the disputed domain name. Accordingly, the disputed domain name is 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 a hyphen and the word "casino" may bear on assessment of the second and third elements, the Panel finds that these additions do not prevent a finding of confusing similarity between the disputed domain name and the mark for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 1.8.

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.

The Complainant has submitted that the Respondent is not commonly known by the disputed domain name and has not used or prepared to use the disputed domain name in connection with a bona fide offering of goods or services and has not been authorised, licensed, or otherwise permitted by the Complainant to register and/or use the disputed domain name. It has submitted further that the Respondent registered the disputed domain name for the purpose of impersonating the Complainant and defrauding Internet users seeking the Complainant's website. It has asserted that the Respondent's use of the disputed domain name does not constitute a legitimate non-commercial or fair use of the disputed domain name. The Complainant, has rather submitted that the Respondent is using the disputed domain name to divert Internet traffic to an imposter website that prominently displays the Complainant's HORSESHOE mark and falsely purports to be the Complainant's official Horseshoe Online Casino website, even though the stated business address is not one of the locations of the Complainant's Horseshoe casinos.

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.

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 United States trademark registration number 1839688 for HORSESHOE was registered many years before the disputed domain name was registered and that its physical HORSESHOE casino businesses operated long before the registration date of the disputed domain name. The Panel notes the HORSESHOE word and device mark predates the registration of the disputed domain name.

Considering that the Respondent has used the HORSESHOE mark in the disputed domain name and has re-directed it to an online gaming website offering similar services to those offered at the Complainant's <horseshoeonlinecasino.com> website and that it also uses the Complainant's HORSESHOE mark on the website to which the disputed domain name resolves, it seems most likely that the Respondent was aware of the Complainant's mark and HORSESHOE casino business, if not also the Complainant's Horseshoe Online Casino business, when it registered the disputed domain name.

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.

Under paragraph 4(b)(iv) of the Policy there is evidence of registration and use of the disputed domain name in bad faith where a Respondent has used the disputed domain name to intentionally attract, for commercial gain, Internet users to its website by creating a likelihood of confusion with the Complainant's trade marks as to the source, sponsorship, affiliation or endorsement of the website.

In this case the Respondent has used the disputed domain name featuring the Complainant's mark to attract Internet users to an online gambling site which is also branded using the Complainant's HORSESHOE mark and on which site there is no disclaimer to suggest that it is not owned, sponsored by, or affiliated with, the Complainant's Horseshoe Casinos or Horseshoe Online Casino business. The Respondent has in the Panel's view intentionally sought to confuse and attract Internet users seeking the Complainant's business to its own website, ostensibly for its own commercial purposes. This amounts to conduct in terms of paragraph 4(b)(iv) of the Policy which is evidence of registration and use of the disputed domain name in bad faith.

The Panel also finds that the use of the disputed domain name by the Respondent in the manner described, to pretend that it is the Complainant, or that it is associated with Complainant, brings the case within the provisions of paragraph 4(b)(iii) of the Policy, in that it shows the Respondent registered the domain name primarily for the purpose of disrupting the business of a competitor in the United States online gaming market, namely the Complainant.

The Complainant's evidence that the business address displayed on the website at the disputed domain name is false and that the Respondent provided false contact information when registering the disputed domain name is persuasive and further reinforces the Panel's finding of the Respondent's registration and use of the disputed domain name in bad faith.

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 <horseshoe-casino.com> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Alistair Payne/

Alistair Payne

Sole Panelist

Date: January 20, 2026