

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

Ocean Star Limited v. Irina Pavlyuk

Case No. D2025-5182

1. The Parties

The Complainant is Ocean Star Limited, Malta, represented by Herzog, Fox & Neeman, Israel.

The Respondent is Irina Pavlyuk, Ukraine.

2. The Domain Names and Registrar

The disputed domain names <tenbetcasino.com> and <tenbetcasino.net> are registered with NameCheap, Inc. (the “Registrar”).

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the “Center”) on December 11, 2025. On December 12, 2025, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain names. On December 12, 2025, 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) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on December 16, 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 21, 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 23, 2025. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was January 12, 2026. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent’s default on January 15, 2026.

The Center appointed Mireille Buydens as the sole panelist in this matter on January 21, 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

Founded in 2003, the Complainant operates as an online betting company offering online sports betting and live casino services. Through its affiliated companies, the Complainant has over one million registered customers worldwide and maintains multiple gambling licenses across various jurisdictions worldwide. The Complainant's Group operates a number of online betting and gaming websites under the "10BET" brand (hereafter the "10BET" Trademark" or "the Trademark"). The 10BET Trademark has a current annual average of 396,000 visitors and 173,000 users in 2025.

The Complainant holds several trademark registrations for the 10BET Trademark, including the following:

- United Kingdom trademark registration no. UK00918046117 for 10BET (word mark), registered on August 15, 2019;
- Brazilian trademark registration no. 928302830 for 10BET (word mark), registered on March 12, 2024.

The Complainant operates various domain names incorporating the Trademark, including <10bet.com>, <10bet.uk>, <10bet.se> and <10bet.mx>.

The disputed domain names were registered respectively on April 19, 2025 (<tenbetcasino.com>) and on May 3, 2025 (<tenbetcasino.net>). According to the Complaint, the disputed domain names resolve to websites offering casino and gaming services and prominently displaying the sign TENBET (under the disputed domain name <tenbetcasino.com>) or TENOBET/TENBET (under the disputed domain name <tenbetcasino.net>). At the date of this Decision, the disputed domain names both resolve to an error page.

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.

First, The Complainant submits that the disputed domain names are confusingly similar to the 10BET Trademark, as they incorporate the 10BET Trademark in its entirety, with the mere addition of the written-out form of the number "10", the addition of the term "casino", and the generic Top-Level Domain ".com" and ".net".

Second, the Complainant claims that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the disputed domain names. The Respondent is not affiliated with the Complainant or any of the companies within the Group and has never been licensed or otherwise authorized to use the 10BET Trademark. To the Complainant's knowledge, neither the Respondent, nor any business operated by it, is or has ever been commonly known by the disputed domain names. The Respondent has not used, or made demonstrable preparations to use, the disputed domain names in connection with a bona fide offering of goods or services. On the contrary, the disputed domain names resolve to websites bearing the Complainant's 10BET Trademark, while offering betting and gaming services similar to those provided by the Complainant. The use of the 10BET Trademark on these websites creates the misleading impression that they are affiliated with, sponsored or endorsed by the Complainant.

The Complainant finally contends that the Respondent registered and uses the disputed domain name in bad faith. According to the Complainant: (1) it is clear that the Respondent knew, or at the very least should have known, about the 10BET Trademark and the Complainant's operations; (2) the Respondent intentionally incorporated the 10BET Trademark within the disputed domain names to confuse Internet users, who will mistakenly assume that the disputed domain names are affiliated with the Complainant; (3) the Respondent's registration of the disputed domain names, incorporating the widely known 10BET Trademark, was made for exploiting the reputation of the 10BET Trademark in the betting field for commercial gain; and (4) the Respondent's use of privacy services supports the finding of bad faith registration and use.

B. Respondent

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

6. Discussion and Findings

6.1 Procedural Considerations – Respondent's location

Paragraph 10 of the Rules requires the Panel to ensure that the Parties are treated with equality and that each Party is given a fair opportunity to present its case. The Panel must also ensure that the administrative proceeding takes place with due expedition. As the Respondent's address is stated to be in Ukraine, which is subject to an international conflict at the date of this Decision that may impact case notification, it is appropriate for the Panel to consider whether the proceeding should continue.

Having considered all the circumstances of the case, the Panel is of the view that it should.

The Panel notes that the Center has used the Respondent's email address as registered with the Registrar for the purposes of notifying the Complaint. It appears that the delivery to the Respondent's email address was complete and that no delivery failure message was received. As a result, there is no evidence that the case notification email was not successfully delivered. The Panel further notes that the disputed domain names were registered on April 19 and May 3, 2025, over three years after the commencement of the present conflict in Ukraine on February 24, 2022, indicating that the Respondent provided the contact address to the Registrar at the point of registration notwithstanding the ongoing conflict.

It is moreover noted that, for the reasons which are set out later in this Decision, the Panel has no serious doubt (albeit in the absence of a Response) that the Respondent registered and has used the disputed domain names in bad faith and with the intention of unfairly targeting the Complainant's goodwill in its Trademark.

Lastly, the Complainant has specified in the Complaint that any challenge made by the Respondent to any decision to transfer the disputed domain name shall be referred to the jurisdiction of the courts at the location of the principal office of the relevant Registrar, which is the United States of America, such courts not being subject to an international conflict. Therefore, the Panel finds that proceeding with this Decision does not preempt the Respondent from asserting its rights under paragraph 4(k) of the Policy to submit this dispute to the courts at the applicable mutual jurisdiction.

The Panel concludes that the Parties have each been given a fair opportunity to present their case and will proceed to a Decision in order that the administrative proceeding takes place with due expedition.

6.2 Substantive elements of the Policy

Paragraph 4(a) of the Policy provides that the Complainant prove each of the following three elements in order to succeed in its Complaint:

- the disputed domain names are identical or confusingly similar to a trademark or service mark in which the Complainant has rights;
- the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the disputed domain names; and
- the disputed domain names were 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 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 Panel finds the 10BET Trademark is recognizable within the disputed domain names. Both disputed domain names include the term "tenbet", which is phonetically and conceptually identical to the Complainant's 10BET Trademark as "ten" is the word form of the number "10". The only (further) difference between the Trademark and the disputed domain names is the addition of the term "casino" after "tenbet" in both disputed domain names. Although the addition of this term may bear on assessment of the second and third elements, the Panel finds the addition of such term does not prevent a finding of confusing similarity between the disputed domain names and the Trademark for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 1.8.

Further, the generic Top-Level Domain ".com" and ".net" are a standard registration requirement and does not prevent the disputed domain names from being confusingly similar to the 10BET Trademark.

Accordingly, the disputed domain names are confusingly similar to the Trademark for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 1.7.

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 names. 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 names such as those enumerated in the Policy or otherwise.

The Respondent is not licensed by, nor affiliated with, the Complainant in any way. There is no evidence that the Respondent is commonly known by the disputed domain names, nor is there any evidence of use or

demonstrable preparations to use the disputed domain names for a bona fide offering of goods or services. There is no evidence of legitimate noncommercial or fair use of the disputed domain names, either. On the contrary, the Panel notes that the disputed domain names reproduce the 10BET Trademark with the mere replacement of the number “10” in the 10BET Trademark by its written-out form “ten” and the addition of the term “casino” (descriptive for the Complainant’s betting services). Even where a domain name consists of a trademark plus an additional (descriptive) term, UDRP panels have largely held that such composition cannot constitute fair use if it effectively impersonates or suggests sponsorship or endorsement by the trademark owner. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 2.5.1. In the case at hand, the disputed domain names both reproduce phonically and conceptually the Complainant’s Trademark with the mere addition of the descriptive term “casino”, which suggests sponsorship or endorsement by the Complainant.

According to the Complainant’s evidence, the disputed domain names resolved to a website appearing to offer casino services similar to those of the Complainant. While the general look and feel of the websites and the “Tenbet” logo differs from the Complainant’s website and logo, the Panel finds that given the composition of the disputed domain names and other circumstances addressed under the third element below, this neither amounts to a bona fide offering of goods or services nor a legitimate noncommercial or fair use of the disputed domain names.

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. Among these factors demonstrating bad faith registration and use is the use of a domain name to intentionally attempt to attract, for commercial gain, Internet users to a website or other online location, by creating a likelihood of confusion with the complainant’s mark as to the source, sponsorship, affiliation, or endorsement of the website or location or of a product or service on the website or location.

Having reviewed the record, the Panel finds the Respondent’s registration and use of the disputed domain names constitutes bad faith under the Policy. The Panel finds that the Respondent should have been aware of the Complainant and its Trademark when it registered the disputed domain names for the following reasons:

- some of the Complainant’s 10BET Trademark registrations predate the registration of the disputed domain names by more than six years;
- the Respondent has composed the disputed domain names by combining a variation of the Complainant’s 10BET Trademark (i.e. the “10” being replaced by its written form “ten”) with the term “casino” descriptive of the Complainant’s gaming and betting services, for resolving to websites offering the same type of services as the Complainant. This can hardly be the result of mere chance.
- A quick search for the term “10BET” or “tenbet” online would have revealed to the Respondent the existence of the Complainant and its Trademark.

As a result, the Panel finds that the Respondent was more likely than not aware of the Complainant’s Trademark at the time of the registration of the disputed domain names. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#) section 3.2.2. In the Panel’s view, the circumstances of this case indicate that the Respondent has intentionally attempted to attract Internet users to its website for commercial gain by creating a likelihood of confusion with the Complainant’s Trademark. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 3.2.4.

By failing to file a Response to the Complaint, the Respondent did not make any effort to contest the foregoing, nor provided any significant explanation or evidence to explain the registration and use of the disputed domain names. Pursuant to paragraph 14 of the Rules, the Panel may draw the conclusions it considers appropriate.

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 names <tenbetcasino.com> and <tenbetcasino.net> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Mireille Buydens/

Mireille Buydens

Sole Panelist

Date: February 2, 2026