

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

Sun International (IP) Limited v. kosisz louiwa
Case No. D2026-0220

1. The Parties

The Complainant is Sun International (IP) Limited, South Africa, represented by Adams & Adams Attorneys, South Africa.

The Respondent is kosisz louiwa, Thailand.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <sunbet.games> is registered with GoDaddy.com, LLC (the “Registrar”).

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the “Center”) on January 20, 2026. On January 20, 2026, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On January 20, 2026, 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 (“Unknown”) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on January 21, 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 amendment to the Complaint on January 21, 2026.

The Center verified that the Complaint together with the amendment to the 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 January 23, 2026. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was February 12, 2026. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent’s default on February 16, 2026.

The Center appointed Willem J. H. Leppink as the sole panelist in this matter on February 17, 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 following facts are undisputed.

The Complainant is the owner of an online platform providing sports betting and casino-type gaming services. The Complainant is also a wholly owned subsidiary of Sun International Limited and part of the Sun International Group. The Sun International Group has a diverse portfolio of assets including five-star hotels, casinos and resorts.

The Complainant is the owner of the SUNBET word mark which it has registered in multiple jurisdictions including the South African registered trademark and service mark SUNBET, registration number 2012/24239-42, registered on September 7, 2012, for goods and services in classes 9, 28, 41 and 42.

The Complainant operates websites at “www.sunbet.co.za”, and “www.suninternational.com”.

The disputed domain name was registered on January 4, 2026, and at the time of filing of the Complaint it resolved to an error page. At the time of rendering this decision it resolved to webpage with a login screen and a prominent logo “SUNBET – slot and casino online”.¹

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 the following.

The Complainant launched its SUNBET platform in November 2013, on which it offers up to 100,000 markets on up to 5,000 events of 40 sports weekly, including 4,000 live events, focusing on the majority of the English Premier League, Cricket and Rugby events. The platform also offers more than 60 casino-type games. The Complainant has made extensive use of the SUNBET mark.

To support its submissions, a significant number of media articles were submitted. The Complainant also had a large marketing expenditure in relation to the SUNBET mark, providing details since 2015. The spend up to November 2025 was nearly USD 10 million.

The Registrant has set out to attract, for commercial gain, Internet users to its website, by creating a likelihood of confusion with the Complainant's mark as to the source, sponsorship, affiliation or endorsement of its website. The use and registration of the domain will, therefore, certainly cause confusion and deception. The fact that the disputed domain name at the time of filing the Complaint does not resolve to an active website does not detract from this. It will still draw Internet traffic, and can be pointed to an active website at any time.

¹The Panel has authority to carry out limited independent research under the general powers of the Panel, amongst others, specified in paragraph 10 of the Rules.

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 identical to the mark 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 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 considers that at the time of filing the Complaint the disputed domain name did not resolve to an active website, but to an error page, albeit that at the time of rendering this decision the disputed domain name resolved to a webpage with a login screen and a prominent logo "SUNBET – slot and casino online". Certainly, lacking a response, the Panel finds, on a balance of probabilities, that the Respondent is more likely than not, using the disputed domain name for illegal activities, likely impersonating the Complainant. Panels have held that the use of a domain name for such activities, can never confer rights or legitimate interests on a respondent. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 2.13.1.

The Panel finds the second element of the Policy has been established.

C. Registered and Used in Bad Faith

The Panel refers to its considerations under 6.B.

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 Respondent is engaged in intentionally attempting to attract, for commercial gain, Internet users to its 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 Respondent's website, and the gaming services offered on the Respondent's website or location.

Panels have held that the use of a domain name for illegitimate activity, here being the impersonation of the Complainant and the passing off of the gaming services offered by the Respondent on the website to which the disputed domain name resolved constitutes bad faith for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 3.4.

Having reviewed the record, and certainly lacking a Response, the Panel finds the Respondent's registration and use of the disputed domain name constitute bad faith under the Policy.

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 <sunbet.games> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Willem J. H. Leppink/

Willem J. H. Leppink

Sole Panelist

Date: February 17, 2026