ARBITRATION
AND
MEDIATION CENTER

WIPO
WORLD
INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY
ORGANIZATION

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

Sun International (IP) Limited, Sun International (South Africa) Limited v. shiqing huang
Case No. D2026-0588

1. The Parties

The Complainants are Sun International (IP) Limited (the "First Complainant"), South Africa, and Sun International (South Africa) Limited (the "Second Complainant"), South Africa, represented by Adams & Adams Attorneys, South Africa.

The Respondent is shiqing huang, China.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <sunbet.com> is registered with NameSilo, LLC (the "Registrar").

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the "Center") on February 10, 2026. On February 12, 2026, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On February 12, 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 (See PrivacyGuardian.org) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainants on February 13, 2026, providing the registrant and contact information disclosed by the Registrar, and inviting the Complainants to submit an amendment to the Complaint. The Complainants filed an amendment to the Complaint on February 16, 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 February 18, 2026. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was March 10, 2026. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent's default on March 11, 2026.

The Center appointed Wilson Pinheiro Jabur as the sole panelist in this matter on March 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 Complainants are part of the Sun International Group which operates hotels, casinos and resorts. The SUNBET sports betting platform was launched in November 2013 (Annexure 6 to the Complaint) and is available at <sunbet.co.za>.

Sun City is one of the Complainants' resorts, established in 1979 and which also hosts the Sun City Casino.

The First Complainant is the owner of the following, amongst others, trademark registrations (Annexure 4 to the Complaint):

- Botswana Trademark Registration No. BW/M/2012/01106 for the word mark SUNBET, registered on November 7, 2014, in classes 9, 28, 41, and 42;
- Brazil Trademark Registration No. 914410504 for the word mark SUNBET, registered on September 3, 2019, in class 9; and
- South Africa Trademark Registration No. 2012/24239 for the word mark SUNBET, filed on September 7, 2012, registered on September 26, 2014, in class 9.

The Second Complainant is the owner of the following, amongst others, trademark registrations (Annexure 20 to the Complaint):

- Australia Trademark Registration No. 1312559 for the word mark SUN CITY, registered on July 29, 2009, successively renewed, in classes 39, 41, and 43;
- Botswana Trademark Registration No. BW/M/1980/006168 for the word mark SUN CITY, registered on March 12, 1980, in class 42; and
- European Union Trademark Registration No. 002371508 for the word mark SUN CITY, registered on September 24, 2002, successively renewed, in classes 41 and 42.

The disputed domain name, initially registered on April 21, 2002, has already been the object of a previous URDP dispute (*Sun International (IP) Limited v. NameSentinel Admin and Sun Ventures Development Limited, Arthur Tsang*, WIPO Case No. D2014-1190), where the panel found it "inconceivable […] that as at date of registration of the Domain Name the Respondent could reasonably be said to have had a bad faith intent directed at the Complainant's SUNBET trade mark."

The record in the present case includes WhoIs and related domain-history materials indicating that the registrant details associated with the disputed domain name later changed, including materials said to reflect a registrant different from the registrant named in the earlier case (Annexure 21 to the Complaint). The Panel addresses below the significance of those changes for purposes of the admissibility of this refiled Complaint.

The Complainant asserts that at the time of filing of the Complaint, the disputed domain name redirected Internet users to a Chinese-language online gaming website available at "www.sunbet321.com", inviting users to click on a link, which in turn, redirected to the website at "www.sun1bet1.com". The record includes evidence that the redirected website "www. sun1bet1.com" used the terms SUNBET申博太阳城最新官方网址 translated as "SUNBET SUN CITY latest official website".

Presently, the disputed domain name redirects Internet users to the website available at "http://sun1bet1.com/" written in Chinese and which states SUNBET申博太阳城最新官方网址 freely translated in English to "SUNBET SUN CITY latest official website".

5. Parties' Contentions

A. Complainants

The Complainants contend that they have satisfied each of the elements required under the Policy for a transfer of the disputed domain name.

Notably, the Complainants contend that the refiling of a complaint should be accepted in this case given that the disputed domain name is no longer held by the registrant against whom the first proceedings were instituted and that the disputed domain name is being used to redirect Internet users to "https://sunbet321.com/", active as of December 2024 and with no indication that it is connected to the previous registrant of the disputed domain name.

Furthermore, the Complainants contend that the use of both the SUNBET and SUN CITY trademarks in the disputed domain name and on the website redirected by it, cannot be a coincidence, but rather a clear targeting of the Complainants by the Respondent who acquired the disputed domain name during the course of 2022.

According to the Complainants, the SUNBET and SUN CITY trademarks are well known being it clear that the Respondent intentionally targeted the Complainants when acquiring the disputed domain name.

Furthermore, the Complainants argue that there is no evidence that the Respondent has been, or is commonly known, by the name SUNBET in South Africa or elsewhere, or that the Respondent has acquired any trademark rights over that name.

B. Respondent

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

6. Discussion and Findings

6.1. Procedural matter – refiling of a complaint

This matter concerns a refiled Complaint, the disputed domain name having previously been the subject of WIPO Case No. D2014-1190, in which transfer was denied.

In the earlier case, the panel's denial turned materially on the conclusion, on the record then before it, that the relevant beneficial ownership of the disputed domain name dated back to at least 2012, i.e., before the Complainant's trademark rights and launch of its SUNBET betting platform. The present Complaint is not merely a repetition of that earlier record. Rather, the Complainants rely on subsequent WhoIs and domain-history materials, together with the Registrar-disclosed details in this proceeding, to contend that the disputed domain name later came to be held by a different registrant and that the current registrant is now using the disputed domain name to redirect Internet users to a website explicitly invoking the Complainants' SUNBET and SUN CITY marks.

The WIPO Overview of WIPO Panel Views on Select UDRP Questions ("WIPO Overview 3.1"), section 4.18, indicates that the refiling of a UDRP complaint is exceptional and is accepted only in highly limited circumstances, such as when (i) there were legally relevant developments after the original decision that directly and materially affect the basis of the denial; (ii) there was an objective breach of natural justice or

due process; (iii) there was serious misconduct in the original case, such as perjured evidence affecting the outcome; (iv) there is new material evidence tied to the basis of the earlier denial that was reasonably unavailable during the first case; or (v) the earlier case was decided (including termination orders) expressly without prejudice.

The Panel is mindful that changes in privacy services, registrar details, or technical configuration do not automatically establish a legally relevant change in beneficial ownership. At the same time, the Registrar-disclosed details in this proceeding identify a registrant different from the registrant named in the prior case, and the record contains supporting materials consistent with a later acquisition of the disputed domain name that postdates the original dispute. In the absence of any Response, and on the present record as a whole, the Panel is prepared to accept that the Complaint is based on a sufficiently new factual matrix to warrant consideration on the merits.

The Panel therefore admits the refiled complaint, while emphasizing that its findings below are based on the present record and the circumstances now alleged, rather than any reassessment of issues already decided on the earlier record.

6.2. Substantive matter

Paragraph 4(a) of the Policy sets forth three requirements, which have to be met for this Panel to order the transfer of the disputed domain name to the Complainants:

(i) the disputed domain name is identical or confusingly similar to a trademark or service mark in which the Complainants have rights; and

(ii) the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the disputed domain name; and

(iii) the disputed domain name has been registered and is being used in bad faith.

The Complainants must prove in this administrative proceeding that each of the aforesaid three elements is present in order to obtain the transfer of the disputed domain name.

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 3.1, section 1.7.

The Complainants have shown rights in respect of a trademark or service mark for the purposes of the Policy. WIPO Overview 3.1, section 1.2.1.

The entirety of the SUNBET 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 3.1, 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 that 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 3.1, section 2.1.

Having reviewed the available record, the Panel finds the Complainants have established a prima facie case that the Respondent lacks rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name. The Respondent has not rebutted the Complainants' 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.

To the contrary, the evidence shows that the disputed domain name has been used to redirect Internet users to a Chinese-language gaming website reproducing the Complainant's SUNBET and SUN CITY trademarks combined, together with wording translated as "SUNBET SUN CITY latest official website". Such use, on its face, trades on the Complainants' trademarks and suggests sponsorship, affiliation, or endorsement by the Complainants. The Panel finds this is not a bona fide offering of goods or services capable of conferring rights or legitimate interests under the Policy.

Also, and on the available record, the lack of evidence as to any trademarks registered by the Respondent corresponding to the disputed domain name, corroborates the indication of an absence of rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name.

Panels have held that the use of a domain name for illegitimate activity such as impersonation/passing off, or other types of fraud can never confer rights or legitimate interests on a respondent. WIPO Overview 3.1, section 2.13.1.

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

C. Registered and Used in Bad Faith

Under paragraph 4(a)(iii) of the Policy, the Complainants must establish that the disputed domain name was registered and is being used in bad faith. In the circumstances of this refiled case, the critical issue is not merely whether the disputed domain name is presently being used in bad faith, but whether the relevant Respondent may properly be treated as having acquired or registered the disputed domain name in bad faith and at a time when the Complainants' rights were already in existence and in circumstances showing targeting of those rights.

The Panel is satisfied on the present record that the disputed domain name is being used in bad faith. The evidence shows that the disputed domain name redirects Internet users to a gaming website invoking the Complainants' SUNBET and SUN CITY trademarks and representing itself, in translation, as the "SUNBET SUN CITY latest official website". This strongly suggests an intentional effort to attract Internet users for commercial gain by creating a likelihood of confusion with the Complainants' marks as to source, sponsorship, affiliation, or endorsement within the meaning of paragraph 4(b)(iv) of the Policy.

The more difficult question is bad faith registration. The earlier panel found, on the record then before it, that the respondent's relevant beneficial ownership predated the Complainant's rights. The present Panel does not lightly depart from that earlier reasoning. However, the present record differs in a material respect. The Registrar-disclosed details in this proceeding identify a registrant different from the registrant named in the earlier case, and the Complainants have submitted supporting domain-history materials consistent with a later acquisition of the disputed domain name in 2022. In the absence of any rebuttal from the Respondent, and having admitted this refiled Complaint precisely because it is grounded in that later factual development, the Panel is prepared to treat the present Respondent as having become the relevant holder of the disputed domain name at a time when the Complainants' SUNBET rights were already in existence for over 10 years.

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.

On that basis, and considering in particular:

(i) the identical nature of the disputed domain name and the Complainants' SUNBET mark;

(ii) the redirected website's express invocation of both SUNBET and SUN CITY trademarks;

(iii) the misleading representation that the website is the "latest official website";

(iv) the absence of any plausible explanation from the Respondent as to the registration and use of the disputed domain name; and

(v) the Respondent's concealment behind a privacy service for the registration of the disputed domain name, which while not conclusive, may in these circumstances lend further support to an inference of bad faith,

the Panel finds that the disputed domain name was acquired and has been used 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 <sunbet.com> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Wilson Pinheiro Jabur/
Wilson Pinheiro Jabur
Sole Panelist
Date: March 27, 2026