

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

Kaizen Gaming International Limited v. Crudu Vadim
Case No. D2026-0594

1. The Parties

The Complainant is Kaizen Gaming International Limited, Malta, represented by Ubilibet, S.L., Spain.

The Respondent is Crudu Vadim, Republic of Moldova.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <betano-casino.com> is registered with Porkbun LLC (the “Registrar”).

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the “Center”) on February 12, 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 13, 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 February 17, 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 February 17, 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 paragraphs 2 and 4 of the Rules, the Center formally notified the Respondent of the Complaint, and the proceedings commenced on February 24, 2026. In accordance with paragraph 5 of the Rules, the due date for Response was March 16, 2026. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent’s default on March 17, 2026.

The Center appointed Yuji Yamaguchi as the sole panelist in this matter on March 23, 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 paragraph 7 of the Rules.

4. Factual Background

The Complainant, founded in 2012, is currently a fast-growing online betting and entertainment operator offering sports betting, online casino, and live betting in the online gaming products and services sector. The Complainant has expanded to 12 countries in Europe and the Americas, including Canada, Portugal, Brazil, Romania, Germany, Bulgaria, the Czech Republic, Chile, Peru, and Ecuador.

The Complainant owns numerous BETANO trademarks in various jurisdictions, including European Union Trade Mark No. 014893671 (registered on March 23, 2016), United Kingdom Trademark No. UK00918170411 (registered on May 22, 2020), Canadian Trademark No. TMA1225224 (registered on March 14, 2024) and International Trademark No. 1797844 (registered on April 24, 2024).

The Complainant also owns many domain names which consist of the Complainant's BETANO trademark and the term "casino", such as <betanocasino.com>, <betano-casino.net>, <betano-casino.cz>, <betano-casino.eu>, <betano-casino.be>, <betanocasino.pt>, and <betanocasino.net>.

The disputed domain name was registered on October 22, 2025, and resolves to an online gambling website that reproduces the Complainant's BETANO trademark, along with a header which reads "Betano Casino Canada | \$2750 Welcome Bonus + 160 Free Spins Deal".

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's contentions may be summarized as follows:

The disputed domain name includes, alongside "betano", the term "casino", which, far from giving the first term sufficient distinctiveness to distinguish it from the Complainant's registered BETANO trademark, only increases the risk of confusion on the part of consumers, as it is a term descriptive of the Complainant's sector of activity, so that it would be logical for consumers to think that the disputed domain name is related to the Complainant's BETANO trademark.

The Complainant has not authorized, licensed, or allowed the Respondent or any third party to use its BETANO trademarks through the disputed domain name or in any other way that would confer validity or legitimacy upon such usage. Also, there is no evidence that the Respondent uses the disputed domain name or a name corresponding to the disputed domain name in connection with a bona fide offering of goods or services. The Respondent is not commonly known by the disputed domain name. The Complainant sent a cease and desist letter to the Registrar involved in the disputed domain name. Despite the Complainant's many efforts, the Respondent never contacted the Complainant or responded to the Complainant's requests.

Given the notoriety of the Complainant's BETANO trademark, it is implausible that the Respondent was unaware of the Complainant's BETANO trademark, especially since the Respondent operates in the same sector. Furthermore, the mere coincidence in the choice of the disputed domain name is highly unlikely. The construction of "betano-casino" clearly indicates a connection to the Complainant, since the BETANO trademark is well known in the Respondent's sector. The addition of "casino" does not create sufficient distinctiveness to suggest the disputed domain name was chosen innocently but is entirely consistent with

the idea that the disputed domain name is related to the Complainant, indicating harmful intent toward both the Complainant and the public.

B. Respondent

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

6. Discussion and Findings

In accordance with paragraph 4(a) of the Policy, the Complainant must assert and prove the following three elements are present:

- (i) the disputed domain name is identical or confusingly similar to a trademark or service mark in which the Complainant has 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.

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. See section 1.7 of the WIPO Overview of WIPO Panel Views on Select UDRP Questions ("[WIPO Overview 3.1](#)").

The Complainant is the owner of the BETANO trademarks and has sufficient standing to file this case. See section 1.2.1 of the [WIPO Overview 3.1](#). The disputed domain name consists of the BETANO trademark in their entirety and the term "casino", which are connected by a hyphen, along with the generic Top-Level Domain ("gTLD") ".com".

The Panel finds that the use of the BETANO trademark with the addition of an hyphen and the term "casino" in the disputed domain name does not prevent a finding of confusing similarity between the disputed domain name and the BETANO trademark under the first element of paragraph 4(a) of the Policy, as the BETANO trademark remains recognizable within the disputed domain name. See section 1.8 of the [WIPO Overview 3.1](#). See also *Rootz Ltd. v. Dmitro Miasnikov*, WIPO Case No. [D2024-1074](#); *Logrand Brands, S.A. de C.V. v. Jeff Hill*, WIPO Case No. [D2024-2256](#); *Bailamia Investments Ltd v. Name Redacted*, WIPO Case No. [D2025-0464](#); and *365 Scores UK Limited v. Alex Muller*, WIPO Case No. [D2025-1634](#).

The gTLD is viewed as a standard registration requirement and as such is disregarded for assessing the confusing similarity under the first element of paragraph 4(a) of the Policy. See section 1.11.1 of the [WIPO Overview 3.1](#).

Thus, the Panel finds that the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to the Complainant's BETANO trademark and the first element in paragraph 4(a) 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.

As the Complainant asserts, the Respondent is not commonly known by the disputed domain name pursuant to paragraph 4(c)(ii) of the Policy and the Complainant has not authorized, licensed, or allowed the Respondent to use its BETANO trademarks in the disputed domain name. Since the Respondent's online

gambling website to which the disputed domain name resolves free-rides on the reputation of the Complainant, it is difficult to infer that the Respondent uses the disputed domain name or a name corresponding to the disputed domain name in connection with a bona fide offering of goods or services within the meaning of paragraph 4(c)(i) of the Policy, or that the Respondent is making a legitimate noncommercial or fair use of the disputed domain name, without intent for commercial gain to misleadingly divert consumers or to tarnish the BETANO trademark within the meaning of paragraph 4(c)(iii) of the Policy.

Although the overall burden of proof in the proceedings is on the complainant, where a complainant makes out a prima facie case that the respondent lacks rights or legitimate interests, the burden of production on the second element in paragraph 4(a) of the Policy 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 in paragraph 4(a) of the Policy. See section 2.1 of the [WIPO Overview 3.1](#).

Having reviewed the available record, the Panel finds that 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.

Accordingly, the Panel finds that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the disputed domain name and the second element in paragraph 4(a) of the Policy has been established.

C. Registered and Used in Bad Faith

Considering that the Complainant is operating online gaming platforms by using many domain names which consist of the Complainant's BETANO trademark and the term "casino" and the Respondent's website to which the disputed domain name resolves displays the Complainant's BETANO trademark, the Respondent must have intentionally attempted to attract, for commercial gain, Internet users by creating a likelihood of confusion with the Complainant's BETANO trademark at the registration of the disputed domain name. See *Kaizen Gaming International Limited v. Maria Papadopoulos*, WIPO Case No. [D2023-0107](#); and *Kaizen Gaming International Limited v. Dmitry Pastov*, WIPO Case No. [D2023-0109](#).

The fact that the Respondent never replied to the Complainant's cease and desist letter sent via the Registrar on November 28, 2025 and continues to operate the online gambling website to which the disputed domain name resolves is considered to be an indicator of the Respondent's bad faith use.

In conclusion, the Panel finds that the disputed domain name has been registered and is being used in bad faith and the third element in paragraph 4(a) of the Policy has been established.

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

/Yuji Yamaguchi/

Yuji Yamaguchi

Sole Panelist

Date: April 6, 2026