

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

BoyleSports 2 Unlimited Company v. Eduard Halushko
Case No. D2026-0620

1. The Parties

The Complainant is BoyleSports 2 Unlimited Company, Ireland, represented by FRKelly, Ireland.

The Respondent is Eduard Halushko, Ukraine.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <boyle-casino.com> (the “Domain Name”) is registered with Internet Domain Service BS Corp (the “Registrar”).

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the “Center”) on February 13, 2026. On February 13, 2026, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the Domain Name. On February 27, 2026, the Registrar transmitted by email to the Center its verification response disclosing registrant and contact information for the Domain Name which differed from the named Respondent (Domain Admin, Whois Privacy Corp.) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on February 27, 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 March 2, 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 March 3, 2026. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was March 23, 2026. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent’s default on March 24, 2026.

The Center appointed Wolter Wefers Bettink as the sole panelist in this matter on March 27, 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 a provider of bookmaking and betting services, founded in 1982 in Ireland. The Complainant's services are available both locally and internationally through its network of retail betting outlets and its online platforms, making them readily accessible to consumers in Ireland and the United Kingdom. As of 2025, the Complainant operates over 390 retail betting shops across Ireland and the United Kingdom. The Complainant has rights in a number of registered trade marks containing the element BOYLE including (hereinafter "the Trade Marks"):

- European Union Trade Mark BOYLESPTS THIS IS BETTING (figurative) registered under No. 18522676 as of January 18, 2022;
- European Union Trade Mark BOYLEXTRA registered under No. 018522682 as of January 18, 2022; and
- European Union Trade Mark BOYLELOTTO registered under No. 018522696 as of September 13, 2022.

The Panel further notes the Complainant has rights in the following registered trade marks consisting of the element BOYLECASINO:

- European Union Trade Mark BOYLECASINO registered under No. 019234645 as of January 10, 2026;
- United Kingdom Trade Mark BOYLECASINO registered under No. UK00004252091 as of November 7, 2025;

The Domain Name was registered on May 15, 2025 and resolves to a website containing the Complainant's BOYLECASINO mark (the "Website"). In the browser's address bar for the Website, the same favicon is displayed as for the Complainant's website under the domain name <boylesportscasino.com> (the "Complainant Website"). When the Panel visited the Website it contained the following text:

"Boyle Casino represents the evolution of a gambling institution that's been serving UK customers for over four decades. Originally operating as BoyleSports Casino, the platform underwent a complete rebrand in 2025 to create a more focused online casino experience whilst maintaining its connection to the respected BoyleSports brand.

The casino operates under a dual licensing structure, holding permits from both the UK Gambling Commission (licence number 039469-R-319383-024) and the Gibraltar Gaming Authority (RGL 083/084). This regulatory framework ensures that new players benefit from the highest standards of player protection, fair gaming practices, and secure financial transactions."

When activating the "Bonus" button on the Website, the Panel was redirected to a website under the domain name <luckygem7.com >, a competitor of the Complainant.

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 Domain Name.

Notably, the Complainant contends that the Domain Name is confusingly similar to the Trade Marks, as it incorporates the Trade Mark BOYLECASINO in its entirety, as well as the dominant and distinctive element BOYLE of the other Trade Marks. The element “casino” is a generic and descriptive term that directly relates to the Complainant’s core field of business. It is widely established that domain names that incorporate a generic or non-distinctive word alongside the dominant elements of the marks involved are considered to be confusingly similar to the earlier registered mark.

Use of the Domain Name is causing or will continue to cause damage to the Complainant’s goodwill and reputation. Where the Domain Name is identical or virtually identical to the Trade Marks, a likelihood of damage may be inferred. In this context, the Complainant notes that, although the United Kingdom Trade Mark BOYLECASINO post-dates the registration of the Domain Name, the Complainant used the term BOYLE CASINO in commerce as early as 2011. The term was actively used by the Complainant and had acquired recognition prior to the Respondent’s use of the Domain Name. This prior use reinforces the association between the BOYLE name and casino-related services in the minds of consumers. In addition, the incorporation of the term “casino” alongside the BOYLE name heightens the likelihood of confusion, as it directly mirrors the Complainant’s branding and services.

The Website further reinforces this confusion as the content, presentation, and overall impression of the site closely resemble the Complainant’s branding and services, demonstrating that the Respondent is intentionally seeking to capitalise on the reputation and goodwill attached to the BOYLE and BOYLESports Trade Marks. The use of the BOYLE name in connection with betting-related services makes clear that the Respondent is attempting to pass itself off as the Complainant or to create a false association with the Complainant.

The Complainant points out that one of the earliest captures of the Domain Name on the Wayback Machine (<archive.org>) contains a section expressly stating: “Welcome to Boyle Casino, your trusted Irish gambling website...”. The page goes on to promote gambling services, bonuses, and an “authentic Irish gaming experience”, thereby falsely presenting the Respondent as the Complainant. The promotion of online casino services, bonuses, and an “authentic Irish gaming experience” is a direct attempt to exploit the Complainant’s goodwill and reputation.

This explicit self-identification as “Boyle Casino,” together with the promotion of online casino services, clearly demonstrates that the Respondent was aware of the Complainant and deliberately sought to exploit the goodwill associated with the BOYLE and BOYLESports brands. Such use is inherently misleading and serves to heighten the likelihood of confusion among Internet users. Such conduct is a clear act of intentional confusion on the consumers and visitors of the site by the Respondent. The inclusion of a generic or descriptive term such as “casino” does not dispel confusion; rather, it exacerbates it by strengthening the false impression that the Domain Name is connected to the Complainant’s legitimate business. The resulting confusion is likely to divert Internet traffic away from the Complainant and cause reputational harm. Accordingly, the Complainant submits that, as per the Policy, Paragraph 4(a)(i); and the Rules, Paragraphs 3(b)(viii), (b)(ix)(1)), it is evident that the Domain Name is highly similar to the Trade Marks and therefore, resulting in confusion.

The Complainant has no affiliation with the Respondent, nor authorized the Respondent to register or use a domain name, which includes the BOYLE Trade Mark, and the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in the registration and use of the Domain Name. The Respondent has acted in bad faith in acquiring the Domain Name and setting up the Website, when the Respondent clearly knew of Complainant’s rights. There is no commercial advantage in setting up such a website other than to trade on the Complainant’s reputation or to sell the Domain Name to the Complainant or a competitor.

Therefore, as per the Policy, Paragraph 4(a)(ii) and the rules, Paragraph 3(b)(ix)(2), the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the Domain Name. The Respondent’s bad faith is demonstrated by it clearly seeking to cause confusion for their own commercial benefit. The Respondent has not only used the Trade Marks in the Domain Name, but has also presented the Website in a manner closely resembling

the Complainant's branding. The Website contains similar content, messaging, and design elements to the Complainant Website. Moreover, in a historic capture of the Respondent's website dated August 2025, mentioned above, the Respondent explicitly referred to themselves as "your trusted Irish gambling website", falsely suggesting an affiliation with the Complainant. Moreover, any click on the Website redirects the user to other sites, which appear to change over time. During the course of preparing the Complaint, the sites to which users were redirected included <https://tikitaka.com/en/> and <https://luckygem44.com>, both of which are online betting platforms. This pattern of redirecting users to multiple, unrelated betting sites demonstrates that the Respondent's intent is not to operate a legitimate website under the Domain Name, but rather to exploit the Complainant's reputation and goodwill for commercial gain in bad faith. In addition, the redirected website <https://tikitaka.com/en/> is commonly referred to online as a scam site, further highlighting the misleading and deceptive nature of the Respondent's conduct. The Respondent's use of the Trade Marks, combined with the imitation of branding and the redirection of users to a different commercial online betting sites, constitutes a clear attempt to deceive consumers and exploit the Complainant's established goodwill. Internet users are likely to be misled into believing that the Domain Name is associated with the Complainant, demonstrating that the Respondent has registered and is using the Domain Name in bad faith.

B. Respondent

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

6. Discussion and Findings

Procedural Issue – Location of the Respondent

Under paragraph 10 of the Rules, the Panel is required to ensure that the Parties are treated with equality and that each Party is given a fair opportunity to present its case, and also that the administrative proceedings take place with due expedition.

The location of the Respondent disclosed by the Registrar appears to be in Ukraine, which is subject to an international conflict at the date of this Decision that may impact case notification. It is therefore appropriate for the Panel to consider, in accordance with its discretion under paragraph 10 of the Rules, whether the proceedings should continue.

Having considered all the circumstances of the case, the Panel is of the view that it should. The Panel notes that the notice of the Complaint with Annexes, and the invitation to submit the Response was delivered to the email address of the Respondent, provided by the Registrar. It is moreover noted that, for the reasons which are set out later in this Decision, the Panel has no doubt that the Respondent registered and has used the Domain Name in bad faith and with the intention of unfairly targeting the Complainant's goodwill in the Trade Marks and misleading consumers.

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

A. Identical or Confusingly Similar

The Complainant has shown that it has registered rights in the Trade Marks. The Domain Name is confusingly similar to the Trade Marks as it incorporates the dominant element BOYLE of the Trade Marks. The addition of the term "-casino" in the Domain Name reinforces the finding of confusing similarity between the Domain Name and the Trade Marks, as it refers to services provided by the Complainant (see WIPO Overview of WIPO Panel Views on Select UDRP Questions ("[WIPO Overview 3.1](#)"), section 1.8; see also, inter alia *TPI Holdings, Inc. v. Carmen Armengol*, WIPO Case No. [D2009-0361](#), and *F. Hoffmann-La Roche AG v. John Mercier*, WIPO Case No. [D2018-0980](#)). The generic Top-Level Domain ("gTLD") ".com" is typically disregarded under the confusing similarity test, since it is a technical registration requirement ([WIPO](#)

[Overview 3.1](#), section 1.11.1). Therefore, the Panel finds that the Domain Name is confusingly similar to the Trade Marks in which the Complainant has rights.

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. See [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 2.1.

Based on the evidence and the undisputed submissions of the Complainant, the Panel concludes that the Respondent has not received the Complainant’s authorization or consent to use the BOYLE element of the Trade Mark as part of the Domain Name, is not commonly known by the Domain Name, and has not acquired trade mark rights in the Domain Name. In addition, the Respondent’s use of the Domain Name does not constitute a bona fide offering of goods or services, nor a legitimate noncommercial use of the Trade Marks. First, the Website uses the BOYLE element of the Trade Marks and the favicon of the Complainant Website, while offering services identical to those offered on the Complainant Website. This creates the false impression of the Website being operated by the Complainant. Furthermore, when the user clicks a button on the Website, it is redirected to the website of a competitor of the Complainant.

In view of the above, the Panel concludes that the Complainant has established that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in the Domain Name.

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. This list of non-exhaustive circumstances that may indicate that a domain name was registered and used in bad faith, leaves open that other circumstances may be relevant in assessing whether a respondent’s registration and use of a domain name is in bad faith. See [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 3.2.1.

Based on the undisputed information and the evidence provided by the Complainant, the Panel finds that at the time of registration of the Domain Name the Respondent was or should have been aware of the Trade Marks, since:

- the Respondent’s registration of the Domain Name occurred three years after the registration of the earliest of the Trade Marks;
- the Website willfully creates confusion with the Complainant Website:
 - (i) by using the BOYLE element of the Trade Marks
 - (ii) displaying in the address bar of the Website the same favicon as the Complainant Website, and
 - (iii) containing the following text:
“Originally operating as BoyleSports Casino, the platform underwent a complete rebrand in 2025 to create a more focused online casino experience whilst maintaining its connection to the respected BoyleSports brand” while offering identical services as the Complainant.

Since the Respondent has no authorization from or other affiliation with the Complainant, and was or should

have been aware of the Complainant's rights at the time of registration, the Panel concludes that the Domain Name was registered in bad faith.

With regard to bad faith use, the Panel finds that the use of the BOYLE element of the Trade Marks in the Domain Name and on the Website for offering services identical as the Complainant, while redirecting users who activate a button on the Website to the website of a competitor of the Complainant, implies that the Respondent has intentionally attempted to attract, for commercial gain, Internet users to its website, by creating a likelihood of confusion with the Trade Marks and the Complainant as to the source, sponsorship, affiliation, or endorsement of the Website and the services offered. In addition, the following circumstances taken together warrant a finding of bad faith use of the Domain Name:

- the probability that the Respondent was aware or should have been aware of the Complainant's rights in the Trade Marks;
- the lack of a formal Response of the Respondent;
- the use upon registration of the Domain Name of a proxy service and, as disclosed by the Registrar, an incomplete or non-existing address, apparently to hide the identity of the Respondent.

Therefore, the Panel concludes that the Domain Name has been registered and is being used in bad faith.

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

/Wolter Wefers Bettink/

Wolter Wefers Bettink

Sole Panelist

Date: April 8, 2026.