ARBITRATION
AND
MEDIATION CENTER

WIPO
WORLD
INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY
ORGANIZATION

# ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION
CASINO DE SPA S.A. v. Finnja, Kerl, Gollnow-Platzer
Case No. D2026-0673

## 1. The Parties

The Complainant is CASINO DE SPA S.A., Belgium, represented by COGITUS SRL, Belgium.

The Respondent is Finnja, Kerl, Gollnow-Platzer.[1]

## 2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <casino777-mx.com> is registered with Web Commerce Communications Limited dba WebNic.cc (the "Registrar").

## 3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the "Center") on February 17, 2026. On February 17, 2026, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On February 18, 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 19, 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 20, 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 the Rules, paragraphs 2 and 4, the Center formally notified the Respondent of the Complaint, and the proceedings commenced on February 23, 2026. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was March 15, 2026. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent's default on March 16, 2026.

[1] The Registrar did not confirm the country of the Respondent.

The Center appointed Mladen Vukmir 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 the Rules, paragraph 7.

## 4. Factual Background

The Complainant is a company incorporated under the laws of Belgium, active in the gambling and casino sector.

The Complainant is the owner of numerous trademarks of CASINO 777 and 777 trademarks registered in various jurisdictions, including, among others, the CASINO 777 word trademark registered in the European Union on March 31, 2016, under the registration number 014632244 for goods and services in Classes 9, 28 and 41 of International Classification, the figurative CASINO 777 trademark registered in the European Union on September 11, 2021, under the registration number 018384332 for goods and services in Classes 9, 16, 28, 35, 38 and 41, and the figurative 777 trademark registered in the European Union on January 8, 2017, under the registration number 017178451 for goods and services in Classes 9, 28, 35, 38 and 41 of International Classification (the "CASINO 777 trademarks").

The Complainant holds the domain names <casino777.es>, <bet777.es>, and <777.es>, which are used in connection with its online gambling activities.

The disputed domain name was registered on August 28, 2025. At the time of filing of the Complaint, the disputed domain name resolved to a website in Spanish offering online gambling services. The website reproduced elements of the Complainant's branding and offered services similar to those 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 disputed domain name.

Notably, the Complainant contends that:

i) the Complainant is a company active in the gambling and casino sector and is the owner of numerous CASINO 777 and 777 trademarks registered in various jurisdictions. As stated in the Complaint, the Gaming operator of the Complainant's websites is Digital Distribution Management Ibérica S.A., which is the official owner of the licenses issued by the Spanish Directorate General for the Regulation of Gambling Access.

ii) the disputed domain name is identical or confusingly similar to its CASINO 777 trademarks, as it incorporates the distinctive element "777" together with the term "casino", which the Complainant submits is inherently distinctive and not descriptive for the relevant services. The Complainant further argues that "777" is a dominant and recognizable element associated with its marks, and that the combination "CASINO 777" has been consistently recognized in prior administrative proceedings as distinctive in the gambling sector

iii) the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the disputed domain name, submitting that it is used in connection with a website offering casino and real-money gambling services in Spanish that are identical to those of the Complainant, and that the website reproduces the visual identity, structure, promotional content, and overall look and feel of the Complainant's official platforms, thereby targeting the Complainant's CASINO 777 trademarks and associated domain names. The Complainant further argues that the Respondent's website displays gambling license details belonging to the Complainant's licensed operator, Digital Distribution Management Ibérica S.A., thereby falsely suggesting authorization or affiliation with the Complainant. In addition, the Complainant submits that users attempting to register are redirected

to an external third-party landing page with tracking parameters, demonstrating that the disputed domain name is used to divert Internet users for commercial gain rather than for any bona fide offering of goods or services.

iv) the disputed domain name was registered and is being used in bad faith, arguing that the Respondent deliberately registered a domain name incorporating the Complainant's well-known CASINO777 / 777 trademarks together with the geographic element "mx" to target Spanish-speaking users and benefit from the Complainant's reputation. The Complainant further submits that the Respondent's website reproduces its branding, including its logo, visual identity, and references to the official domain name <casino777.es>, demonstrating prior knowledge and intentional targeting, and also displays genuine gambling license details belonging to the Complainant's authorized operator to falsely suggest affiliation, while redirecting users to an unrelated third-party platform with affiliate tracking parameters, which the Complainant contends shows that the disputed domain name is used as a traffic diversion mechanism to attract users for commercial gain by creating a likelihood of confusion as to source, sponsorship, affiliation, or endorsement under paragraph 4(b)(iv) of the Policy.

**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 ("WIPO Overview 3.1"), section 1.7.

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

The Complainant is the holder of a number of CASINO 777 trademarks registered before the competent authorities worldwide. As such, the Panel finds the Complainant has shown rights in respect of a trademark or service mark for the purposes of the Policy.

The entirety of the mark is reproduced within the disputed domain name. Accordingly, the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to the mark for the purposes of the Policy. WIPO Overview 3.1, section 1.7.

Although the addition of other terms (here, a hyphen and the term "mx") may bear on assessment of the second and third elements, the Panel finds that the addition of such elements does not prevent a finding of confusing similarity between the disputed domain name and the mark for the purposes of the Policy. WIPO Overview 3.1, section 1.8.

The Panel further notes that the applicable Top-Level Domain (".com") is generally disregarded for the purpose of the comparison under the first element.

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 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 notes that the Complainant has not authorized the Respondent to use its CASINO 777 trademarks, and there is no evidence that the Respondent is commonly known by the disputed domain name. Furthermore, the disputed domain name resolves to a website offering gambling services similar to those of the Complainant and redirects users to third-party websites, which does not constitute a bona fide offering of goods or services. Nor does such use represent a legitimate noncommercial or fair use of the disputed domain name.

Panels have held that the use of a domain name for illegitimate activity, including passing off and the operation of copycat websites, 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**

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 has intentionally attempted 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 the Respondent's website. Specifically, the Respondent registered a domain name that incorporates the Complainant's CASINO 777 trademark in its entirety, together with the addition of a hyphen and the term "mx", which is commonly understood as a country code designation for Mexico. The Panel finds that the composition of the disputed domain name supports a finding that the Respondent sought to target Spanish-speaking Internet users by leveraging the Complainant's established reputation.

Paragraph 4(b) of the Policy sets out a non-exhaustive list of circumstances that may indicate bad faith. WIPO Overview 3.1, section 3.2.1. The Panel finds that the Respondent was aware of the Complainant and its trademarks at the time of registration of the disputed domain name. This is supported by the content of the website to which the disputed domain name resolves, which features a graphic logo identical or highly similar to the Complainant's registered "777" figurative mark and reproduces a color scheme and overall presentation closely resembling that of the Complainant's official websites. The Panel considers that such imitation constitutes evidence of prior knowledge and intentional targeting.

Panels have held that the use of a domain name for illegitimate activity, including copycat websites and passing off, constitutes bad faith. WIPO Overview 3.1, section 3.4. Having reviewed the record, the Panel finds that the Respondent's use of the disputed domain name constitutes such bad faith. In particular, the

disputed domain name resolves to a website offering gambling services while imitating the Complainant's visual identity and displaying references to regulatory licenses associated with the Complainant, thereby creating a misleading impression of legitimacy.

The Panel further notes that the disputed domain name is used to redirect Internet users to a third-party website containing affiliate tracking parameters. The Panel finds that such use seeks to capitalize on the Complainant's trademarks by diverting Internet traffic for commercial gain, which further supports a finding of 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 <casino777-mx.com> be transferred to the Complainant.

*/Mladen Vukmir/*
**Mladen Vukmir**
Sole Panelist
Date: April 6, 2026