

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

Casino de SPA S.A. v. Amit Kekare
Case No. D2026-0750

1. The Parties

The Complainant is Casino de SPA S.A., Belgium, represented by COGITUS SRL, Belgium.

The Respondent is Amit Kekare, United Kingdom.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <777casinonl.bet> is registered with Devexpanse Ltd d/b/a Regery.com (the "Registrar").

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the "Center") on February 23, 2026. On February 23, 2026, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On February 23, 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 24, 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 March 2, 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 March 5, 2026. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was March 25, 2026. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent's default on March 26, 2026.

The Center appointed Philippe Gilliéron as the sole panelist in this matter on April 9, 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 Belgium company which is active in online gambling and related services.

The Complainant owns numerous trademarks on a worldwide basis consisting in all or in part of the terms "casino 777", including:

- European Union combined trademark n° 018384332 that was registered on September 11, 2021 in classes 9, 16, 28, 35, 38 and 41;
- European Union word trademark n° 014632244 that was registered on March 31, 2016 in classes 9, 28 and 41.

The Complainant further owns numerous domain names, such as <casino777.co.nl>, <casino777.nl>, <casinos-777.nl>, <777-bet.nl>, <777-bingo.nl>, <777-games.nl>, <777-sports.nl> among many others.

On September 8, 2025, the Respondent registered the disputed domain name. The disputed domain name relates to a website in Dutch language which reproduces the Complainant's logo and visual identity, including photographs originating from the Complainant's official website, to offer gambling and casino services.

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 the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to its trademarks as it entirely incorporates the terms "casino 777".

The Complainant then affirms that the Respondent does not have any rights or legitimate interest in the disputed domain name. He does not make any bona fide offering of goods and services under the disputed domain name and related website. He does not have any trademark corresponding to the disputed domain name, has never been licensed or authorized by the Complainant to use its trademarks and is not known under that name.

The Complainant finally is of the view that the disputed domain name was registered and is being used in bad faith. In light of the strong reputation enjoyed by the Complainant's trademarks, the Respondent was undoubtedly aware of its existence when he registered the disputed domain name. Furthermore, the use made of the website related to the disputed domain name, whose visual layout mirrors the Complainant's official one, amounts to a use in bad faith.

B. Respondent

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

6. Discussion and Findings

Paragraph 15(a) of the Rules instructs this Panel to “[...] decide a complaint on the basis of the statements and documents submitted and in accordance with the Policy, these Rules and any rules and principles of law that it deems applicable”.

Pursuant to paragraph 4(a) of the Policy, the Complainant must prove each of the following three elements to obtain an order that the disputed domain name should be cancelled or transferred:

- (i) the disputed domain name registered by the Respondent is identical or confusingly similar to a trademark or a service mark in which the Complainant has rights;
- (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. WIPO Overview of WIPO Panel Views on Select 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 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 3.1](#), 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 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.

Panels have held that the use of a domain name for an illegal activity here, claimed as the impersonation of the Complainant to arguably offer gambling services without any authorization to do so in breach of the applicable regulatory framework, 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 was obviously aware of the Complainant's CASINO 777 trademark when he registered the disputed domain names, as such a choice cannot be a pure coincidence but rather reflects a deliberate intent to appropriate the Complainant's trademark in an illegitimate way, particularly noting the similarity with the Complainant's logo on the website at the disputed domain name.

Paragraph 4(b) of the Policy sets out a list of non-exhaustive circumstances that may indicate that a domain name was registered and used in bad faith, but other circumstances may be relevant in assessing whether a respondent's registration and use of a domain name is in bad faith. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 3.2.1.

Panels have held that the use of a domain name for illegal activity here, claimed as the impersonation of the Complainant to offer gambling services without arguably any regulatory authorization to do so, constitutes bad faith. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 3.4. Having reviewed the record, the Panel finds the Respondent's registration and use of the disputed domain name constitutes 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 <777casinonl.bet> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Philippe Gilliéron/

Philippe Gilliéron

Sole Panelist

Date: April 15, 2026