

## **ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION**

Citexar S.A. v. ILJA SPICINS

Case No. D2026-0837

### **1. The Parties**

The Complainant is Citexar S.A., Belgium, represented by Bird & Bird (Belgium) LLP, Belgium.

The Respondent is ILJA SPICINS, Latvia.

### **2. The Domain Name and Registrar**

The disputed domain name <goldenpalaced.com> 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 26, 2026. On February 26, 2026, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On February 26, 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 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 February 27, 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 Yuri Chumak as the sole panelist in this matter on April 2, 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 Belgian company active since 1992 in the leisure and entertainment sector, particularly in the field of games of chance and sports betting. The Complainant operates 45 licensed gaming halls across Belgium and offers associated services, including through its online platform at the domain name <goldenpalace.be>.

The Complainant owns several trademark registrations for the mark GOLDEN PALACE, including:

- Benelux figurative trademark, registration number 1485926, registered on August 29, 2023;
- Benelux figurative trademark, registration number 1485924, registered on August 29, 2023;
- French word trademark GOLDEN PALACE, registration number 4574363, registered on December 13, 2019.

The disputed domain name <goldenpalaced.com> was registered on December 17, 2025.

The disputed domain name resolves to a website presenting itself as an online casino platform under the name "Golden Palace - Casino en ligne 2026". The website reproduces elements associated with the Complainant's branding, including references to the Complainant's business, history and visual presentation, including the Complainant's logo. The website contains links which redirect Internet users to third-party gambling platforms. A disclaimer appears at the bottom of the webpage stating that the site is not "related to the brand."

#### **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 the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to its GOLDEN PALACE trademarks, incorporating the mark in its entirety with the addition of the letter "d".

The Complainant further submits that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name. The Respondent is not affiliated with the Complainant and has not been authorized to use its trademarks. The use of the disputed domain name to host a website featuring pay-per-click ("PPC") links and mimicking the Complainant's business does not constitute a bona fide offering.

The Complainant also contends that the disputed domain name was registered and is being used in bad faith. The Respondent is said to have intentionally attempted to attract Internet users for commercial gain by creating a likelihood of confusion with the Complainant's mark and by replicating aspects of the Complainant's business.

##### **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 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, notwithstanding the addition of the letter "d", the disputed domain name is confusingly similar 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 illegitimate activity, here, passing off, can never confer rights or legitimate interests on a respondent. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 2.13.1. Similarly, a respondent's use of a complainant's mark to redirect users to a competing site) would not support a claim to rights or legitimate interests. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 2.5.3.

The presence of a disclaimer at the bottom of the website does not cure the overall misleading nature of the disputed domain name and associated content.

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 finds that the Respondent registered and is using the disputed domain name in bad faith.

The disputed domain name incorporates the Complainant's mark in its entirety with a minor variation, which is consistent with typo-squatting and indicates targeting of the Complainant.

The content of the website reproduces elements associated with the Complainant and describes its business and corporate history, indicating that the Respondent was aware of the Complainant and its trademarks at the time of registration.

The Respondent has used the disputed domain name to attract Internet users to a website passing off as the Complainant and containing links redirecting to competing third-party gambling services. Such use appears intended to generate commercial gain by creating a likelihood of confusion with the Complainant's mark, consistent with paragraph 4(b)(iv) of the Policy. Noting that the overall circumstances of this case point to the Respondent's bad faith, the Panel finds that the presence of the disclaimer at the bottom of the website is rather an admission by the Respondent that users may be confused.

Panels have held that the use of a domain name for passing off 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 constitute 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 <goldenpalaced.com> be transferred to the Complainant.

*/Yuri Chumak/*

**Yuri Chumak**

Sole Panelist

Date: April 13, 2026