

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

Betsson Services Limited v. Valentina Nikolaeva
Case No. D2026-0895

1. The Parties

The Complainant is Betsson Services Limited, Malta, represented by Abion GmbH, Switzerland.

The Respondent is Valentina Nikolaeva, Ukraine.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <inkabet-online.com> is registered with NameCheap, Inc. (the “Registrar”).

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the “Center”) on March 2, 2026. On March 2, 2026, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On March 3, 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 (Redacted for Privacy) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on March 3, 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 5, 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 6, 2026. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was March 26, 2026. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent’s default on March 27, 2026.

The Center appointed Reyes Campello Estebaranz as the sole panelist in this matter on April 8, 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 forms part of the Betsson group as a subsidiary of Betsson AB, a company incorporated in Sweden. The Complainant's group operates internationally, providing gaming and gambling entertainment services since 1963 under various brands, including BETSSON, BETSAFE, NORDICBET, and INKABET. It offers sportsbook, casino, and other gaming services through licenses in 23 jurisdictions and employs approximately 2,200 people of various nationalities across 18 locations.

On October 1, 2021, the Complainant's group acquired the INKABET brand and the associated online gaming business, including an online sportsbook and casino platform primarily serving customers in Peru via the website "www.inkabet.pe".

The Complainant owns numerous trademark registrations for the INKABET brand, including:

- Peruvian Trademark Registration No. S00120441, INKABET LA EMOCION DE GANAR (figurative), registered on December 27, 2019, with the following graphic representation:



- Peruvian Trademark Registration No. S00070538, INKABET.COM (figurative), registered on February 29, 2012, with the following graphic representation:



- Peruvian Trademark Registration No. T00045865, INKABET (figurative), registered on January 15, 2026, with the following graphic representation:



- Peruvian Trademark Registration No. T00045858, INKABET (word), registered on January 15, 2026; and

- Mexican Trademark Registration No. 1742776, INKABET (word), registered on April 12, 2017.

(Hereinafter collectively referred to as the "INKABET Mark", unless specific reference is made to any individual mark.)

The Complainant also owns several domain names corresponding to its INKABET Mark, including <inkabet.pe> and <pronosticosinkabet.pe>, which resolve to the group's official websites. Through these websites, the Complainant provides information to Internet users and prospective consumers regarding the INKABET Mark and its products and services.

The disputed domain name was registered on November 21, 2024, and currently resolves to a Spanish-language website that prominently reproduces the INKABET Mark in its header, using a color scheme and design similar to those used in, and protected by, the aforementioned Peruvian Trademark Registration No. T00045865. The website further reproduces images from the Complainant's official websites, as well as their branding design and color scheme (black and orange on a white background). The website does not

provide any information regarding its owner or the registrant of the disputed domain name, nor does it include any disclaimer text indicating a lack of affiliation with the Complainant. Instead, the website identifies itself as “Inkabet online”, “Inkabet Perú”, or simply “Inkabet”, and includes statements such as “Inkabet sitio oficial” (Inkabet official site), “Tragamonedas en Inkabet” (slots in Inkabet), and “Inkabet online es una plataforma de apuestas en línea que ha ganado popularidad rápidamente, especialmente en Perú. Con su amplia oferta de juegos de casino y apuestas deportivas, es uno de los principales competidores en el mercado” that can be translated as “Inkabet online is a top online betting platform that has rapidly gained popularity, especially in Peru. With its wide range of casino games and sports betting options, it is one of the leading competitors in the market.”

The website associated with the disputed domain name further claims to be officially authorized and regulated by the relevant Peruvian authority, namely the Ministry of Foreign Trade and Tourism (MINCETUR), and provides two purported license numbers (“La plataforma está regulada por el Ministerio de Comercio Exterior y Turismo (MINCETUR) bajo las licencias no. 11002603010000 y 21002603010000”). It asserts that these licenses ensure compliance with local and international online gambling regulations, thereby providing users with a high level of confidence. Additionally, the website contains multiple links redirecting users to third-party platforms, including BIG CLASH (“www.bigclash-4949.com”), as well as sections requiring user registration through links that appear to be flagged or blocked due to potential phishing or fraudulent activity. The copyright notice of the site states, “Copyright © 2026. All rights reserved.”

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 the INKABET Mark. The disputed domain name incorporates the INKABET Mark in its entirety, followed by the term “online” separated by a hyphen. This addition does not prevent a finding of confusing similarity, as the mark remains clearly recognizable within the disputed domain name. The generic Top-Level-Domain (“gTLD”) “.com” is a standard registration requirement and may be disregarded for the purpose of this assessment.

The Complainant further contends that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the disputed domain name. There is no relationship between the Parties, and the Respondent has not been authorized to use the INKABET Mark. There is no evidence that the Respondent is commonly known by the disputed domain name or that she owns any corresponding trademark rights. Internet searches for the terms “inkabet online” return results exclusively related to the Complainant, its trademark, and its acquisition of the INKABET brand in 2021. In contrast, searches combining these terms with the Respondent’s name yield no relevant results. Likewise, searches conducted in the Global Brand Database reveal no trademark registrations owned by the Respondent, nor any registrations for the term “inkabet online”. The composition of the disputed domain name creates a likelihood of confusion and a false association with the Complainant, which is further reinforced by the content and design of the Respondent’s website. The website appears to have been designed to mislead Internet users for commercial gain, including through a potential phishing scheme involving links to unaffiliated third-party websites requesting sensitive personal information. Such use cannot constitute a bona fide offering of goods or services, nor a legitimate noncommercial or fair use of the disputed domain name. Given the inherent value of personal data, the collection of such information in this manner further underscores the absence of any legitimate interest.

Finally, the Complainant contends that the disputed domain name was registered and is being used in bad faith. The INKABET Mark is widely known, particularly in the gaming sector, and enjoys a strong online presence, such that any Internet search readily identifies the Complainant and its trademark. The composition of the disputed domain name, together with the content of the Respondent’s website,

demonstrates that the Respondent had knowledge of the Complainant and its trademark at the time of registration and deliberately targeted them in order to create confusion and a false association, thereby taking unfair advantage of their reputation. The disputed domain name has been used in bad faith to resolve to a website that impersonates the Complainant as part of a potential phishing scheme, evidencing an intentional effort to deceive users by creating a false impression of affiliation. Furthermore, the Respondent's website invites users to "login" and "register", only to redirect them to unaffiliated third-party websites that request sensitive personal data, such as phone numbers, email addresses, and passwords. This conduct clearly indicates a fraudulent intent.

B. Respondent

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

6. Discussion and Findings

6.1 Preliminary Matters

The Panel notes that no communication has been received from the Respondent. The Respondent's postal address is listed in Ukraine, which, as of the date of this Decision, is affected by an ongoing international conflict that could potentially impact the delivery of case-related notifications.

In accordance with its discretion under paragraph 10 of the Rules, the Panel has considered whether the proceedings should continue (see *Wilshire Refrigeration & Appliance, Inc. v. Oleksandr Kliuiev, Henryslist.com*, WIPO Case No. [D2024-0962](#)).

Having reviewed all the circumstances, the Panel concludes that the proceedings should proceed.

In particular, the Panel notes that the Center used both the Registrar's contact form and the Respondent's email address, as recorded with the Registrar, to notify the Complainant; and there is no evidence indicating that the notification emails were not successfully delivered.

Furthermore, the Respondent registered the disputed domain name on November 21, 2024, more than two years after the onset of the international conflict, which suggests that the Respondent remains capable of controlling both the disputed domain name and its associated content. Having apparently received notification of the Complaint by email, the Respondent would have been in a position to prepare and submit a Response had she wished to do so.

The Panel also notes that the website to which the disputed domain name resolves is in Spanish and displays gambling authorization licenses purportedly issued by the relevant Peruvian authorities. This suggests that the website is targeted at, and possibly operated in connection with, Peru. Such circumstances support the inference that the Respondent may not, in fact, be located in Ukraine and is capable of controlling the website and receiving email communications related to the disputed domain name.

Moreover, for the reasons set out later in this Decision, the Panel considers—despite the absence of a Response—that the Respondent registered and has used the disputed domain name in bad faith, with the intention of unfairly targeting the Complainant's goodwill in its trademarks.

Accordingly, the Panel finds that it may proceed to a decision and draw appropriate inferences from the Respondent's failure to submit a Response. While such failure does not automatically result in a decision in favor of the Complainant, the Panel may draw adverse inferences from the Respondent's default (see WIPO Overview of WIPO Panel Views on Select UDRP Questions ("[WIPO Overview 3.1](#)"), section 4.3; see also *Verner Panton Design v. Fontana di Luce Corp.*, WIPO Case No. [D2012-1909](#)).

6.2 Substantive Matters

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 3.1](#), section 1.7.

The Complainant has shown rights in respect of a trademark or service mark for the purposes of the Policy, namely the INKABET Mark. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.2.1.

The entirety of the mark is reproduced within the disputed domain name, followed by the term "online" separated by a hyphen. The Panel finds the mark is recognizable 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 the term "online" separated by a hyphen, may bear on assessment of the second and third elements, the Panel finds the addition of such term 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 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 disputed domain name bears no resemblance to the Respondent's name as disclosed in the Registrar verification, and confirms that, according to the Global Brand Database, the Respondent does not own any trademark registrations.

The Panel further notes that the Respondent's website impersonates the Complainant by prominently displaying the INKABET Mark in its header and throughout its content, using the same color scheme (black and orange), as well as a highly similar design and overall look and feel to that of the Complainant's official websites. The Panel also observes that the Respondent's website displays various official images and screenshots apparently taken from the Complainant's websites, and uses expressions that create confusion and a false impression of affiliation with the Complainant and its INKABET Mark. The website does not

provide any information regarding its true owner or the registrant of the disputed domain name, nor does it disclose the absence of any relationship with the Complainant or its trademark.

The Panel further observes that the Respondent's website seeks to create user trust by referring to an alleged official authorization and license issued by the Peruvian authorities. The site also includes links to competing third-party websites in the gambling and betting sector, as well as links inviting users to register on the Respondent's platform, which require the submission of sensitive personal information for access or registration.

The Panel finds that such use creates confusion and a false impression of affiliation, which cannot give rise to rights or legitimate interests under the Policy. On the contrary, such conduct indicates an intention to impersonate the Complainant and its business in order to unfairly benefit from its reputation in the gambling and betting sector, either by increasing traffic to the Respondent's website and related third-party sites for commercial gain, or by fraudulently obtaining users' sensitive personal information through a phishing scheme.

In either case, panels have consistently held that the use of a domain name for illegitimate or illegal activity—such as impersonation, phishing, or other forms of fraud—can never confer rights or legitimate interests on a respondent. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 2.13.1.

Accordingly, the Panel finds that the second element of the Policy has been established.

C. Registered and Used in Bad Faith

For the purposes of paragraph 4(a)(iii) of the Policy, paragraph 4(b) sets out certain circumstances which, in particular but without limitation, shall be evidence of the registration and use of a domain name in bad faith when found by the Panel to be present.

These non-exhaustive circumstances may indicate that a domain name was registered and is being used in bad faith; however, other factors may also be relevant in assessing bad faith registration and use. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 3.2.1.

In the present case, the Panel notes that the INKABET Mark is notorious within its sector and enjoys a strong online presence, particularly in relation to the Peruvian and broader South American markets. The Panel has confirmed that Internet searches for the term "INKABET" consistently return results referring to the Complainant, its prior rights, and its gambling and betting business.

The fact that the Respondent uses the disputed domain name in connection with a website that not only prominently displays the INKABET Mark using the same color scheme and graphic elements registered by the Complainant in Peru (i.e., Peruvian Trademark Registration No. T00045865), but also targets the same gambling and betting sector and jurisdiction in which the mark is notorious, makes it evident that the Respondent was aware of the Complainant and its trademark at the time of registration and intentionally targeted it in bad faith.

The Respondent's website attempts to impersonate the Complainant and pass itself off as an official website in order to derive unfair commercial benefit from this false association, including through redirection to competing gambling-related websites and/or the collection of users' sensitive data in a potential phishing scheme. Such conduct constitutes unlawful activity and, accordingly, bad faith use, particularly in a high-risk environment. A phishing scheme in this context may be especially harmful to Internet users, given that the gambling and betting sector involves the handling of funds and financial transactions. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 3.4.

Accordingly, having reviewed the record, the Panel finds that the Respondent's registration and use of the disputed domain name constitute bad faith under the Policy. In particular, 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 website and the services offered therein, within the meaning of paragraph 4(b)(iv) of the Policy, likely as part of a fraudulent phishing scheme.

The Panel therefore 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 <inkabet-online.com> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Reyes Campello Estebarez/

Reyes Campello Estebarez

Sole Panelist

Date: April 15, 2026