

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

TIPWIN LIMITED v. Piter Haynes

Case No. D2026-0896

1. The Parties

The Complainant is TIPWIN LIMITED, Malta, represented by Kroher Strobel Rechts- und Patentanwälte PartmbB, Germany.

The Respondent is Piter Haynes, United States of America.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <tipwin-de.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 (Unknown (Redacted for Privacy) / The RDAP server redacted the value, Privacy Service Provided by Withheld for Privacy ehf) 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 4, 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 Teruo Kato as the sole panelist in this matter on April 1, 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 contends that it provides multi-channel sports betting services in the stationary and in the online area and that it was founded in 2011 as an international trading company and is an officially licensed sports betting organizer.

The Complainant submitted as Annex 6 an extract of the Complainant's website at "<https://tipwin.de/>" of March 2, 2026. The Panel was unable to verify its contents, because, for a reason unknown to the Panel, the Panel's attempts to access the said website have all been blocked.

The Complainant submitted documentary evidence indicating that it owns the European Union Trade Mark registration No. 018073646 TIPWIN (figurative), registered on October 31, 2019, for, among others, "Games software; Betting software" in class 9; "Providing access to gambling and gaming websites on the internet" in class 38, and "Gambling; Betting services; Casinos; Betting exchange services; On-line gambling services" in class 41.

The disputed domain name was registered on January 22, 2026.

The disputed domain name resolves to a website, mostly written in German, that purports to offer betting and gambling services, and the Complainant contends that the website at the disputed domain name features the Complainant's name and the registered trademark as above.

The website contains a statement written in German and English mixed, i.e. "Aktivieren Sie unseren 100% match up to €200 plus 50 free spins after account verification and limit setup. We process withdrawals within 24 hours via SEPA, Visa, Mastercard, PayPal, and Paysafecard; minimum deposit €10, minimum cashout €20. Licensed for Germany, we publish RTP for every slot and cap daily withdrawals at €5,000 for security. Live chat is available 08:00-24:00 CET, with email support 24/7. At Tipwin Online Germany, we maintain strict KYC, youth protection, and session reminders. New to our casino? Start with low-volatility games (96%+ RTP) und erkunden Sie dann Live-Tabellen, sobald Ihr Profil vollständig verifiziert ist. Exklusive wöchentliche Free-Spin-Drops Warten Sie auf verifizierte Spieler."

The Registrar confirmed the identity of the Respondent as Piter Haynes.

5. Parties' Contentions

A. Complainant

The Complainant contends that it has satisfied each of the elements required under the Policy for a cancellation of the disputed domain name, as more particularly set out in this Decision.

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, 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, "-de", 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 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 intentionally attempted to attract, for commercial gain, Internet users by creating a likelihood of confusion with the Complainant's mark. Policy, Paragraph 4(b)(iv).

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 illegitimate activity, such as copycat sites and passing off, as claimed by the Complainant here, constitutes bad faith. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 3.4.

The Panel also notes that the Respondent had engaged the use of the privacy service upon the registration, and that it has not participated in the present proceedings.

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 <tipwin-de.com> be cancelled.

/Teruo Kato/

Teruo Kato

Sole Panelist

Date: April 8, 2026