ARBITRATION
AND
MEDIATION CENTER

WIPO
WORLD
INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY
ORGANIZATION

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION
CDE Entertainment Ltd. v. Genetix FZCO
Case No. D2026-0916

1. The Parties

The Complainant is CDE Entertainment Ltd., United Kingdom, represented by HGF Law LLP, United Kingdom.

The Respondent is Genetix FZCO, United Arab Emirates.

2. The Domain Names and Registrar

The disputed domain names <larabet.com>, <larabet1.com>, <larabet2.com>, <larabet-2230.com>, <larabet3.com>, and <larabet-4222.com> are registered with GoDaddy.com, LLC (the "Registrar").

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the "Center") on March 3, 2026. On March 5, 2026, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain names. On March 5, 2026, the Registrar transmitted by email to the Center its verification response disclosing registrant and contact information for the disputed domain names which differed from the named Respondent and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on March 6, 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 March 10, 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 13, 2026. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was April 2, 2026. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent's default on April 7, 2026.

The Center appointed Willem J. H. Leppink as the sole panelist in this matter on April 15, 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 following facts are undisputed.

The Complainant is the owner of the European Union trademark LARA CROFT (word mark), with registration number No. 000549006, filed on May 28, 1997, and registered on January 4, 2000, claiming priority of April 1, 1997, registered inter alia for the goods in class 9 "computer games software; computer games; computer games provided through a global computer network; television games; video games" and for the services in class 41 "computer games services provided on a global computer network".

The Complainant is also the proprietor of goodwill in its business under this trademark. The first Tomb Raider game featuring the character "Lara Croft", was published in 1996, and, since that time, the LARA CROFT trademark has been used throughout the world, including in Europe, in relation to computer games. The "Lara Croft" character has further appeared in video game spin-offs, printed adaptations, global feature films, and merchandise related to the series. The promotion of the character includes a brand of apparel and accessories, action figures, and model portrayals. The character has been licensed for third-party promotion, including in television and print advertisements. Critics consider "Lara Croft" a significant game character in popular culture. "Lara Croft" holds numerous Guinness World Records, has a strong fan following, and is among the first video game characters to be successfully adapted to film.

Computer games under the LARA CROFT brand are popular in the gaming industry, with over 100 million Tomb Raider games sold worldwide.

The disputed domain name <larabet.com> was registered September 12, 2021. The disputed domain name <larabet1.com> was registered January 7, 2025. The disputed domain name <larabet2.com> was registered January 7, 2025. The disputed domain name <larabet3.com> was registered January 7, 2025. The disputed domain name <larabet-2230.com> was registered April 29, 2025. The disputed domain name <larabet-4423.com> was registered April 29, 2025.

At the time of filing the Complaint, all disputed domain names resolved to web pages with a similar look and feel, under the heading and logo "LARA BET", offering casino services and showing a depiction of what appear to the Panel as being the "Lara Croft" character. Only <larabet3.com> resolved to an inactive page. At the time of rendering this Decision this disputed domain name resolved to a page with the identical "LARA BET" logo stating that access is restricted.

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 names.

Notably, the Complainant contends the following.

The LARA CROFT trademark is reputed for "computer games", which is evidenced by an opposition decision by the European Union Intellectual Property Office ("EUIPO"). The disputed domain names are confusingly similar to the trademark. The element "lara" is a distinctive and dominant element in the disputed domain

names. Each disputed domain name reproduces the distinctive “lara” element at the head of the string with the secondary element “bet” (together “larabet”) being descriptive of gambling services.

The disputed domain names resolve to sites branded “LaraBet” and featuring Lara Croft themed imagery reinforcing that the disputed domain names were chosen to exploit the Complainant’s mark. The imagery consistently depicts a female character with a high degree of visual similarity to LARA CROFT, including comparable attire, pose, and action, and is deployed in a manner intended to capitalise on the character’s recognisable look and persona.

The Complainant (and its licensees) offers official LARA CROFT-branded real money gaming content in regulated environments, including licensed slot titles such as (i) Lara Croft Temples and Tombs and (ii) Lara Croft Tombs of the Sun (available through major operators such as Genting Casino and Mecca Bingo respectively). The Respondent’s use of “LaraBet” for unlicensed gambling services creates a direct risk of confusion with these legitimate offerings, misleading consumers and affiliates into believing the Respondent’s sites are endorsed or connected with the Complainant’s official gaming products.

The Respondent is not affiliated with the Complainant, nor has it been authorised, licensed, or otherwise permitted to use the Complainant’s mark in any form, including as part of a domain name, or for gambling services. The Respondent is not commonly known by the disputed domain names. WhoIs and RDAP records confirm that registrant details are masked by privacy/proxy services. There is no evidence that the Respondent has any legitimate trademark rights or business name corresponding to “LaraBet” or “LARA CROFT”. Such use constitutes impersonation and implied affiliation, which panels consistently find to negate any claim of rights or legitimate interests.

By using the disputed domain names to operate and redirect to gambling sites branded “LaraBet”, the Respondent intentionally seeks to attract users for commercial gain by creating a likelihood of confusion as to source, sponsorship and/or endorsement. The Respondent registered multiple domain names incorporating the distinctive element of the Complainant’s mark, resolving to different Respondent-owned websites. This pattern of registration is clear evidence of bad faith under Policy. It is clear that the Respondent was aware of the Complainant’s intellectual property rights; evidenced by the use of “Lara Croft” themed imagery.

The Complainant became aware of a European Union trademark application for LARABET (No. 019157455) filed by a third party potentially connected to the Respondent’s commercial scheme. The stylization of the applied for trademark is identical to that used on the websites to which the disputed domain names resolve. The Complainant initiated opposition proceedings before EUIPO based on its prior rights, including in the mark that is invoked here. The opposition has been deemed admissible and the proceedings are currently in the contentious stages in which the parties are invited to file facts, evidence and arguments in support of their respective positions. On September 22, 2025, the Complainant sent a formal cease-and-desist letter to the operator of the disputed domain names demanding cessation of use of “LaraBet” branding and transfer of some of the disputed domain names. No response was received.

B. Respondent

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

6. Procedural Issue

The Panel noted that opposition proceedings before EUIPO are taking place between the Complainant and the Respondent or a party affiliated to the Respondent. Paragraph 18(a) of the Rules gives the panel discretion to suspend, terminate, or continue these proceedings where the disputed domain name is also the subject of other pending legal proceedings. As the disputed domain names are not part of these opposition proceedings, the Panel finds that it can proceed with rendering this decision.

7. 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 names. 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 Panel finds the mark is recognizable within the disputed domain names. Accordingly, the disputed domain names are confusingly similar to the mark for the purposes of the Policy. WIPO Overview 3.1, section 1.7.

Although the content of the website associated with the domain name is usually disregarded by panels when assessing confusing similarity under the first element, the Panel finds that from the contents of the website associated with the disputed domain names, it appears clearly that the Respondent sought to target the Complainant's mark through the disputed domain names. See WIPO Overview 3.1, section 1.15.

Although the addition of other terms, here for all but one disputed domain name numbers, may bear on assessment of the second and third elements, the Panel finds the addition of such terms does not prevent a finding of confusing similarity between the disputed domain names 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 names. 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 names such as those enumerated in the Policy or otherwise.

Panels have held that the use of a domain name for illegitimate and illegal activities, here as claimed unlicensed / illegal gambling and impersonation 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 by registering and using the disputed domain names intentionally attempted to attract, for commercial gain, Internet users by creating a likelihood of confusion with the Complainant's mark. This is reinforced by the fact that by registering multiple domain names the Respondent has engaged in a pattern of such conduct.

Panels have held that the use of a domain name for illegitimate and illegal activities, here as claimed illegal / unlicensed gambling and impersonation, 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 names constitutes bad faith under the Policy.

The Panel finds that the Complainant has established the third element of the Policy.

8. 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 names <larabet.com>, <larabet1.com>, <larabet2.com>, <larabet-2230.com>, <larabet3.com>, and <larabet-4222.com> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Willem J. H. Leppink/
Willem J. H. Leppink
Sole Panelist
Date: April 27, 2026