ARBITRATION
AND
MEDIATION CENTER

WIPO
WORLD
INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY
ORGANIZATION

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION
Gambling Management S.A. v. Alexander Alexandrov
Case No. D2026-0949

1. The Parties

The Complainant is Gambling Management S.A., Belgium, represented by COGITUS SRL, Belgium.

The Respondent is Alexander Alexandrov, Kazakhstan.

2. The Domain Names and Registrar

The disputed domain names <casinocircuseu.com> (the "First Domain Name"), and <circuscasinofr.com> (the "Second Domain Name") (collectively referred to as the "Domain Names") are registered with Hosting Concepts B.V. d/b/a Registrar.eu. (the "Registrar").

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the "Center") on March 5, 2026. On March 6, 2026, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the Domain Names. On March 7, 2026, the Registrar transmitted by email to the Center its verification response disclosing registrant and contact information for the Domain Names which differed from the named Respondent (N/A) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on March 16, 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 17, 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 23, 2026. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was April 12, 2026. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent's default on April 13, 2026.

The Center appointed Piotr Nowaczyk as the sole panelist in this matter on April 17, 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 provides licensed online gambling and sports betting services in Belgium. In particular, it operates the official online casino website located at the domain name <circus-casino.be> (the "Official Website"), which constitutes the online extension of the physical Casino de Namur and is operated in accordance with the applicable Belgian regulatory framework.

The Complainant further clarifies that it operates the Official Website under the relevant license and subject to the supervision of the Belgian Gaming Commission, in association with Circus Belgium S.A., a company with its seat in Belgium.

Circus Belgium S.A. is the owner of numerous CIRCUS and CIRCUS CASINO trademark registrations, including:

- the European Union Trade Mark Registration for Circus (figurative trademark) No. 018025773, registered on October 20, 2020 (the "First Trademark"); and

- the European Union Trade Mark Registration for  (figurative trademark) No. 018544938, registered on March 10, 2022 (the "Second Trademark").

The Complainant is the licensee of Circus Belgium S.A. (the "Licensor") in respect of the First Trademark and the Second Trademark (collectively referred to as the "Trademarks").

The Domain Names were registered on October 20, 2025.

At the time of the filing of the Complaint, the Domain Names resolved to websites displaying the First Trademark and presenting themselves as online casino platforms, with layout and content similar to those of the Complainant's Official Website.

As of the date of this Decision, the Domain Names resolve to websites that purport to offer online casino and gambling services, with a different presentation.

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 Domain Names.

First, the Complainant contends that the Domain Names are confusingly similar to the Trademarks in which the Complainant has rights.

Second, the Complainant argues that the Respondent has neither rights nor legitimate interests in the Domain Names.

Third, the Complainant submits that the Domain Names were registered and are being used in bad faith.

B. Respondent

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

6. Discussion and Findings

6.1. Preliminary Matters – The Complainant's Standing to File the Complaint

The Complainant brings the Complaint on the basis that it is the licensee of the Licensor in respect of the Trademarks.

Panels have held that a trademark owner's affiliate such as a subsidiary of a parent or of a holding company, or an exclusive trademark licensee, is considered to have rights in a trademark under the UDRP for purposes of standing to file a complaint. See section 1.4.1 of the WIPO Overview of WIPO Panel Views on Select UDRP Questions ("WIPO Overview 3.1").

While panels have been prepared to infer the existence of authorization to file a UDRP case based on the facts and circumstances described in the complaint, they may expect parties to provide an explanation of the relationship between the entities and/or relevant evidence of authorization to file a UDRP complaint, especially if the companies are not named in the complaint as co-complainants. See section 1.4.1 of the WIPO Overview 3.1.

In the present case, the Complainant has provided a unilateral declaration from the Licensor confirming the existence of a license agreement in respect of the Trademarks. The Complainant has also submitted an authorization by which the Licensor empowers the Complainant to initiate proceedings based on the Trademarks.

Based on the foregoing, the Panel is satisfied that the Complainant has rights in the Trademarks under the UDRP for purposes of standing to file the Complaint.

6.2. Substantive Matters – Three Elements

Paragraph 4(a) of the Policy places a burden on the Complainant to prove the presence of three separate elements, which can be summarized as follows:

(i) the Domain Names are identical or confusingly similar to a trademark or service mark in which the Complainant has rights;

(ii) the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in the Domain Names; and

(iii) the Domain Names have been registered and are being used in bad faith.

The applicable standard of proof in UDRP cases is the "balance of probabilities" or "preponderance of the evidence"; some panels have also expressed this as an "on balance" standard. Under this standard, a party should demonstrate to a panel's satisfaction that it is more likely than not that a claimed fact is true. See section 4.2 of the WIPO Overview 3.1.

A. Identical or Confusingly Similar

Under the first element, the Complainant must establish that the Domain Names are identical or confusingly similar to the Trademarks in which the Complainant has rights.

As noted above, the Complainant holds valid rights in the Trademarks. The Domain Names incorporate the First Trademark in its entirety. As numerous UDRP panels have held, in cases where a domain name incorporates the entirety of a trademark, the domain name will normally be considered confusingly similar to that mark. See section 1.7 of the WIPO Overview 3.1.

The addition of the terms "casino" and "eu" in the First Domain Name, as well "casino" and "fr" in the Second Domain Name does not prevent a finding of confusing similarity between the Domain Names and the Complainant's First Trademark. Panels have consistently held that where the relevant trademark is recognizable within the disputed domain name, the addition of other terms (whether descriptive, geographical, pejorative, meaningless, or otherwise) would not prevent a finding of confusing similarity under the first element. See section 1.8 of the WIPO Overview 3.1.

The Top-Level Domain ("TLD") ".com" in the Domain Names is viewed as a standard registration requirement and as such is typically disregarded under the first element confusing similarity test. See section 1.11.1 of the WIPO Overview 3.1.

Given the above, the Panel finds that the Domain Names are confusingly similar to the Complainant's First Trademark. Thus, the Panel finds the first element of the Policy has been established.

B. Rights or Legitimate Interests

Under the second element, the Complainant must prove that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in the Domain Names.

A right or legitimate interest in the Domain Names may be established, in accordance with paragraph 4(c) of the Policy, if the Panel finds any of the following circumstances:

(i) that the Respondent has used or made preparations to use the Domain Names or a name corresponding to the Domain Names in connection with a bona fide offering of goods or services prior to the dispute; or

(ii) that the Respondent is commonly known by the Domain Names, even if the Respondent has not acquired any trademark rights; or

(iii) that the Respondent is making a legitimate noncommercial or fair use of the Domain Names without intent for commercial gain to misleadingly divert consumers or to tarnish the Trademarks.

In the present case, the Panel finds that the Complainant has established a prima facie case that the Respondent does not have any rights or legitimate interests in the Domain Names, and the burden of production of evidence shifts to the Respondent. See section 2.1 of the WIPO Overview 3.1. Although given the opportunity, the Respondent has not submitted any evidence indicating that any of the circumstances foreseen in paragraph 4(c) of the Policy are present in this case.

On the contrary, it results from the evidence on record that the First Trademark in which the Complainant has right predate the Respondent's registration of the Domain Names. There is no evidence in the case record that the Complainant and/or the Licensor have licensed or otherwise permitted the Respondent to use the First Trademark or to register the Domain Names incorporating this trademark. There is also no evidence to suggest that the Respondent has been commonly known by the Domain Names.

The Panel considers that the composition of the Domain Names carries a risk of implied affiliation with the Complainant. See section 2.5.1. of the WIPO Overview 3.1.

Moreover, it results from the evidence on record that the Respondent does not make use of the Domain Names in connection with a bona fide offering of goods or services, nor does it make a legitimate noncommercial or fair use of the Domain Names. On the contrary, at the time of the filing of the Complaint, the Domain Names resolved to websites displaying the First Trademark and presenting themselves as online casino platforms, with layout and content similar to those of the Complainant's Official Website. As of the date of this Decision, the Domain Names resolve to websites that purport to offer online casino and gambling services, with a different presentation. Such use of the Domain Names in this case does not confer rights or legitimate interests on the Respondent.

In sum, the Respondent has failed to invoke any circumstances, which could demonstrate, pursuant to paragraph 4(c) of the Policy, any rights or legitimate interests in respect of the Domain Names. Thus, there is no evidence in the case file that refutes the Complainant's prima facie case. The Panel concludes that the second element of the Policy has been established.

C. Registered and Used in Bad Faith

Under the third element, the Complainant must prove that the Domain Names have been registered and are being used in bad faith.

Bad faith under the UDRP is broadly understood to occur where a respondent takes unfair advantage of or otherwise abuses a complainant's mark. See section 3.1 of the WIPO Overview 3.1.

Under paragraph 4(b) of the Policy, evidence of bad faith registration and use includes, without limitation:

(i) circumstances indicating the domain name was registered or acquired primarily for the purpose of selling, renting, or otherwise transferring the domain name registration to the owner of a trademark or to a competitor of the trademark owner, for valuable consideration in excess of the documented out-of-pocket costs directly related to the domain name; or

(ii) circumstances indicating that the domain name was registered in order to prevent the owner of a trademark from reflecting the mark in a corresponding domain name, provided it is a pattern of such conduct; or

(iii) circumstances indicating that the domain name was registered primarily for the purpose of disrupting the business of a competitor; or

(iv) circumstances indicating that the domain name has intentionally been used in an attempt to attract, for commercial gain, Internet users to a website or other online location, by creating a likelihood of confusion with a trademark as to the source, sponsorship, affiliation, or endorsement of the website or location or of a product or service on a website or location.

As indicated above, the Trademarks in which the Complainant has rights predate the registration of the Domain Names. This Panel finds that the Respondent was or should have been aware of the Complainant's Trademarks at the time of registration, as it has been proven to the Panel's satisfaction that these Trademarks are well known, and unique to the Complainant, at least in the online gambling sector. Thus, the Respondent could not ignore the reputation of the Trademarks.

Furthermore, at the time the Complaint was filed, the Domain Names resolved to websites which prominently featured the Complainant's First Trademark and presented themselves as online casino platforms, with layout and content similar to those of the Complainant's Official Website. As noted by the Complainant, the websites explicitly represented themselves as "Circus Casino Belgique" and falsely claimed that the platform operated under a license issued by the Belgian Gaming Commission.

Moreover, as evidenced by the Complainant, user interaction with key elements of the websites, such as the game icons, did not lead to any genuine service but instead redirected users to third-party gambling platforms via affiliate tracking URLs. This indicates a commercial affiliate scheme and that Domain Names were used as a traffic-capture gateway.

As of the date of this Decision, the Domain Names resolve to websites that purport to offer online casino and gambling services, albeit with a different presentation.

The Panel finds, having regard to the totality of the circumstances of the case, that the Respondent has intentionally attempted to attract, for commercial gain, Internet users to the websites associated with the Domain Names by creating a likelihood of confusion with the Complainant's Trademarks as to the source, sponsorship, affiliation, or endorsement of these websites.

For the reasons discussed above, the Panel finds the third element of the Policy has been established.

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 Domain Names <casinocircuseu.com> and <circuscasinofr.com> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Piotr Nowaczyk/
Piotr Nowaczyk
Sole Panelist
Date: April 22, 2026