

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

Bet Theory (Malta) Limited v. hb hb
Case No. D2026-1026

1. The Parties

The Complainant is Bet Theory (Malta) Limited, Malta, represented by Winston Taylor International LLP, United Kingdom.

The Respondent is hb hb, Cambodia.

2. The Domain Names and Registrar

The disputed domain names <stakemate77.com> and <stakemate77.net> 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 10, 2026. On March 11, 2026, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain names. On March 11, 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 (“Registration Private, DomainsByProxy.com”) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on March 13, 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 18, 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 19, 2026. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was April 8, 2026. The Response was filed with the Center on March 21, 2026.

The Center appointed Assen Alexiev as the sole panelist in this matter on March 27, 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.

On March 27, 2026, the Complainant informed the Center that its representative in the proceeding was changed to Winston Taylor International LLP and made an unsolicited supplemental submission.

4. Factual Background

The Complainant offers online group sports betting services and is licensed and regulated in Great Britain by the Gambling Commission under account No.66151.¹ The Complainant offers its betting services through its website at the domain name “www.stakemate.com”, which was launched on September 16, 2022, and displays the logo:



The Complainant also offers its betting services through its mobile phone application Stakemate, which has been available for use on iPhones and Android phones since May 26, 2023. The Complainant's Stakemate application displays the logo:



The Complainant is the owner of the United Kingdom trademark registration for **STAKEMATE** (the “STAKEMATE trademark”) with registration No. UK00003765168, registered on June 3, 2022, for services in International Class 41.



The Complainant is also the owner of the United Kingdom trademark registration for (the “Clapping Hands figurative trademark”) with registration No. UK00004015624, registered on May 10, 2024, for services in International Class 41.

The disputed domain names were registered on October 25, 2025. They are currently blocked by Internet browsers, which display the warning “Potentially unwanted content has been found”. According to the evidence submitted by the Complainant, at the time of filing of the Complaint the disputed domain names resolved to websites that offered sports betting services and displayed the logos:



and



The Respondent's websites did not provide any contact details other than an email address, and displayed the seal of Gaming Curacao. The Gaming Curacao website² states that this organisation ceased operations on August 18, 2024, that all active sub-licences and seals issued by Gaming Curacao are to be considered inactive, and that any attempt to display active seals or convey an extension of either the sub-license or master license will be considered fraudulent and illegal.

¹ <https://www.gamblingcommission.gov.uk/public-register/business/detail/66151>.

² <https://www.gaming-curacao.com/>.

The Respondent describes itself as an online casino and slot games platform serving the Australian market. However, the Register of licensed interactive gambling providers, available online on the official website of the Australian Communications and Media Authority (ACMA)³ does not include any entity with a name that includes “Stakemate” or “Stakemate77”. According to the ACMA website, “[t]he Interactive Gambling Act 2001 makes it illegal for gambling providers to offer some online services to people in Australia. Banned services include: online casinos, in-play sports betting, sports betting services which do not hold an Australian licence, and betting on the outcome of a lottery”.⁴

5. Parties’ Contentions

A. Complainant

The Complainant states that the disputed domain names are confusingly similar to its STAKEMATE trademark, because they reproduce the trademark in its entirety with the addition of the number “77”, which is insufficient to distinguish them from the Complainant’s trademark. The Complainant adds that the generic Top-Level Domain (“gTLD”) sections “.com” and “.net”, may be disregarded when assessing the similarity between its trademark and the disputed domain names.

According to the Complainant, the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the disputed domain names, because it has no relevant trademark registrations, there is no connection between the Parties, and the Complainant has not permitted the Respondent to use its intellectual property.

The Complainant maintains that the disputed domain names and the associated websites are operated by the same entity (the Respondent) given the identity of their second-level parts, the identical content of the websites, the same registration date, and the fact that links on the website at the disputed domain name <stakemate77.net> refer to pages on the website at the disputed domain name <stakemate77.com>.

The Complainant notes that the websites at the disputed domain names advertise and offer for commercial gain, seemingly in Australia but potentially elsewhere, a sports betting website and numerous social media profiles under the name “Stakemate77”, which uses the Complainant’s trademark, the name of its official application and a logo identical to the Complainant’s Clapping Hands figurative trademark and logo. The Complainant adds that the websites at the disputed domain names claim to be “Australia’s Most Strategic Betting Arena” and, “the premier global destination for gaming enthusiasts who crave excitement, integrity, and superior rewards”, that the country options available through a drop-down menu include more than 20 countries around the world, including the United Kingdom. The Complainant points out that the websites at the disputed domain names are promoted on YouTube, Trustpilot, Instagram, X, and Facebook, using the “Stakemate77” name and displaying the Clapping Hands logo. The Complainant notes that the Respondent is not listed in the licensing registers in the United Kingdom and Australia, so it is not licensed to operate betting websites targeted at United Kingdom or Australian consumers, and the websites at the disputed domain names are illegal in these two countries. The Complainant also notes that the websites at the disputed domain names display the seal of Gaming Curacao, which organisation ceased operations prior to the registration date of the disputed domain names.

The Complainant contends that the disputed domain names were registered and are being used in bad faith. The Complainant states that the websites at the disputed domain names deliberately copy the name and the logo of the Complainant to mislead people that they have an official partnership with the Complainant, and are being used to advertise and offer sports betting services for commercial gain, which directly compete with the Complainant’s sports betting services.

The Complainant adds that it sent a formal cease-and-desist letter to the Respondent on December 19, 2025, but received no response.

³ “<https://www.acma.gov.au/check-if-gambling-operator-legal>”.

⁴ “<https://www.acma.gov.au/about-interactive-gambling-act>”.

B. Respondent

The Respondent states that it operates the disputed domain name <stakemate77.com> as an online casino and pokies platform serving the Australian market exclusively. The platform's primary offering comprises online slot games, live casino tables, and casino-style gaming from established third-party providers, and a sportsbook feature is provided through a third-party white-label sports data provider.

The Respondent states that it was not aware of the Complainant's Stakemate sports betting application at the time of registering the disputed domain name or commencing operations.

The Respondent maintains that the businesses of the Parties operate in different countries, different regulatory environments, different market segments, and serve different consumer profiles. According to the Respondent, an Australian online casino operator conducting reasonable due diligence on a proposed brand name would search Australian trademark registers (where the Complainant held no registered marks at the relevant time), and would search for competing Australian online casino brands. The Complainant's application would not appear in such searches as a competitor or a conflicting brand.

The Respondent submits that the name "Stakemate77" was independently conceived as a compound of three distinct and independently sourced elements, none of which derives from or references the Complainant's brand. The element "stake" was inspired by "stake.com", which according to the Respondent is the world's largest and most recognised online casino platform by trading volume. The element "mate" is what the Respondent describes as a quintessentially Australian vernacular, and was included to signal the platform's Australian identity. According to the Respondent, the combination "stakemate" is a compound word that simultaneously evokes the act of wagering and the distinctly Australian spirit of the platform, and bears no conceptual relationship to the Complainant's STAKEMATE brand, while the addition of the element "77", being a universally-recognised symbol of luck and good fortune in casino gaming culture, reinforces the casino identity of the Respondent's brand.

The Respondent denies that the "Stakemate77 Partnership" banner on its website is a claim of official partnership with the Complainant. According to the Respondent, the "Partnership" section of its website is a standard industry affiliate and casino brand partnership page listing other online casino brands and gaming providers with whom the disputed domain name <stakemate77.com> has commercial affiliate arrangements, and this section does not suggest any connection with the Complainant's brand.

The Respondent maintains that it operates exclusively in the Australian market, because its platform transacts exclusively in Australian Dollars and integrates as a primary payment method PayID, which is an Australian-specific payment system operated by Australian financial institutions and is unavailable to European consumers. The Respondent denies that any dropdown country selection menu exists or existed on the disputed domain name <stakemate77.com>. The Respondent denies that the disputed domain name <stakemate77.com> targets consumers from the United Kingdom only because the website is accessible from there, and notes that accessibility does not constitute targeting.

The Respondent states that it has made bona fide use of the disputed domain names in connection with a genuine commercial online casino operation serving Australian consumers since the date of their registration. According to the Respondent, its platform maintains an established player base, active gaming operations, real commercial relationships with internationally-recognised game providers, and has a substantial ongoing business activity.

The Respondent states that it did not receive the Complainant's cease-and-desist letter, and became aware of the Complainant's concerns only upon receipt of the Complaint, after which it took immediate and proactive remedial steps. Notwithstanding its position that the Complaint should be dismissed, the Respondent removed the Gaming Curacao license seal from the website at the disputed domain name and commissioned a completely new logo for the platform, entirely independent of any hand or clapping motif. The Respondent also acknowledges that while it independently selected a clapping hands design as a generic celebratory casino icon, it accepts that the visual similarity to the Complainant's device mark, of

which it was unaware, creates an appearance it wishes to remedy proactively.

The Respondent requests a finding of Reverse Domain Name Hijacking (“RDNH”). According to it, the Complainant has made material factual misrepresentations in its Complaint and has used the UDRP procedure to eliminate a geographically and commercially distinct competitor brand rather than to address a genuine consumer confusion or trademark harm.

6. Discussion and Findings

6.1. Procedural issue – Supplemental submission by the Complainant

The Complainant has filed an unsolicited supplemental submission.

Paragraph 10(d) of the Rules vests the Panel with the authority to determine the admissibility, relevance, materiality and weight of the evidence, and also to conduct the proceedings with due expedition, and paragraph 12 of the Rules expressly provides that it is for the Panel to request, in its sole discretion, any further statements or documents from the Parties it may deem necessary to decide the case.

As noted in section 4.6 of the WIPO Overview of WIPO Panel Views on Select UDRP Questions (“[WIPO Overview 3.1](#)”), unsolicited supplemental filings are generally discouraged, unless specifically requested by the Panel. Panels have repeatedly affirmed that the party submitting or requesting to submit an unsolicited supplemental filing should clearly show its relevance to the case and why it was unable to provide the information contained therein in its complaint or response (e.g., owing to some unforeseen or exceptional circumstance).

The Complainant’s supplemental submission does not refer to any such unforeseen or exceptional circumstances and does not contain any new evidence or information necessary for the consideration of this matter. It does not affect the findings of the Panel on the substance of the dispute, and its acceptance would not contribute to the efficiency of the present proceeding.

Considering the above, the Panel finds that there is no justification for the acceptance of the Complainant’s supplemental submission, and decides not to accept it in the proceeding.

6.2. Substantive issues

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 the STAKEMATE trademark for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.2.1.

The Panel finds that the STAKEMATE trademark is recognisable within the disputed domain names. Accordingly, the disputed domain names are confusingly similar to the STAKEMATE trademark for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.7.

Although the addition of other terms (here, the number “77”), may bear on assessment of the second and third elements, the Panel finds the addition of such element does not prevent a finding of confusing similarity between the disputed domain names and the STAKEMATE trademark for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.8.

The Panel therefore finds that the first element of the Policy has been established.

B. Rights or Legitimate Interests and Bad Faith

As noted in section 2.15 of the [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), in some cases panels assess the second and third UDRP elements together, for example where clear indicia of bad faith suggest there cannot be any respondent rights or legitimate interests. In such cases, panels have found that the facts and circumstances of the case would benefit from a joint discussion of the policy elements. The Panel considers this to be so here.

The Response discusses only the content of the website at the disputed domain name <stakemate77.com>, and does not dispute the Complainant's contention that the website at the other the disputed domain name <stakemate77.net> was substantially, if not completely, identical to it at the time of filing of the Complaint. The Panel therefore accepts that there is no dispute between the Parties that the websites at the two disputed domain names were identical at the time of filing of the Complaint, as also appears from the evidence submitted by the Complainant.

The disputed domain names are confusingly similar to the Complainants' distinctive trademark STAKEMATE. The associated websites previously displayed logos that almost identically copied the Stakemate logo appearing on the Complainant's website combined with the Clapping Hands figurative trademark. The Respondent could not have designed such logos by coincidence. Its websites offered online games and sports betting services which are very similar to the services offered by the Complainant, but contained no contact details and no disclaimer for the absence of relationship with the Complainant. The Response is unsigned, does not name its author or indicate any contact details, and does not include the certifications required under the Rules. The contact details provided to the Registrar appear to be false.

In view of the above, the Respondent's denial of knowledge of and targeting of the Complainant, and its allegations about the independent creation of its brand "Stakemate77" are superficial and unconvincing. It rather appears that the Respondent has chosen to register and use the disputed domain names being well aware of the Complainant's STAKEMATE trademark and its goodwill in an attempt to exploit its goodwill for commercial gain by misleading Internet users that its websites are affiliated to the Complainant.

The Respondent asserts that the websites at the disputed domain names offer online casino games, slot games and sports betting to Australian Internet users. The Response however does not identify the entity that organises these activities and does not claim that it holds a license to operate in Australia. As evident from the official website of ACMA, there is no gambling license issued to a company operating under the name "Stakemate77", and the same website states that online casinos are illegal in Australia, while sports betting can only be organised by licensed operators. The Respondent's websites also displayed the seal of Gaming Curacao, which ceased operations more than one year before the registration of the disputed domain names. The display of this seal therefore appears to have been a fraudulent attempt to mislead visitors that the websites were duly licensed to operate.

It appears from the above that the Respondent's websites are not operating legally. Panels have held that the use of a domain name for illegal activity can never confer rights or legitimate interests on a respondent and constitutes bad faith. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), sections 2.13.1 and 3.4.

Considering the above, the Panel finds that the Respondent does not have rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain names, and that the disputed domain names have been registered and are being used in bad faith.

Therefore, the second and the third elements of the Policy have 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 disputed domain names <stakemate77.com> and <stakemate77.net> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Assen Alexiev/

Assen Alexiev

Sole Panelist

Date: April 10, 2026