

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

Central Professional Unit Solution Co. Ltd. v. Srdan Andelkovic, Sunwin Vibes Limitada

Case No. D2026-1172

1. The Parties

The Complainant is Central Professional Unit Solution Co. Ltd., Cambodia, internally represented.

The Respondent is Srdan Andelkovic, Sunwin Vibes Limitada, Costa Rica and Serbia.

2. The Domain Names and Registrars

The disputed domain names <go88.bz>, <go88i.vip>, and <trangchugo88.cc> are registered with NameCheap, Inc., the disputed domain name <go88chinhthuc2026.net> is registered with Spaceship, Inc., and the disputed domain names <go88k.pro>, <go88real2026.com>, <go88x.bet>, <go88xi.org>, <go88xs.org> and <go88z.bet> are registered with Nicenic International Group Co., Limited. NameCheap, Inc., Spaceship, Inc., and Nicenic International Group Co., Limited are hereinafter referred to individually as the “Registrar” or collectively as the “Registrars”.

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the “Center”) on March 18, 2026 regarding seven of the disputed domain names and other three domain names. On March 19, 2026, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrars a request for registrar verification in connection with seven of the disputed domain names and three other domain names. On March 20, 2026, the Registrars transmitted by email to the Center its verification responses confirming that the Respondent is listed as the registrant and providing the contact details for seven of the disputed domain names and another entity is listed as the registrant for other three domain names.

The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on March 20, 2026 with the registrant and contact information of nominally multiple underlying registrants revealed by the Registrars, requesting the Complainant to either file separate complaint(s) for seven of the disputed domain names and other three domain names associated with different underlying registrants or alternatively, demonstrate that the underlying registrants are in fact the same entity and/or that all domain names are under common control. The Complainant filed the amended Complaint on March 25, 2026, removing other three domain names and adding the disputed domain names <go88x.bet>, <go88z.bet>, and <go88xs.org> to the proceedings.

On March 25, 2026, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain names <go88x.bet>, <go88z.bet>, and <go88xs.org>. On March 26, 2026, the Registrar transmitted by email to the Center its verification response confirming that the Respondent is listed as the registrant and providing the contact details for these disputed domain names.

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 April 7, 2026. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was April 27, 2026. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent’s default on April 28, 2026.

The Center appointed Iris Quadrio as the sole panelist in this matter on May 7, 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, Central Professional Unit Solutions Co. Ltd., is a company incorporated under the laws of Cambodia in February 2023, with its registered office in Phnom Penh, Cambodia. The Complainant is the holder of a portfolio of trademark registrations and domain names associated with the brand GO88, under which an online gaming and entertainment platform is operated by the Complainant’s licensee.

The Complainant is the owner of the following trademarks: (i) United States of America: GO88, Reg. No. 7766504, registered on April 22, 2025, for class 41; (ii) United Kingdom: GO88, Reg. No. UK00004287922, registered on January 23, 2026, for classes 9, 41, and 42; and (iii) Germany: GO88, Reg. No. 302025110145, registered on June 20, 2025, for classes 9, 41, and 42. All registrations are held in the name of the Complainant.

In addition to its registered rights, the Complainant claims unregistered trademark rights in the GO88 sign, based on use of the mark in connection with online gaming services since 2019, which predate the incorporation of the Complainant. According to the Complaint, the Complainant’s domain name <go88.com> was first registered in 2011 by an affiliate of the Complainant’s Director, which was then transferred to the Complainant’s Director in 2017, and was subsequently associated with the Complainant upon its incorporation in 2023. The Complainant has submitted Wayback Machine captures and Whois records of multiple domain names incorporating the GO88 trademark, including <go88.com>, <go88.cc> (registered in 2014), <go88.tv> and <go88.org> (registered in 2017), <go88.win> (registered in 2019), <go88.vip> and <go88.net> (registered in 2021), among others, evidencing the use of the GO88 sign through the Complainant’s licensees. The Complainant alleges that the GO88 mark has acquired substantial goodwill and recognition among consumers in connection with online gaming services.

The disputed domain names were registered between June 23, 2025 and March 13, 2026, all of them after the Complainant’s earliest registered trademark rights. According to the record, the disputed domain names resolve, or have resolved, to active websites offering or referring to online gambling and gaming services, displaying content in Vietnamese and reproducing the GO88 mark and figurative elements substantially similar to the Complainant’s logos, including the gold and black color combination and the use of a card-and-crown device. At the time of this Decision, the disputed domain name <go88.bz> redirects to a website that is blocked; the disputed domain name <go88chinhthuc2026.net> resolves to a blocked website; and the disputed domain names <go88i.vip>, <go88k.pro>, <go88real2026.com>, <go88x.bet>, <go88xi.org>, <go88xs.org>, <go88z.bet>, and <trangchugo88.cc> do not resolve to any active website.

The Respondent is identified, on the basis of registrar verification, as Srdan Andelkovic, Sunwin Vibes Limitada, with addresses on record in Costa Rica and Serbia. The Respondent filed its trademark application No. UK00004217829 on June 12, 2025 for GO88. Upon receipt of the Complainant's cease and desist letter, the Respondent withdrew its trademark application, and the trademark application was terminated on October 10, 2025.

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 that the disputed domain names are identical or confusingly similar to its GO88, WIN GO88, and GO88 GO88.COM trademarks, on which it claims rights both as a result of its trademark registrations in multiple jurisdictions and on the basis of unregistered common law rights derived from continuous and extensive use of the GO88 sign since 2019. The Complainant asserts that each of the disputed domain names reproduces the GO88 mark in its entirety, and that the addition of any suffix does not prevent a finding of confusing similarity. The Complainant further asserts that the use of different generic or country-code Top-Level Domains is immaterial for the purposes of the comparison.

The Complainant further contends that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the disputed domain names. The Complainant states that the Respondent is not related in any way to the Complainant and that it has not authorized, licensed, or otherwise permitted the Respondent to use its trademarks or to register any domain name incorporating them. The Complainant submits that the Respondent is not commonly known by the disputed domain names and that the Respondent's use of the disputed domain names does not constitute a bona fide offering of goods or services nor a legitimate noncommercial or fair use, but rather an attempt to impersonate the Complainant and to pass itself off as the Complainant or as an authorized licensee thereof.

Moreover, the Complainant contends that the disputed domain names were registered and are being used in bad faith. In particular, the Complainant asserts that the disputed domain names were registered with knowledge of the Complainant's prior rights in the GO88 mark and with the intention of trading off the goodwill and reputation that the Complainant has built in connection with its online gaming services. The Complainant submits that the websites associated with the disputed domain names have reproduced the Complainant's GO88 trademark with similar gold-and-black color combination, and card-and-crown device, and overall layout of the Complainant's official platform, purporting to offer online gaming services. The Complainant further submits that the Respondent has registered other domain names targeting the Complainant's GO88 mark, evidencing a pattern of abusive conduct (*Central Professional Unit Solution Co. Ltd. v. Srdan Andelkovic, Sunwin Vibes Limitada*, WIPO Case No. [D2025-5111](#)), and that the absence of any plausible legitimate use of the disputed domain names further supports a finding of bad faith.

Finally, the Complainant requests that the Panel order the transfer of the disputed domain names to the Complainant.

B. Respondent

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

6. Discussion and Findings

According to paragraph 4(a) of the Policy, for this Complaint to succeed in relation to the disputed domain names, the Complainant must prove each of the following, namely that:

- i. the disputed domain names are identical or confusingly similar with a trademark or service mark in which the Complainant has rights; and
- ii. the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interest in respect of the disputed domain names; and
- iii. the disputed domain names were registered and are being used in bad faith.

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 record shows that the Complainant is the owner of multiple trademark registrations for the GO88 mark (alone and in combination with other elements) in several jurisdictions, including the United States of America, the United Kingdom, and Germany, as set out in the Factual Background above.

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.

Disregarding the generic Top-Level Domain ("gTLD") or country-code Top-Level Domain ("ccTLD") in each case, the disputed domain names all reproduce the Complainant's GO88 trademark as a clearly recognizable element. In <go88.bz>, the disputed domain name reproduces the Complainant's mark in its entirety, with no additional terms. In <go88i.vip>, <go88k.pro>, <go88xi.org>, <go88xs.org>, <go88x.bet>, and <go88z.bet>, the disputed domain names reproduce the GO88 mark followed by single or short alphabetical strings ("i", "k", "xi", "xs", "x", "z"). In <go88real2026.com> and <go88chinhtuc2026.net>, the disputed domain names combine the GO88 mark with the terms ("real", and "chinh thuc" meaning "official" in Vietnamese) and the year "2026". In <trangchugo88.cc>, the disputed domain name incorporates the GO88 mark preceded by the Vietnamese term "trang chu" (meaning "home page").

Although the addition of other terms here, as described above, 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.

The Complainant asserts that it has not authorized, licensed, or otherwise permitted the Respondent to use the GO88 mark or to register any domain name incorporating it, and that no relationship exists between the Parties. There is no evidence on record suggesting that the Respondent has been commonly known by the disputed domain names or that the Respondent holds any trademark or other rights corresponding to them. The Registrars-disclosed information identifies the registrant as Srdan Andelkovic, Sunwin Vibes Limitada, a name that bears no correspondence to the disputed domain names. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 2.3.

Furthermore, the record establishes that the disputed domain names resolved, at the time the Complaint was filed, to active websites offering or referring to online gaming services and reproducing the Complainant's GO88 mark together with figurative elements substantially similar to the Complainant's logos, including the gold-and-black color combination and the card-and-crown device. The websites were presented in a manner apt to create the impression that they were operated by, or affiliated with, the Complainant or an authorized licensee thereof, which is reinforced by the incorporation in several of the disputed domain names with the additional terms such as "real", "chinh thuc" ("official"), and "trang chu" ("home page"). Such conduct cannot constitute a bona fide offering of goods or services within the meaning of paragraph 4(c)(i) of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 2.2.

Panels have held that the use of a domain name for illegitimate activity here, claimed impersonation and passing off as the Complainant 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 Complainant's earliest registered trademark rights in the GO88 mark date back to April 2025 (USPTO Registration No. 7766504), which predate the registration of all the disputed domain names, which were registered between June 2025 and March 2026. The Complainant has further submitted evidence of continuous use of the GO88 brand in connection with online gaming services through its licensee since 2019, supported by Wayback Machine captures of multiple domain names incorporating the GO88 element. Given the prior registration of the GO88 mark and the Complainant's evidence of use in the online gaming sector, the Panel considers it more likely than not that the Respondent was aware of the Complainant and its GO88-branded services at the time of registration of each of the disputed domain names. The composition of the disputed domain names, all of which incorporate the GO88 mark together with some terms either descriptive of the Complainant's field of activity ("real"), suggestive of official status ("chinh thuc", meaning "official"), or of a website structure ("trang chu", meaning "home page"), confirms that the Respondent had the Complainant and its GO88 mark in mind at the time of registration.

It is, in the Panel's view, that the Respondent selected 10 disputed domain names, each incorporating the GO88 mark, accompanied by some terms tailored to the Complainant's online gaming business, on purpose. The manner in which the disputed domain names were used further reinforces this conclusion.

The record establishes that, at the time the Complaint was filed, the websites associated with the disputed domain names reproduced the Complainant's GO88 mark together with figurative elements substantially similar to the Complainant's logos, including the gold-and-black color scheme and the card-and-crown device, and purportedly offered or referred to online gaming services. The websites were presented to evoke the Complainant's official platform and to create the impression that they were operated by, or affiliated with, the Complainant or an authorized licensee thereof. Such conduct falls squarely within paragraph 4(b)(iv) of the Policy, in that the Respondent has intentionally attempted to attract, for commercial gain, Internet users to its websites by creating a likelihood of confusion with the Complainant's mark as to the source, sponsorship, affiliation, or endorsement of the websites and the services offered thereon.

The Panel further notes that the Respondent has registered 10 domain names incorporating the GO88 mark over a period of several months. In addition, the Respondent was found in registering other domain names in bad faith in another case filed by the Complainant (*Central Professional Unit Solution Co. Ltd. v. Srdan Andelkovic, Sunwin Vibes Limitada, supra*). This conduct evidences a pattern of bad faith directed at the Complainant's mark within the meaning of paragraph 4(b)(ii) of the Policy.

Panels have held that the use of a domain name for illegitimate activity here, claimed impersonation and passing off as the Complainant 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 further notes that, at the time of this decision, the disputed domain names <go88i.vip>, <go88k.pro>, <go88real2026.com>, <go88x.bet>, <go88xi.org>, <go88xs.org>, <go88z.bet>, and <trangchugo88.cc> do not resolve to any active website, while the disputed domain names <go88.bz> and <go88chinhthuc2026.net> redirect to, or resolve to, blocked websites. Panels have found that the non-use of a domain name would not by itself prevent a finding of bad faith under the doctrine of passive holding. On the other hand, when looking at the totality of circumstances in each case, panels have found that the registration and non-use of a domain name can still constitute bad faith for purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 3.3. Having reviewed the available record, the Panel notes the prior reproduction of the Complainant's mark and figurative elements on the corresponding websites, the composition of the disputed domain names, the absence of any conceivable good faith use to which the disputed domain names could be put, and the Respondent's failure to submit a Response or otherwise come forward with any explanation, and finds that in the circumstances of this case the current non-use or blocked status of the disputed domain names does not prevent a finding of 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 names <go88.bz>, <go88chinhthuc2026.net>, <go88i.vip>, <go88k.pro>, <go88real2026.com>, <go88x.bet>, <go88xi.org>, <go88xs.org>, <go88z.bet>, and <trangchugo88.cc> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Iris Quadrio/

Iris Quadrio

Sole Panelist

Date: May 21, 2026