

## **ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION**

Quickspace Marketing Management LLC v. Srdan Andelkovic, Sunwin Vibes Limitada, Minh Thong Tran, and Tran Hoang Thai  
Case No. D2026-1196

### **1. The Parties**

The Complainant is Quickspace Marketing Management LLC, United Arab Emirates, internally represented.

The Respondents are Srdan Andelkovic, Sunwin Vibes Limitada, Costa Rica, Minh Thong Tran, Viet Nam, and Tran Hoang Thai, Viet Nam.

### **2. The Domain Names and Registrars**

The disputed domain names <789club2026.info> and <hitclub.game> are registered with NameCheap, Inc.

The disputed domain names <hit-club.tv>, <hitclubx.tv>, <hitclubz.tv>, <hit-club1.net>, <hitclub2.app>, <789clubm.win>, <789-club.win>, and <789clubx.app> are registered with Nicenic International Group Co., Limited.

In this Decision, NameCheap, Inc. and Nicenic International Group Co., Limited are referred to as the “Registrars”.

### **3. Procedural History**

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the “Center”) on March 19, 2026. On March 20, 2026, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrars requests for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain names. On March 23 and March 26, 2026, the Registrars transmitted by email to the Center their verification responses, disclosing registrant and contact information for the disputed domain names which differed from the named Respondent (Srdan Andelkovic, Sunwin Vibes Limitada, Unknown Registrants / 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 26, 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 the disputed 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 an amended Complaint on March 31, 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 Respondents of the Complaint, and the proceedings commenced on April 9, 2026. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was April 29, 2026. The Respondents did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondents’ default on May 1, 2026.

The Center appointed John Swinson as the sole panelist in this matter on May 13, 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 operates an entertainment gaming platform and mobile application offering a variety of games to customers. The Complainant says it has used the domain name <789.club> since 2014 and the domain name <hit.club> since 2020 in connection with its gaming services. The Complainant’s services are operated under the brand names “HitClub” and “789Club”.

The Complainant owns a number of trademark registrations for marks relating to these brand names, including the following:

- HIT CLUB, European Union (“EU”) Registration No. 019188206, date granted August 31, 2025;
- HITCLUB, EU Registration No. 019188318, date granted August 31, 2025;
- HIT.CLUB, EU Registration No. 019188307, date granted August 31, 2025;
- HIT CLUB (figurative), German Registration No. 302025110147, date granted June 24, 2025;
- 789.CLUB, EU Registration No. 019211565, date granted November 14, 2025;
- 789.CLUB (figurative), German Registration No. 302025111218, date granted June 27, 2025;
- 789 CLUB, German Registration No. 302025110857, date granted July 17, 2025; and
- 789CLUB, German Registration No. 302025110858, date granted June 25, 2025.

The Complainant holds further related EU Intellectual Property Office (“EUIPO”) and German (DPMA) registrations for variations of the HIT CLUB and 789 CLUB marks. All of the Complainant’s earliest trademark registrations date from 2025, with the earliest German registrations granted in June 2025 and the EUIPO registrations granted between August and November 2025. The Complainant owns registrations for a stylized logo including the words “Hit Club” see for example EUIPO Registration No. 019188308 granted on August 31, 2025. This is referred to as the “Hit Club Logo” in this Decision. The Complainant owns a registration for a stylized logo including the words “789.Club” - German Registration No.302025111218 granted on June 27, 2025.

The Complainant uses the following domain names for its business: <789.club> since 2014 and <hit.club> since 2020.

Details of the disputed domain names are as follows:

<hit-club.tv>, <hitclubx.tv>, <hitclubz.tv>, <hit-club1.net>, <hitclub2.app>, <789clubm.win>, <789-club.win>, and <789clubx.app>, registered between October 22, 2025 and February 7, 2026 with the registrant being Srdan Anđelković, Sunwin Vibes Limitada.

<hitclub.game> registered on July 17, 2025 with the registrant being Minh Thong Tran.

<789club2026.info> registered on February 22, 2026 with the registrant being Tran Hoang Thai.

At the date of this Decision, the disputed domain names do not resolve to active websites. In the past, some of the websites at the disputed domain names have been utilized to offer gambling services that compete with those of the Complainant, employing branding that is similar to the Complainant's marks and using the Complainant's Hit Club Logo.

Some of the named Parties in this dispute have been involved in prior disputes under the Policy, including *Sunwin Information Technology LLC v. Srdan Anđelković, Sunwin Vibes Limitada, Sunwin Vibes, Sunwin Vibes Content Writing Service, Srdan Anđelković, Sunwin Vibes Limitada*, WIPO Case No. [D2025-5040](#); and *Quickspace Marketing Management LLC v. Sunwin Vibes Limitada*, WIPO Case No. [D2025-5044](#).

## 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.

In summary, the Complainant makes the following submissions.

The disputed domain names incorporate the marks HITCLUB and 789CLUB, or visually equivalent variants thereof. The disputed domain names are composed of the Complainant's distinctive, registered trademarks HITCLUB and 789CLUB. The presence of a random number or letter added to the mark or the presence of a hyphen to separate the distinct words comprised in the trademark, does nothing to diminish the confusing similarity between the Complainant's trademarks and the disputed domain names.

The Complainant says the Respondents have no rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain names, having never been authorized to use the Complainant's marks, and that there is no evidence that the Respondents have been commonly known by the disputed domain names.

The use being made of the disputed domain names cannot be characterized as a bona fide offering of goods or services, given that the Respondents' websites prominently feature the Complainant's trademarks in connection with the services offered by the Complainant without any explanation of the lack of relationship between the Respondents and the Complainant, which increases the likelihood of confusion amongst Internet users who might think that the disputed domain names are owned, related, or otherwise endorsed by the Complainant, which is not accurate.

The disputed domain names exhibit clear indicia of typosquatting, including the intentional addition of extraneous letters or words, and the use of various Top-Level Domains.

The Respondents have engaged in a pattern of cybersquatting falling within the ambit of paragraph 4(b)(ii) of the Policy. Specifically, the Respondents have systematically and repeatedly targeted the Complainant's registered trademarks. This is evidenced by the registration of domain names corresponding to the Complainant's marks and their prominent use for similar commercial activities, thereby infringing upon the Complainant's rights as an established commercial enterprise.

## **B. Respondents**

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

## **6. Discussion and Findings**

To succeed, the Complainant must demonstrate that all of the elements enumerated in paragraph 4(a) of the Policy have been satisfied, namely:

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

(ii) the Respondents have no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the disputed domain names; and

(iii) the disputed domain names have been registered and are being used in bad faith.

The onus of proving these elements is on the Complainant.

Each of the disputed domain names must be considered separately.

### **Consolidation: Multiple Respondents**

The amended Complaint was filed in relation to nominally different domain name registrants. The Complainant alleges that the domain name registrants are the same entity or mere alter egos of each other, or under common control. The Complainant requests the consolidation of the disputes against the multiple disputed domain name registrants pursuant to paragraph 10(e) of the Rules.

The disputed domain name registrants did not comment on the Complainant's request.

Paragraph 3(c) of the Rules states that a complaint may relate to more than one domain name, provided that the domain names are registered by the same domain name holder.

In addressing the Complainant's request, the Panel will consider whether (i) the disputed domain names or corresponding websites are subject to common control; and (ii) the consolidation would be fair and equitable to all Parties. See WIPO Overview of WIPO Panel Views on Select UDRP Questions (["WIPO Overview 3.1"](#)), section 4.11.2.

As regards common control, the Complainant alleges that two of the disputed domain names <hitclub.game> and <789club2026.info> are under the control of Sunwin Vibes Limitada. The Complainant asserts that this conclusion can be made because of the analogous nature of the content displayed on the websites associated with the disputed domain names <hitclub.game> and <789club2026.info> when compared to the disputed domain names registered by Sunwin Vibes Limitada.

Additionally, the Complainant provided a screenshot from the websites at <789club2026.info> which explicitly displays an email address using the domain name <sunvibes.ltd> which further shows is associated with Srdan Anđelković of Sunwin Vibes Limitada.

As regards fairness and equity, the Panel sees no reason why consolidation of the disputes would be unfair or inequitable to any Party.

Accordingly, the Panel decides to consolidate the disputes regarding the nominally different disputed domain name registrants (referred to below as "the Respondent") in a single proceeding.

## **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 two trademarks or service marks for the purposes of the Policy, being HITCLUB and 789CLUB. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.2.1.

The Panel finds one of the Complainant's marks HITCLUB or 789CLUB are recognizable within each of the disputed domain names. Accordingly, the disputed domain names are confusingly similar to one of the Complainant's marks for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.7.

Although the addition of other terms in the disputed domain names 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 in respect of each of the disputed domain names.

## **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 activity (here, claimed passing off) 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**

Generally speaking, a finding that a domain name has been registered and is being used in bad faith requires an inference to be drawn that the respondent in question has registered and is using the disputed domain name to take advantage of its significance as a trademark owned by (usually) the complainant.

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.

The disputed domain names were registered after the Complainant registered its trademark for HITCLUB and 789CLUB. That the Respondent registered domain names involving two of the Complainant's trademarks is evidence that the Respondent was aware of the Complainant.

Importantly, some of the disputed domain names were registered after December 30, 2025, which was the date that the Respondent was notified of another complaint against it, involving the same Complainant and same trademarks (*Quickspace Marketing Management LLC v. Sunwin Vibes Limitada*, WIPO Case No. [D2025-5044](#)). All but one of the disputed domain names were registered after a cease and desist letter was sent to the Respondent by the Complainant on September 12, 2026 regarding other domain names and the 789CLUB mark.

Some of the disputed domain names have been used for websites that compete with the Complainant and that use the Complainant's trademarks.

Panels have held that the use of a domain name for illegitimate activity (here, claimed passing off) 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.

Some of the disputed domain names may not have been used. 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. To the contrary, in 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 distinctiveness or reputation of the Complainant's trademark, the composition of the disputed domain name, and the Respondent's knowledge of the Complainant's rights, and finds that in the circumstances of this case the passive holding of the disputed domain name does not prevent a finding of bad faith under the Policy.

In view of the number of disputed domain names in this case, and taking into account the domain names that were in dispute in *Quickspace Marketing Management LLC v. Sunwin Vibes Limitada* (supra), the Panel finds that paragraph 4(b)(ii) of the Policy applies here, namely that the Respondent has registered the disputed domain names in order to prevent the Complainant from reflecting its HITCLUB or 789CLUB marks in corresponding domain names, and that the Respondent has engaged in a pattern of such conduct.

The Panel also finds that paragraph 4(b)(iii) applies in the present case.

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 <hitclub.game>, <hit-club.tv>, <hitclubx.tv>, <hitclubz.tv>, <hit-club1.net>, <hitclub2.app>, <789clubm.win>, <789-club.win>, <789clubx.app>, and <789club2026.info> be transferred to the Complainant.

*/John Swinson/*

**John Swinson**

Sole Panelist

Date: May 27, 2026