

## **ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION**

KamaGames Entertainment Group Limited v. UBG CP, CPUBG  
Case No. D2026-1283

### **1. The Parties**

The Complainant is KamaGames Entertainment Group Limited, United Kingdom, represented by Kosnahan Law, United Kingdom.

The Respondent is UBG CP, CPUBG, Philippines.

### **2. The Domain Name and Registrar**

The disputed domain name <pokeristi.com> is registered with GMO Internet, Inc. d/b/a Discount-Domain.com and Onamae.com (the "Registrar").

### **3. Procedural History**

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the "Center") on March 25, 2026. On March 26, 2026, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On March 27, 2026, the Registrar transmitted by email to the Center its verification response disclosing registrant and contact information for the disputed domain name which differed from the named Respondent (Whois Privacy Protection Service c/o GMO Internet, Inc., Whois Privacy Protection Service by onamae.com) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on March 27, 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 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 Respondent of the Complaint, and the proceeding commenced on April 9, 2026. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was April 29, 2026. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent's default on May 4, 2026.

The Center appointed Sebastian M.W. Hughes as the sole panelist in this matter on May 6, 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**

##### **A. Complainant**

The Complainant is a company headquartered in the United Kingdom and providing a range of social gaming related apps under the trade marks POKERIST and POKERIST.COM (the "Trade Mark(s)"), including via its website at "www.pokerist.com".

The Complainant is the owner of registrations in jurisdictions worldwide for the Trade Marks, including United Kingdom registration No. 00910675627 for the POKERIST.COM Trade Mark, with a registration date of June 15, 2012; and United States of America registration No. 4099075 for the POKERIST Trade Mark, with a registration date of February 14, 2012.

##### **B. Respondent**

The Respondent is apparently an individual or entity located in the Philippines.

##### **C. The Disputed Domain Name**

The disputed domain name was registered on March 9, 2026.

##### **D. Use of the Disputed Domain Name**

The disputed domain name was previously resolved to a Chinese language website promoting online gambling, casino and gaming related services (the "Website").

As at the date of this Decision, the disputed domain name is no longer resolved to an active website.

#### **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 name.

Notably, the Complainant contends that the disputed domain name has been registered and used in bad faith, and without the approval or authorisation of the Complainant, to promote third party gambling related services via the Website.

##### **B. Respondent**

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

## **6. 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 trade mark 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 trade marks or service marks for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.2.1.

The Panel finds the Trade Marks are recognizable within the disputed domain name. The disputed domain names consists of a misspelling of the POKERIST Trade Mark (through the addition of the letter "i"). [WIPO Overview 3.01](#), section 1.9. Accordingly, the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to the marks for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.7.

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 name. 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 name such as those enumerated in the Policy or otherwise. To the contrary, the disputed domain name has been used to promote third party gambling related services via the Website, without the approval or authorisation of the Complainant.

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 finds that the Respondent's registration and use of the disputed domain names in respect of the Website constitutes bad faith under paragraph 4(b)(iv) of the Policy.

The fact that the disputed domain names no longer resolve to an active website does not prevent a finding of bad faith.

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 name <pokeristi.com> be transferred to the Complainant.

*/Sebastian M.W. Hughes/*

**Sebastian M.W. Hughes**

Sole Panelist

Date: May 8, 2026