

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

Tipico Group Ltd. v. Vitaliia Bolban
Case No. D2026-1367

1. The Parties

The Complainant is Tipico Group Ltd., Malta, represented by Boehmert & Boehmert, Germany.

The Respondent is Vitaliia Bolban, Ukraine.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <tipico-at.com> is registered with Dynadot Inc (the “Registrar”).

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the “Center”) on March 31, 2026. On March 31, 2026, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On April 2, 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 (Dynadot Privacy Service / Super Privacy Service LTD c/o Dynadot) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on April 2, 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 April 2, 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 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 Knud Wallberg as the sole panelist in this matter on May 5, 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 is part of the Tipco group of companies, an international provider of sports betting services and virtual games, headquartered in St Julian's, Malta.

The Complainant is the owner of a large portfolio of registered trademarks including European Union Trademark No. 003939998 for TIPICO (word) registered on September 23, 2005, European Union Trademark No. 011339835 for TIPICO (device) registered on May 3, 2013, and European Union Trademark No. 017913149 for TIPICO (device) registered on May 16, 2019.

The Complainant is also the owner of several domain names that contain the TIPICO trademark including <tipico.com>.

The disputed domain name <tipico-at.com> was registered on January 22, 2026. It resolves to a website that features the Complainant's registered word mark and the Complainant's registered logo and which appears to offer various betting services and games.

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 is confusingly similar to the Complainant's TIPICO trademark, since it contains the mark in its entirety with the addition of a hyphen and the geographical abbreviation for Austria "at".

The Complainant further submits that the Complainant has not licensed or otherwise permitted the Respondent to use any of its trademarks or to register the disputed domain name and that the Respondent is not making legitimate noncommercial or fair use of the disputed domain name. On the contrary, the Respondent's behavior shows a clear intent to obtain an unfair commercial gain, with a view to misleadingly diverting consumers or to tarnish the trademarks owned by the Complainant.

Finally, the Complainant submits that the disputed domain name was registered and is being used in bad faith. The Respondent started offering competing gambling games services immediately after registering the disputed domain name. It is thus that the Respondent has registered and is using the disputed domain name with the intention to attract, for commercial gain, Internet users to the website by creating a likelihood of confusion with the Complainant's TIPICO trademark as to the source, sponsorship, affiliation, or endorsement of its website or location or of a product or service on its website or location, which constitutes registration and use in bad faith pursuant to paragraph 4(b)(iv) of the Policy. In addition, the Respondent is using the Complainant's business information and contact details on its website, which clearly suggests that the website belongs to the Complainant or is an official affiliated franchise partner endorsed by the Complainant, and the fact that the Respondent is hiding its true identity is itself a factor indicating bad faith.

B. Respondent

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

6. Discussion and Findings

6.1. Procedural Issue

According to the paragraph 10 of the Rules, the Panel is required to ensure that the Parties are treated with equality and that each Party is given a fair opportunity to present its case, and also that the administrative proceeding takes place with due expedition.

The location of the Respondent disclosed by the Registrar appears to be in Ukraine, which is subject to an international conflict at the date of this Decision that may impact case notification. Therefore, it is appropriate for the Panel to consider, in accordance with its discretion under paragraph 10 of the Rules, whether the proceeding should continue. Having considered all the circumstances of the case, the Panel considers that it should.

The Panel notes that the Center sent the Complaint to the Respondent's disclosed email address and that there is no evidence of non-delivery. The Panel notes that the disputed domain name was registered on January 1, 2026, several years after the commencement of the international conflict. This indicates that, at the time of registration of the disputed domain name, the Respondent was able to provide the Registrar with a functioning email and postal addresses despite the conflict, and therefore appears capable of controlling the disputed domain name.

The Panel further notes that the Center's postal notification sent to the Respondent's registered mailing address arrived in the destination country on April 19, 2026. The record shows that the delivery failed because the Respondent was absent.

Having determined that the Respondent received a fair opportunity to present its case, the Panel will proceed to a decision to ensure the timely conclusion of these proceedings.

6.2. Substantive Issues

Paragraph 4(a) of the Policy provides that the Complainant must prove each of the following elements:

- (i) the disputed domain name is identical or confusingly similar to a trademark or service mark in which the Complainant has rights; and
- (ii) the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the disputed domain name; and
- (iii) the disputed domain name has been registered and is 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 entirety of the mark is reproduced within the disputed domain name. Accordingly, the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to the mark for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.7.

Although the addition of other terms (here, "at") which is the geographical abbreviation for Austria, may bear on assessment of the second and third elements, the Panel finds the addition of such term does not prevent a finding of confusing similarity between the disputed domain name 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 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.

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 Respondent uses the disputed domain name for a website that purports to offer the same type of games that the Complainant offers and on which the Respondent impersonates the Complainant inter alia by using the Complainant’s registered logo and by reproducing the contact details that are published on the Complainant’s websites.

The Panel therefore finds that the record of this case reflects that the Respondent has intentionally attempted to attract, for commercial gain, Internet users to its website, by creating a likelihood of confusion with the Complainant’s mark as to the source, sponsorship, affiliation, or endorsement of the Respondent’s website or of a service on the Respondent’s website. Paragraph 4(b)(iv) of the Policy, and [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 3.1.4.

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 <tipico-at.com> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Knud Wallberg/

Knud Wallberg

Sole Panelist

Date: May 19, 2026