

## **ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION**

Sportsline Technologies, Inc. v. Enis Miftaroski  
Case No. D2026-1516

### **1. The Parties**

The Complainant is Sportsline Technologies, Inc., United States of America (“United States”), represented by Snell & Wilmer, LLP, United States.

The Respondent is Enis Miftaroski, North Macedonia.

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

The disputed domain name <predictex.net> is registered with PDR Ltd. d/b/a PublicDomainRegistry.com (the “Registrar”).

### **3. Procedural History**

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the “Center”) on April 6, 2026. On April 10, 2026, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On April 13, 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.

The Center verified that 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 14, 2026. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was May 4, 2026. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent’s default on May 5, 2026.

The Center appointed Jeremy Speres as the sole panelist in this matter on May 8, 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 a sports prediction platform under the PREDICTEX mark allowing users to trade on the outcomes of sports games using borrowed capital. The platform was launched in early 2025 and operates from the Complainant's website hosted at its domain name <predictex.io>, which was registered in 2024. The Complainant also owns the domain name <predictex.com>, registered in 2021.

The Complainant submitted evidence of two trademark applications in Curaçao filed in the name of its wholly owned subsidiary Sportsline Technologies N.V., specifically:

- Trademark Application No. D-2026106 PREDICTEX in classes 9, and 41, having an application date of March 20, 2026; and
- Trademark Application No. D-2026107 PREDICTEX (device) in classes 9, and 41, having an application date of March 20, 2026.

The disputed domain name was registered on June 8, 2025, and presently resolves to an inactive "Index" page. The Complainant's evidence establishes that the disputed domain name previously resolved to a website entitled "PREDICTEX" which describes itself as "the home of the best sports betting picks," offering predictions for various football matches.

#### 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 was registered and has been used in bad faith in order to capitalize on confusion with the Complainant's mark for the Respondent's commercial gain.

##### 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 trademark and the disputed domain name. WIPO Overview of WIPO Panel Views on Select UDRP Questions ("[WIPO Overview 3.1](#)"), section 1.7.

Pending trademark applications are insufficient to establish standing under the Policy, and the Complainant thus cannot rely on its subsidiary's pending applications. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.1.4.

The Complainant does however claim goodwill in its mark and may therefore have unregistered trademark rights. The main evidence offered by the Complainant in this respect is screenshots from its own website (showing predominant use of PREDICTEX with a logo, along with information about the different sports games), and a single third-party article. The Panel considers this insufficient to establish that the mark has become a distinctive identifier with secondary meaning. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.3.

Nevertheless, as discussed below in relation to bad faith, there is direct evidence of bad faith targeting of the Complainant, which supports the Complainant's assertion of unregistered trademark rights. In accordance with its duty to conduct these proceedings with due expedition as set out in paragraph 10(c) of the Rules, the Panel has independently<sup>1</sup> conducted brief Internet searches for the Complainant's claimed PREDICTEX mark. The results reveal that this mark is overwhelmingly associated with the Complainant across the first few pages of results. The Panel also notes an X profile associated with the Complainant under this mark that has attracted a meaningful following. Although the Complainant's use appears relatively recent, the evidence of direct impersonation discussed below shows that the Respondent itself perceived the PREDICTEX mark as having value as a source identifier. Additionally, as noted in the [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.3, the length of time that a mark has been used is not itself determinative. Panels have noted that, nowadays, some brands may rapidly acquire recognition due to a broad and significant Internet presence and user base. These findings support the conclusion that the mark has acquired distinctiveness through use for the purposes of the standing requirement under the first element of the Policy.

In the circumstances, the Panel finds the Complainant has unregistered trademark or service mark rights in the PREDICTEX mark for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.3.

The entirety of the mark is reproduced within the disputed domain name. Accordingly, the disputed domain name is identical to the mark 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.

As discussed in relation to bad faith below, it is more likely than not that the Respondent's intentions were to benefit from confusion with the Complainant's mark. This cannot confer rights or legitimate interests. *Sistema de Ensino Poliedro Vestibulares Ltda., Editora Poliedro Ltda. v. Anonymize, Inc. / STANLEY PACE*, WIPO Case No. [D2022-1981](#).

---

<sup>1</sup> In accordance with its powers articulated inter alia in paragraphs 10 and 12 of the Rules, the Panel is entitled to conduct limited independent research into matters of public record. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 4.8.

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.

For the following reasons, the Panel finds that it is more likely than not that the Respondent registered and has used the disputed domain name to take advantage of confusion with the Complainant's mark for the Respondent's commercial gain.

The Panel has independently viewed the Internet Archive records for the disputed domain name. These show that as at August 30, 2025, the disputed domain name resolved to the same website described in the factual background section above, except for the prominent inclusion at the top of the website of an exact replica of the Complainant's current PREDICTEX logo, which features a unique red and blue broken square device. The Panel's viewing of the Complainant's own website hosted at its domain name at <predictex.io> reveals that the Complainant had been using this logo as early as April 15, 2025, which is before the disputed domain name was registered in June 2025.

It therefore appears quite likely that the Respondent was not only aware of the Complainant when it registered the disputed domain name, but actively sought to take advantage of confusion with the Complainant by adopting its logo wholesale for a competitive offering, falling squarely within paragraph 4(b)(iv) of the Policy.

The Panel draws an adverse inference from the Respondent's failure to take part in the present proceedings where an explanation is certainly called for. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 4.3.

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 <predictex.net> be transferred to the Complainant.

*/Jeremy Speres/*

**Jeremy Speres**

Sole Panelist

Date: May 11, 2026