

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

LeoVegas Gaming PLC v. Valeria Ferrazza
Case No. D2026-1649

1. The Parties

The Complainant is LeoVegas Gaming PLC, Malta, represented by Com Laude Limited, United Kingdom.

The Respondent is Valeria Ferrazza, Italy.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <leovegascanada.online> is registered with URL Solutions, Inc. (the “Registrar”).

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the “Center”) on April 17, 2026. On April 20, 2026, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On the same day, 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 (REDACTED) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on April 24, 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 April 29, 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 proceedings commenced on May 1, 2026. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was May 21, 2026. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent’s default on May 26, 2026.

The Center appointed Anton Polikarpov as the sole panelist in this matter on June 2, 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 a Maltese company, internationally active in the field of online gambling. It has evolved into a tech-driven iGaming group that owns a portfolio of software platforms, graphical content and trademarks across multiple jurisdictions, for example:

- European Union Trademark No. 014583355 for LEOVEGAS, registered on January 18, 2016, covering goods and services in Classes: 9, 38, and 41;
- United Kingdom Trademark No. UK00914583355 for LEOVEGAS, registered on January 18, 2016, covering goods and services in Classes: 9, 38, and 41;
- International Registration No. 1291744 for LEOVEGAS as of February 5, 2016, covering goods and services in Classes: 9, 38, and 41 (Designating Australia, Colombia, Ghana, Mexico, Norway);
- Canadian Trademark No. TMA988317 for , registered on January 11, 2018 covering goods and services in Classes: 9, 38, and 41; and
- European Union Trademark No. 017447897 for , registered on February 22, 2018, covering goods and services in Classes: 9, 38, and 41.

The LEOVEGAS marks are used in connection with several categories of products such as online casino, betting, B2B gaming services and developing proprietary audiovisual content.

Corresponding to its core brand, the Complainant owns and operates numerous domain names, including <leovegas.com> (created on February 12, 2011), <leovegas.co.uk> (created on August 18, 2011) and others.

The disputed domain name was registered on October 17, 2024. At the time of filing the Complaint and the Decision, it resolves to an active website prominently referring to the LeoVegas brand, offering online gambling services and containing links redirecting users to a third-party gambling website at “www.slotshakecasino.org”, alleged to be a competitor of the Complainant.

5. Parties' Contentions

A. Complainant

The Complainant believes that it has satisfied each of the elements required under the Policy for a transfer of the disputed domain name, namely:

- the disputed domain name is identical or confusingly similar to the trademarks in which the Complainant has established rights;
- the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the disputed domain name;
- the disputed domain name was registered and is being used in bad faith.

B. Respondent

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

6. Discussion and Findings

The applicable standard of proof in the UDRP cases is the “balance of probabilities” or “preponderance of the evidence” which allows the Panel to draw certain inferences in light of the particular circumstances of the case.

Here the Respondent has not used the opportunity provided to it under the Rules for submitting a response. Despite this fact, the Complainant still bears the burden of proving that all requirements set forth in paragraph 4(a) of the Policy are fulfilled.

The Panel will now proceed to evaluate this matter in light of the Complaint, the absence of the response, the Policy, the Rules, the WIPO Supplemental Rules, and any other rules and principles of law that it deems applicable, as outlined in accordance with paragraph 15(a) of the Rules.

A. Identical or Confusingly Similar

The Complainant appears to have a relatively mature IP portfolio built around its online gambling, casino, betting and other gaming business. The registered rights in the LEOVEGAS marks were duly established by the evidence.

The Panel has taken note of the WIPO Overview of WIPO Panel Views on Select UDRP Questions (“[WIPO Overview 3.1](#)”), and, where appropriate, will decide consistently with the reasonable views stated therein.

Section 1.2.1 of the [WIPO Overview 3.1](#) makes clear that, where the complainant holds a nationally or regionally registered trademark or service mark, this prima facie satisfies the threshold requirement of having trademark rights for purposes of standing to file a UDRP case.

As regards the second limb of the first element, the disputed domain name completely reproduces the LEOVEGAS marks in combination with the geographical term “Canada”. It is well established that the addition of other terms, descriptive elements, or the lack thereof does not prevent a finding of confusing similarity under the first element. The nature of such additional term(s) may however bear on assessment of the second and third elements (see [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.8).

The inclusion of a Top-Level Domain is a standard registration requirement and is generally disregarded when comparing a domain name with a trademark (see [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.11.1).

Accordingly, the Panel finds the disputed domain name to be confusingly similar to the Complainant's trademarks, so the first element of paragraph 4(a) of the Policy has been satisfied.

B. Rights or Legitimate Interests

On this matter, the Complainant noted:

- the Respondent was not commonly known by the LEOVEGAS or LEOVEGAS CANADA marks, as well as there was no prior use;
- the registration and use of the disputed domain name could not be considered “fair” since the disputed domain name effectively impersonates or suggests sponsorship or endorsement by the Complainant;
- the Respondent's primary intent was to obtain financial benefit by redirecting Internet users to a competing gambling website through affiliate links, exploiting the attractive force of the Complainant's well-known LEOVEGAS mark to generate that traffic;
- there was no bona fide offering of goods or services.

Paragraph 4(c) of the Policy provides a list of circumstances in which the Respondent may demonstrate rights or legitimate interests in the 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 (see [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 2.1).

Here, the Respondent failed to describe any reason and provide credible evidence supporting its side.

As is seen from the case file, the website under the disputed domain name has the same look and feel with the Complainant’s pages, not only using the trademarks, but wording as well.

This creates a risk of implied affiliation that misleads those users seeking the proprietary platform. Moreover, it is further exacerbated by the absence of any explanatory notice regarding the connection of the Respondent (or lack thereof) with the Complainant.

The disputed domain name also redirects Internet users to other third-party online gambling portal. Such use of the LEOVEGAS marks to generate traffic through a false affiliation or confusion, in order to divert the traffic to a competing platform, can never be considered a bona fide offering of goods or services (See e.g., *Elec Games Ltd and Ninja Global OÜ v. Alvaro Arroyo Lara*, WIPO Case No. [D2025-2155](#); *Sanctum IP Holdings Ltd v. Andrew Barker*, WIPO Case No. [D2024-3408](#)).

In light of this, the Panel concludes that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the disputed domain name, therefore the second element of paragraph 4(a) of the Policy has been satisfied too.

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.

The LEOVEGAS marks have been used in commerce prior to the registration of the disputed domain name; since 2012 online casino and betting services have been continuously provided, promoted and other ways presented on the market under the trademarks, targeting customers in multiple countries and languages, which allowed the LEOVEGAS marks to acquire a high level of recognition.

It is clearly to be inferred from the case file that the Respondent registered the disputed domain name in the knowledge of the Complainant’s trademarks with the intention of taking unfair advantage of the reputation and goodwill attaching to the LEOVEGAS marks in the field of online gambling services.

The Panel further notes that the disputed domain names is being used to resolve to a website prominently referring to the LeoVegas brand, offering online gambling services and the presence of hyperlinks redirecting consumers to competing online gambling platforms of third parties further demonstrates the aim to attract, for commercial gain, Internet users, by creating a likelihood of confusion with the Complainant’s trademarks as to the source, sponsorship, affiliation, or endorsement of the Respondent’s website.

In view of the above, the Panel finds the Respondent’s registration and use of the disputed domain name constitutes bad faith.

As such, the third and final element of paragraph 4(a) of the Policy has been met.

7. Decision

For the foregoing reasons, in accordance with paragraphs 4(i) of the Policy and paragraph 15 of the Rules, the Panel orders that the disputed domain name, <leovegascanada.online>, be transferred to the Complainant.

/Anton Polikarpov /

Anton Polikarpov

Sole Panelist

Date: June 11, 2026