

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

London Operations, LLC v. Davis Yu, Casino Royale Brand Ltd
Case No. D2026-1712

1. The Parties

The Complainant is London Operations, LLC, United States of America ("United States"), represented by Taylor Wessing LLP, Germany.

The Respondent is Davis Yu, Casino Royale Brand Ltd, Malta, represented by Osborne Clarke, United Kingdom.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <casinoroyale.com> is registered with GoDaddy.com, LLC (the "Registrar").

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the "Center") on April 22, 2026. On April 23, 2026, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On April 24, 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 (Registration Private, Domains by Proxy, LLC) 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 April 30, 2026. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was May 20, 2026. The Response was filed with the Center on May 20, 2026.

The Center appointed Luca Barbero, Angela Fox, and Dawn Osborne as panelists in this matter on June 8, 2026. The Panel finds that it was properly constituted. Each member of 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, a Delaware corporation, is the intellectual property holding company for the James Bond 007 franchise.

The Complainant's mark CASINO ROYALE originates from the name of a fictional casino in Ian Fleming's first James Bond novel, itself called "Casino Royale", which was first published in 1953.

In 2006, CASINO ROYALE was used by the Complainant's predecessor in rights as the name of the twenty-first installment in the world-famous James Bond series of films.

The CASINO ROYALE mark has been continuously used in connection with multiple entertainment formats and merchandise categories for over 70 years. CASINO ROYALE branded products include clothing, playing cards, drink tumblers, hats, art prints, sunglasses, tree ornaments, model cars, lighter and bow ties and can be purchased via the website "www.007store.com".

The Complainant is the owner, amongst others, of the following trademark registrations for CASINO ROYALE:

- European Union Trademark Registration No. 004812418 for CASINO ROYALE, filed on December 29, 2005, and registered on July 13, 2010, in classes 3, 9, 14, 16, 25, 28, 38, and 41;
- United Kingdom Trademark Registration No. UK00904812418 for CASINO ROYALE, filed on December 29, 2005 and registered on July 13, 2010, in classes 3, 9, 14, 16, 25, 28, 38, and 41;
- United States Trademark Registration No. 3769400 for CASINO ROYALE, filed on March 15, 2006, and registered on March 30, 2010, in international classes 9, 25, 28, and 41.

The Respondent is a company based in Malta, established on March 11, 2026, with the main activity of being a "holding company". The Respondent is connected to the company Casino Royale Brand Ltd, incorporated in June 2025 in the British Virgin Islands, which in January 2026, filed a European Union trademark applications for CASINO ROYALE (Application No. 019303870) and CASINOROYALE.COM (Application No. 019203863), including for software, entertainment and gaming services. Both trademark applications are under examination.

The Respondent filed a revocation application against the Complainant's European Union Trademark Registration No. 004812418 and United Kingdom Trademark Registration No. UK00904812418 for CASINO ROYALE.

The Complainant claims that the Respondent is also connected to a Swedish individual named Nicolas Frederiksen, who, on June 17, 2025, filed the European Union trademark application No. 019203863 for CASINOROYALE.COM in classes 35, 38, and 42, including for software, which was opposed by the Complainant based on its prior trademark rights on CASINO ROYALE.

The Respondent denies being connected to Mr. Frederiksen, but its position is unclear as it cites its prior discussions with the Complainant's predecessor in rights Danjaq LLC which led to: i) entering the cooling-off period in the opposition filed against the European Union trademark application No. 019203863 (filed by Mr. Frederiksen); and ii) suspending the revocation that the Respondent filed against the Complainant's European Union trademark registration No. 004812418 for CASINO ROYALE.

The disputed domain name was originally registered on October 11, 1995, and resolves to a webpage where the disputed domain name is parked and displaying pay-per-click ("PPC") links related to online casino in the Philippines, with an article/post titled "Philippines Online Casino Guide". On or around December 2, 2025, the disputed domain name hosted a website featuring the trademark CASINO ROYALE. A disclaimer published in small characters at the bottom of the website indicated that the website was a private entertainment and gaming platform with access restricted to adults aged 18, that access was by invitation only and that the website was not affiliated with, endorsed by, or connected to the James Bond 007 franchise and the Complainant's predecessor in rights.

The Respondent is also the owner of the domain name <casinoroyale.us>, which was subject of the usDRP proceeding *London Operations, LLC v. Davis Yu / Casino Royale Brand Ltd*, Forum Claim No. FA2604002217357, concluded with a denial without prejudice.

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 trademark CASINO ROYALE, in which the Complainant claims rights based on its trademark registrations as well as unregistered/common law trademark rights arising from continuous and extensive use since Ian Fleming's 1953 novel, which precipitated the Complainant's long-established and protectable common law rights across a huge number of jurisdictions and a broad array of goods and services.

The Complainant claims that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name since: i) the Respondent has never been licensed, authorized, or permitted by Complainant to use the trademark CASINO ROYALE in any capacity and there are no licensing agreements, business relationships, or authorization for domain registration or use between the parties; ii) the Respondent is not genuinely commonly known by CASINO ROYALE and Internet searches for "casino royale" return only results relating to the Complainant; iii) the disputed domain name is not used in connection with a bona fide offering of goods or services since it resolves to a webpage with PPC links competing with and capitalize on the Complainant's CASINO ROYALE mark, which is used across entertainment-related and other goods and services; iv) the use of the disputed domain name on or around December 2, 2026 is not sufficient to claim a legitimate interest because the website showed private use, rather than evidence of a bona fide commercial offering of goods or services, and included a disclaimer in very small characters, which was insufficient to obviate confusion and on the other hand demonstrated that the Respondent was aware of the conflict with the Complainant's prior rights; v) in light of Complainant's longstanding, diverse and extensive use of CASINO ROYALE and the Complainant's resulting goodwill, any commercial use of CASINO ROYALE for entertainment and casino goods or services amounts to passing off because consumers will assume that the website owner is authorized, endorsed or otherwise connected to the Complainant; vi) to the extent that the Respondent is acting in concert with Mr. Frederiksen, their activities do not predate the letter sent by the Complainant's predecessor to Mr. Frederiksen with a request to withdraw his trademark application for CASINOROYALE.COM on August 29, 2025, as well as the notice of filing of the opposition against said mark on October 2, 2025, and in any event do not amount to a bona fide offering of goods or services; vii) the filing of European Union trademark applications including "casino royale" and the incorporation of companies encompassing the CASINO ROYALE mark in their names are not sufficient for the Respondent to establish rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name as they were made to legitimize the ownership of the disputed domain name by the Respondent and circumvent the Policy.

With reference to the bad faith requirement, the Complainant contends that, regardless of the date of acquisition of the disputed domain name between 2013 and March 2025 (and see below as to the Respondent's assertion that it was acquired in 2024), the Respondent must have known about the Complainant's rights in the famous trademark CASINO ROYALE, which exists exclusively within the James Bond universe, making any claim of bona fide use implausible. The Complainant also states that a brief internet search would have immediately revealed the Complainant's use of the mark, and a basic trademark search would have disclosed the Complainant's corresponding trademark rights before the Respondent registered the disputed domain name. The Complainant concludes that the Respondent deliberately selected the disputed domain name to take unfair advantage of the Complainant's well-known trademark CASINO ROYALE and of the wider James Bond 007 franchise and submits that this conscious choice to appropriate the Complainant's famous mark evidences the opportunistic intent underlying the Respondent's registration and use. The Complainant submits that the Respondent's bad faith is reinforced by Respondent's use of a disclaimer referring to the Complainant's predecessor and related entities.

The Complainant further submits that the Respondent cannot credibly argue that the Complainant's prior rights, goodwill and reputation in CASINO ROYALE did not form part of the reasoning for the acquisition, otherwise the Respondent could have used "casino royal" instead of "casino royale".

The Complainant also states that the Respondent engaged in a pattern of bad faith registrations as it also registered the domain name <casinoroyale.us>.

The Complainant further submits that it appears that the Respondent took over the disputed domain name between 2013 and March 2025 with the purpose of selling it to Complainant or otherwise to make profit, as the disputed domain name was offered for sale until December 2025 and, prior to 2021, it was offered for a price of USD 600,000.

The Complainant submits that, to the extent that the Respondent seeks to put forward a claim to good-faith use in respect of an online casino, the Respondent's escalating activity in 2025-2026 represents a calculated attempt to position itself for maximum leverage precisely when the Complainant's mark will receive heightened attention given 2026 marks the 20th anniversary of Complainant's CASINO ROYALE movie. The Complainant states that the Respondent selected the disputed domain name on purpose to take advantage of the success and reputation of the Complainant's well-known CASINO ROYALE mark, particularly given the close proximity of online gambling services and the entertainment services associated with the CASINO ROYALE mark.

The Complainant concludes that any commercial use of the Complainant's CASINO ROYALE mark for entertainment services (including casino, gambling and online gaming) by the Respondent would amount to passing off.

B. Respondent

The Respondent contends that the Complainant has not satisfied the elements required under the Policy for a transfer of the disputed domain name.

As a preliminary issue, the Respondent denies having any relationship with Mr. Frederiksen and states to have purchased the disputed domain name via GoDaddy for a six-figure sum on December 27, 2024, in its own right and for its own legitimate business purposes, namely to launch an eGaming and crypto-integrated gambling platform.

The Respondent also states that, starting on or around November 24, 2025, the Respondent entered into confidential discussions regarding the "Casino Royale" name with the Complainant's predecessor, Danjaq LLC, following which the Complainant's predecessor, through counsel, agreed to enter the cooling-off period in the opposition filed by Complainant's predecessor against the European Union trademark application No. 019203863 for the CASINOROYALE.COM mark and the Respondent agreed to suspend the revocation application that it had filed against the Complainant's European Union trademark Registration No.

004812418 for CASINO ROYALE. The Respondent points out that the Complainant, as the most recent owner of the James Bond 007 film franchise, is fully aware of these earlier discussions, which the Respondent entered into in good faith.

With regard to the Complainant's statements concerning the first element, the Respondent states that it recognizes the Complainant's registrations for the CASINO ROYALE mark but denies that such rights prevent legitimate use of the disputed domain name for unrelated and distinct goods and services from those covered by the Complainant's trademark registrations. Particularly, the Respondent indicates that the Complainant's trademark registrations for CASINO ROYALE exclude any protection for the mark in relation to casino gaming services or any related services. The Complainant further claims that both the law in the European Union and the United States do not provide trademark protection for the title of a single creative work, as it will not ordinarily function as a trademark because it identifies the work itself rather than the commercial source of goods or services.

The Respondent claims rights and legitimate interests in the disputed domain name since, before any notice of the dispute, it has made and continues to make demonstrable preparations to use the disputed domain name in connection with a bona fide offering of goods or services. Particularly, it states that it purchased the disputed domain name on December 27, 2024, and its additional domain name <casinoroyale.us> on April 20, 2025. Besides, it also incorporated two businesses that include the CASINO ROYALE brand and name in order to carry out and effectuate its business operations, i.e. Casino Royale Ltd, incorporated in the British Virgin Islands on June 25, 2025, and Casino Royale Brand Ltd, incorporated in Malta on March 11, 2026.

The Respondent states that, since December 2024, it has taken numerous steps and made significant investments in order to establish its business and operations under the CASINO ROYALE name and mark, and also engaged consulting firms with expertise in the gaming industries to assist with preparing applications to obtain licensing to operate its business, as well as a graphic designer, since at least as early as February 2025, for designing and developing extensive graphic designs, brand books, and digital art required for Respondent's CASINO ROYALE brand and brand identity, as well as the graphics and art required for the eGaming platform, original games, and website content to be displayed at the disputed domain name. The Respondent also explains that the disputed domain name does not presently resolve to an active commercial website because the underlying business has not yet commercially launched, and the launch is dependent on securing the requisite licensing, investment, partnerships, and time to create the required business assets in order to commence operations successfully.

The Respondent also claims to be commonly known by the disputed domain name since it incorporated two companies incorporating the wording "casino royale", namely Casino Royale Ltd and Casino Royale Brand Ltd, the latter being mentioned as registrant of the disputed domain name in the Whois records.

The Respondent further rebuts the Complainant's contentions about passing off, stating that any commercial use of the Respondent's CASINO ROYALE brand in the online gaming sector would be in a market plainly distinct from the Complainant's film franchise and its associated merchandise, and would not constitute passing off. In this regard, the Respondent states that the Complainant already coexists with other third parties using the name and/or brand "Casino Royale" for in-person casino and gambling services, including the Best Western Plus Casino Royale in Las Vegas, Nevada (which uses the domain name <casinoroyalehotel.com>), the Casino Royale in Sint Maarten, and the Casino Royale casinos onboard every ship in the Royal Caribbean cruise fleet.

With reference to the Complainant's allegations about the Respondent's bad faith registration and use, the Respondent submits that it acquired the disputed domain name for its own legitimate business and not for the purpose of selling, renting, or otherwise transferring it to Complainant, and points out that the screenshots provided by the Complainant showing the disputed domain name was offered for sale refer to prior ownership of the disputed domain name.

As to the redirection of the disputed domain name to a webpage with PPC links, the Respondent claims that it been generated by the Registrar automatically and that, in any event, it cannot cause the Complainant any damage because the webpage relates to online casino services in the Philippines and the Complainant's mark and rights do not extend to casino gaming services.

The Respondent also denies the Complainant's assertion about the Respondent's engagement in a pattern of conduct, stating that it registered both the disputed domain name and the <casinoroyale.us> domain name as part of a cohesive and genuine business development strategy for its online casino gaming platform, under its own established business name.

Further, the Respondent contends that there is no basis on which the Respondent's use of the disputed domain name for an online casino gaming platform could be said to be an intentional attempt to attract Internet users by creating a likelihood of confusion with the Complainant's mark as to source, sponsorship, affiliation, or endorsement.

The Respondent also states that, while the Respondent is generally aware of the James Bond 007 film franchise, it was not aware of the Complainant's rights in CASINO ROYALE when it acquired the disputed domain name. It also submits that the temporary website deployed at the disputed domain name in December 2025, including a disclaimer of non-affiliation with the Complainant, is evidence of legitimate preparations, not bad faith.

The Respondent concludes that it did not register the disputed domain name to target the Complainant or otherwise trade on the reputation or goodwill of the Complainant, but instead, acquired the disputed domain name in good faith, with a legitimate business venture in mind, unrelated to the Complainant.

The Respondent requests the Panel find that the Complainant, by bringing the Complaint, engaged in Reverse Domain Name Hijacking because the Complainant was aware of the good faith discussions with the Respondent prior to bringing this Complaint and knew it could not prove its case, but anyway brought this Complaint in bad faith, primarily to harass Respondent and to induce it to abandon its legitimate business plans.

6. Discussion and Findings

It is apparent from perusal of the factual background section and the Parties' contentions that this is a complex multi-jurisdictional trademark dispute. While this would not by itself prevent the resolution of this case under the Policy if the Panel were satisfied that it could fairly decide the dispute under the Policy's streamlined procedures, that is not the case here.

Indeed, there are various trademark disputes ongoing between the Respondent (the identity of whose controlling entity is in part contested) and the Complainant or its predecessor, including a revocation action filed by the Respondent against the Complainant's European Union Trademark Registration No. 004812418 and United Kingdom Trademark Registration No. UK00904812418 for CASINO ROYALE.

The Panel notes that the dispute involves broad factual and legal issues relating to trademark rights and usage, and that there is limited and contradictory evidence before it. The Panel is not in a position to form a judgment on the authenticity of the Parties' conflicting statements and finds that resolution of these issues would require findings more appropriately made in court proceedings, with the benefit of discovery, witness examination and fuller evidentiary procedures than are provided for under the Policy.

Accordingly, the Panel denies the Complaint, not on the merits, but on the broader ground that this dispute exceeds the relatively limited "cybersquatting" scope of the Policy and would be more appropriately addressed by a court of competent jurisdiction. WIPO Overview of WIPO Panel Views on Select UDRP Questions ("[WIPO Overview 3.1](#)"), section 4.14.6.

In limited circumstances, the Panel may decide to record in its decision denying a complaint its opinion that such denial should be “without prejudice” to the Complainant’s ability to refile a case against the same respondent in respect of the same domain name should later-known facts and circumstances support such action, e.g., when the complainant establishes that legally relevant developments, that would directly and materially impact the basis for the prior denial, have occurred since the original UDRP decision. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 4.18. In light of the above, the Panel issues its decision on a “without prejudice” basis. The Panel makes no substantive findings on the three limbs of the Policy nor on Reverse Domain Name Hijacking.

7. Decision

For the foregoing reasons, the Complaint is denied.

/Luca Barbero/

Luca Barbero

Presiding Panelist

/Angela Fox/

Angela Fox

Panelist

/Dawn Osborne/

Dawn Osborne

Panelist

Date: June 22, 2026