

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

Central Professional Unit Solution Co. Ltd. v. Bui Duc Sau, Bui Duc Sau
Case No. D2026-1750

1. The Parties

The Complainant is Central Professional Unit Solution Co. Ltd., Cambodia, internally represented.

The Respondent is Bui Duc Sau, Bui Duc Sau, Viet Nam.

2. The Domain Names and Registrars

The disputed domain names <go88aae.com>, <go88ax.com>, <go88.build>, <go88ddc.com>, <go88hanoi.com>, <go88hp.com>, <go88a.com>, and <go88o.com> are registered with NameCheap, Inc, and the disputed domain names <go88saigon.com>, and <go88trum.online> are registered with Spaceship, Inc. (collectively, the “Registrars”).

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the “Center”) on April 24, 2026. On April 24, 2026, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrars a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain names. On April 27, 2026, the Registrars transmitted by email to the Center their 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 30, 2026. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was May 20, 2026. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent’s default on May 21, 2026.

The Center appointed Mladen Vukmir as the sole panelist in this matter on May 29, 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 private limited company incorporated in Cambodia, active in online gaming services through a duly licensed affiliate. Through its licensee, it operates a global entertainment gaming platform offering various game types, including cards, slots, and live casino games, and promotes responsible gaming under the GO88 brand.

The Complainant is the owner of the GO88 trademarks, registered in various jurisdictions, including the GO88 (word) trademark registered in the United States on April 22, 2025, under registration number 7766504 for services in class 41 of the International Classification ("IC"), the GO88 GO88.COM trademark registered in the United States on August 19, 2025, under registration number 7901775 (device) for services in class 41 of the IC, and the GO88 (figurative) trademark registered in the Cambodia on June 12, 2025, under registration number KH/116291/D/25 for goods in class 28 of the IC (collectively, the "GO88 trademark").

The Complainant operates its official website under the domain name <go88.com>, which has been in continuous use since 2011. The Complainant also holds and uses multiple other domain names incorporating the GO88 mark. The domain name <go88.com> was originally registered in 2011 by Sor Niran, the sole owner of the Complainant, through one of his affiliates, and was subsequently formally transferred to Mr. Niran in 2017.

According to records, the ten disputed domain names were registered on the following dates: <go88.build> on November 20, 2025; <g088a.com> on January 3, 2026; <g088o.com> on January 25, 2026; <go88ax.com> on January 30, 2026; <go88hanoi.com> on January 31, 2026; <go88hp.com> on February 2, 2026; <go88saigon.com> on February 21, 2026; <go88trum.online> on March 11, 2026; and <go88aae.com> on April 2, 2026; and <go88ddc.com> on April 5, 2026. The disputed domain names were used for Vietnamese-language online gaming and gambling websites prominently displaying the GO88 trademark, offering games of chance and other gaming services. The websites operating under the disputed domain names used the Complainant's registered trademark, common email address, and the same mobile number, and displayed additional similarity of layout, design, colour scheme, goods and services, and structure.

At the time of this Decision, the Panel notes that only the domain name <go88ddc.com> remains active and continues to resolve to Vietnamese-language online gambling content featuring the Complainant's GO88 mark. All other disputed domain names are inactive and either return error messages, including access-denied or service-unavailable responses, or otherwise fail to resolve to any active content.

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 names.

Notably, the Complainant contends that:

(i) it has owned and used the domain name <go88.com> since 2011, and that GO88 is a distinctive and arbitrary combination of the term "GO" and the number "8" repeated twice. The Complainant further submits that the GO88 trademark has been recognized in prior UDRP proceedings and that it holds registered trademark rights in the GO88 mark in multiple jurisdictions, including the United States, the United Kingdom, Germany, and Cambodia;

(ii) the disputed domain names are confusingly similar to the GO88 trademark, as they all incorporate that mark in its entirety, differing only by the addition of geographic terms (such as “hanoi” and “saigon”), descriptive letter strings (such as “aae”, “ax”, “ddc”, and “hp”), the generic word “trum” or by substituting the letter “o” with the numeral “0” in the disputed domain names;

(iii) the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the disputed domain names, as the Complainant has not authorized any third party to use its trademark or intellectual property in any form, the Respondent is not commonly known by the GO88 trademark, and the use of the disputed domain names to operate competing gaming websites that target users in Viet Nam and promote unlicensed online gambling-related services constitutes a direct violation of the Complainant’s legally protected trademark rights and can never confer rights or legitimate interests;

(iv) the disputed domain names were registered and are being used in bad faith. The Respondent registered ten disputed domain names all incorporating the Complainant’s GO88 trademark within a period of approximately five months, used privacy services to conceal its identity across the majority of the disputed domain names, and distributed the registrations across multiple registrant accounts, all while operating competing Vietnamese-language gambling websites bearing the GO88 branding, soliciting user registrations and financial deposits. The Complainant further submits that this constitutes a pattern of cybersquatting within the meaning of paragraph 4(b)(ii) of the Policy. The Complainant also relies on a prior UDRP decision rendered against a different respondent for similar domain names as further evidence of a broader pattern of bad faith targeting the GO88 trademark.

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 names. 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 Panel finds that the GO88 trademark is recognizable within each of the disputed domain names. Most of the disputed domain names reproduce the GO88 mark in its entirety, while the remaining disputed domain names contain a common misspelling consisting of the substitution of the letter “o” with the numeral “0”. Such a minor variation does not prevent a finding of confusing similarity. See [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.9. Accordingly, the disputed domain names are confusingly similar to the Complainant’s GO88 trademark for the purposes of the Policy. See [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.7.

The addition of other elements (“hanoi”, “saigon”, “ax”, “hp”, “aae”, “ddc”, and “trum”) does not prevent a finding of confusing similarity. The GO88 trademark remains clearly recognizable within each of the disputed domain names. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.8.

The generic Top-Level Domains (gTLDs) extensions (“.com”, “.build”, and “.online”) are disregarded as a standard registration requirement. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.11.

The Panel finds that 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 names. 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 names such as those enumerated in the Policy or otherwise.

In particular, the Panel notes that the Complainant has not authorized the Respondent to use the GO88 trademark or to register disputed domain names. There is no evidence that the Respondent has ever been commonly known by the name GO88 or any variation thereof. Furthermore, the Respondent’s use of the disputed domain names to operate gaming and gambling websites prominently displaying the GO88 brand and soliciting financial deposits from users, in direct competition with the Complainant, does not constitute a bona fide offering of goods or services within the meaning of paragraph 4(c)(i) of the Policy, nor does it qualify as a legitimate noncommercial or fair use within the meaning of paragraph 4(c)(iii) of the Policy.

The Panel finds that 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 each of the disputed domain names incorporates the Complainant’s GO88 mark in its entirety, or a visually equivalent variant thereof. All of the disputed domain names were registered after the Complainant had secured trademark protection for the GO88 designation in multiple jurisdictions. The Respondent operates in the same commercial sector as the Complainant, namely online gaming, which makes it implausible that the selection of the disputed domain names closely corresponding to the Complainant’s mark was coincidental. The Panel is therefore satisfied, on the balance of probabilities, that the Respondent was aware of the Complainant’s rights at the time of registration.

The available evidence further shows that, prior to the commencement of these proceedings, the disputed domain names were used in connection with Vietnamese-language websites offering online gaming and gambling services, prominently displaying the GO88 sign and related variations. These websites shared a uniform visual identity, identical copyright attribution (“Go88 On Top”), common contact details, and interfaces designed to solicit user registration and financial deposits. The Panel finds that such use was intended to create a likelihood of confusion with the Complainant’s mark and to attract Internet users for commercial gain within the meaning of paragraph 4(b)(iv) of the Policy.

The Panel also notes that one of the disputed domain names (i.e. <go88.build>) had previously been registered to and used by the Complainant and was subsequently re-registered by the Respondent. This circumstance further supports a finding of bad faith, as it demonstrates specific awareness of the Complainant's commercial presence and prior association with the Complainant's domain name.

At the time of this Decision, nine of the disputed domain names are inactive and either resolved to error messages or display access-denied or service-unavailable responses. The only actively used disputed domain name is <go88ddc.com>, which continues to resolve to Vietnamese-language online gambling content prominently featuring the Complainant's GO88 trademark and providing functionality for user registration and financial transactions.

Panels have found that passive holding of a domain name does not by itself prevent a finding of bad faith. Having considered the totality of the circumstances, including the distinctiveness and reputation of the Complainant's GO88 mark, the Respondent's prior use of the disputed domain names for gambling-related websites, the composition of the disputed domain names reproducing the Complainant's mark as a dominant element, and the re-registration of a disputed domain name previously held by the Complainant, the Panel concludes that passive holding in respect of the inactive disputed domain names does not preclude a finding of bad faith.

In respect of the actively used disputed domain name, the Panel finds that its use for unauthorized online gambling services incorporating the Complainant's trademark constitutes bad faith under the Policy, including under paragraph 4(b)(iv) of the Policy.

Paragraph 4(b) of the Policy sets out a list of non-exhaustive circumstances that may indicate that a domain name was registered and used in bad faith, but other circumstances may be relevant in assessing whether a respondent's registration and use of a domain name is in bad faith. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 3.2.1.

The Respondent has failed to submit any Response or provide any explanation for its conduct. The Panel draws adverse inferences from this failure and, in the absence of any plausible legitimate justification and in light of the totality of the circumstances described above, finds that the disputed domain names were registered and are being used in bad faith within the meaning of paragraph 4(a)(iii) of the Policy.

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 names <go88aae.com>, <go88ax.com>, <go88.build>, <go88ddc.com>, <go88hanoi.com>, <go88hp.com>, <go88saigon.com>, <go88trum.online>, <go88a.com>, and <g088o.com> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Mladen Vukmir/

Mladen Vukmir

Sole Panelist

Date: June 12, 2026