ARBITRATION
AND
MEDIATION CENTER

WIPO
WORLD
INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY
ORGANIZATION

# ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

Virgin Enterprises Limited v. Selim morgok
Case No. D2026-1875

## 1. The Parties

The Complainant is Virgin Enterprises Limited, United Kingdom, represented by Venner Shipley LLP, United Kingdom.

The Respondent is Selim morgok, Türkiye.

## 2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <virginbet1110.com> is registered with CloudFlare, Inc. (the "Registrar").

## 3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the "Center") on April 30, 2026. On May 1, 2026, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On May 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 (REDACTED FOR PRIVACY) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on May 4, 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 May 21, 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 May 21, 2026. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was June 10, 2026. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent's default on June 22, 2026.

The Center appointed Stefan Bojovic as the sole panelist in this matter on June 23, 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 Virgin Group, and is the owner of the VIRGIN brand and associated trademarks. The VIRGIN brand was originally established as a business selling popular music records by mail order. Since then, the Complainant's operations have grown and now VIRGIN branded businesses span a diverse range of sectors covering financial services, health and wellness, music and entertainment (including games), retail, people and planet, telecommunications and media, travel and leisure, and space. The Complainant currently operates more than 40 businesses under the VIRGIN trademark and employs more than 70,000 people across multiple business sectors and five continents.

In 2019, the Virgin Group launched an online sports betting app available in the United Kingdom called Virgin Bet. In March 2026, the Complainant extended its Virgin Bet business in South Africa, demonstrating the brand's expansion outside of the UK.

The Complainant is responsible for registering and maintaining registrations for trademarks containing the VIRGIN name and VIRGIN signature logo and licensing these rights to different business entities within the Virgin Group.

The Complainant is the owner of the VIRGIN and VIRGIN BET trademarks which are protected by trademark registrations in various jurisdictions, including the following:

- United Kingdom trademark registration No. UK00003163121 for VIRGIN, registered on July 29, 2016;
- United Kingdom trademark registration No. UK00003269158 for VIRGIN BET, registered on February 2, 2018;
- European Union trademark registration No. 005189923 for VIRGIN, registered on May 2, 2007; and
- European Union trademark registration No 016151102 for VIRGIN BET, registered on July 11, 2017.

The Complainant also owns domain names reflecting its VIRGIN and VIRGIN BET trademarks, such as <virgin.com>, registered on September 10, 1997, and <virginbet.com>, registered on February 10, 2003.

The disputed domain name was registered on January 23, 2026, and at the time of filing of the Complaint, it resolved to a website under the name "VIRGIN BET" that purported to offer online gaming, betting, and casino services. This website purported to offer Internet users the option of depositing funds, and the account details to which Internet users were encouraged to send payments appear to be an individual's account rather than a verified business, as the recipient's name is a natural person. At the time of the Decision, the disputed domain name resolves to a page indicating that the account has been suspended.

## 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 its VIRGIN and VIRGIN BET trademarks. The only difference between the disputed domain name and the Complainant's trademarks is the inclusion of element "1110", which does not distinguish the disputed domain name from the Complainant's trademarks.

With reference to rights or legitimate interests in respect of the disputed domain name, the Complainant contends that has not authorized the Respondent to use the Complainant's trademarks or to register the disputed domain name. The Complainant can find no legitimate reason for use of signs identical or highly similar to the Complainant's trademarks to offer online gaming and betting services, being services for which the Complainant's trademarks have a reputation. According to the Complainant, the use of the disputed domain name for a website that offers Internet users option of depositing funds into account of a natural person is likely associated with phishing and fraud and such use cannot be considered as bona fide offering of goods and services. There is no evidence that the Respondent has ever used or made preparations to use the disputed domain name or the name "Virgin Bet" or "Virgin Bet 1110" in connection with a legitimate business or otherwise been known by the disputed domain name.

With reference to the circumstances evidencing bad faith, the Complainant indicates that it is inconceivable that the Respondent was unaware of the Complainant, its businesses and its trademarks when registering the disputed domain name, given the significant reputation that existed in the Complainant's trademarks at the time of the registration of the disputed domain name. The use of the disputed domain name to resolve to a website that purports to offer online gaming and betting services is clearly intended to deceive consumers into believing that the disputed domain name is operated by, or otherwise connected with, the Complainant. By using the disputed domain name, 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 trademarks as to the source, sponsorship, affiliation, or endorsement of the website to which the disputed domain name used to resolve.

**B. Respondent**

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

**6. Discussion and Findings**

According to paragraph 15(a) of the Rules: "A Panel shall decide a complaint on the basis of the statements and documents submitted and in accordance with the Policy, these Rules and any rules and principles of law that it deems applicable." Paragraph 4(a) of the Policy stipulates that the complainant must prove each of the following:

(i) that the disputed domain name is identical or confusingly similar to a trademark or service mark in which the complainant has rights;
(ii) that the respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the disputed domain name; and
(iii) that 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. Although the Complainant has based its Complaint on both the VIRGIN and VIRGIN BET trademarks, the Panel holds that, for the purposes of the analysis under the first element of the Policy, it is sufficient to take into account only the VIRGIN BET trademark. The Panel will, where appropriate, also use the same approach in assessment of the second and the third UDRP elements.

The entirety of the Complainant's VIRGIN BET trademark is reproduced within the disputed domain name. Accordingly, the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to the Complainant's trademark for the purposes of the Policy. WIPO Overview 3.1, section 1.7.

Although the addition of other terms, here the numerical element "1110", 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.

In addition, it is well established that ".com", as a generic Top-Level Domain (the "gTLD"), is disregarded in the assessment of the confusing similarity between the disputed domain name and the trademark. WIPO Overview 3.1, section 1.11.1.

The Panel, therefore, 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 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 notes that there is no relationship between the Respondent and the Complainant and that the Respondent is not a licensee of the Complainant, nor has the Respondent otherwise obtained an authorization to use the Complainant's VIRGIN and VIRGIN BET trademarks. There appears to be no element from which the Panel could infer the Respondent's rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name, or that the Respondent might be commonly known by the disputed domain name.

The disputed domain name resolved to a website under the name "VIRGIN BET" that purported to offer online gaming, betting, and casino services. This website offered Internet users the option of depositing funds, and the account details to which Internet users were encouraged to send payments appear to be an individual's account rather than a verified business, as the recipient's name is a natural person. Such use of the disputed domain name cannot constitute a bona fide offering of goods or services under the Policy. Panels have held that the use of a domain name for illegitimate activity (here, claimed passing off and potential fraud) can never confer rights or legitimate interests on a respondent. WIPO Overview 3.1, section 2.13.1.

Having in mind the above, 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.

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.

In the present case, the Panel notes that the Respondent must have been well aware of the Complainant and its VIRGIN and VIRGIN BET trademarks at the time of the registration of the disputed domain name. Namely, the first registration and use of the Complainant's trademarks predate the registration of the disputed domain name by years, making it unlikely that the Respondent was not aware of the Complainant's trademarks at the time of registration of the disputed domain name. Furthermore, the content of the website to which the disputed domain name used to resolve is such that leaves no room for a doubt on the Respondent's knowledge of the Complainant and its VIRGIN and VIRGIN BET trademarks and evidences that the Respondent actually had the Complainant in mind when registering the disputed domain name.

Due to the above, the Panel finds that the disputed domain name has been registered in bad faith.

As indicated above, the disputed domain name resolved to a website under the name "VIRGIN BET" that purported to offer online gaming, betting, and casino services. This website purported to offer Internet users the option of depositing funds, and the account details to which Internet users were encouraged to send payments appear to be an individual's account rather than a verified business, as the recipient's name is a natural person. Such use of the disputed domain name directly competes with the goods and services offered by the Complainant and appears intended to capitalize on the goodwill associated with the Complainant's trademark. Moreover, based on the available evidence, such use of the disputed domain name may be associated with Internet fraud and, as such, cannot under any circumstances be regarded as a good-faith use of the disputed domain name. Panels have held that the use of a domain name for illegitimate activity (here, claimed passing off and potential fraud) constitutes bad faith. WIPO Overview 3.1, section 3.4. Having reviewed the record, the Panel finds the Respondent's registration and use of the disputed domain name constitutes bad faith under the Policy.

While the disputed domain name no longer resolves to an active website, such passive holding does not prevent a finding of bad faith given the totality of the circumstances of the case at hand. WIPO Overview 3.1, section 3.3.

In accordance with the above, the Panel finds the Respondent's registration and use of the disputed domain name constitutes bad faith under the Policy.

Therefore, 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 <virginbet1110.com> be transferred to the Complainant.

*/Stefan Bojovic/*
**Stefan Bojovic**
Sole Panelist
Date: July 7, 2026