

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

Caesars License Company, LLC v. Oleksandra Bevz
Case No. D2026-1900

1. The Parties

The Complainant is Caesars License Company, LLC, United States of America ("United States"), represented by Greenberg Traurig, LLP, United States.

The Respondent is Oleksandra Bevz, Ukraine.

2. The Domain Names and Registrar

The disputed domain names <caesarscasino-online.com> (the "First Domain Name") and <caesarsonline-casino.com> (the "Second Domain Name") (collectively referred to as the "Domain Names") are registered with Internet Domain Service BS Corp (the "Registrar").

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the "Center") on May 1, 2026. On May 4, 2026, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the Domain Names. On May 5, 2026, the Registrar transmitted by email to the Center its verification response disclosing registrant and contact information for the Domain Names 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 5, 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 May 14, 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 15, 2026. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was June 4, 2026. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent's default on June 5, 2026.

The Center appointed Piotr Nowaczyk as the sole panelist in this matter on June 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 casino and hotel properties under the CAESARS brand, including Caesars Palace in Las Vegas, Nevada, United States and other CAESARS-branded establishments in the United States, Canada, Egypt, and the United Arab Emirates.

The Complaint states that Caesars Palace in Las Vegas, Nevada, United States opened in 1966 and receives approximately 1.5 million guests annually.

The Complainant further states that it offers online and mobile gaming services, including through licensees, and provides a range of online games and mobile applications under the CAESARS brand. According to the Complaint, the Complainant owns and operates the “Caesars Casino Website” at the domain name <caesarspalaceonline.com>, through which users may access online casino and gaming services.

The Complainant is the owner of numerous CAESARS trademark registrations (the “First Trademark”), including:

- (i) the European Union Trade Mark Registration for CAESARS (word trademark) No. 012717195, registered on August 14, 2014;
- (ii) the European Union Trade Mark Registration for CAESARS (word trademark) No. 006866321, registered on August 14, 2009; and
- (iii) the European Union Trade Mark Registration for CAESARS (word trademark) No. 012166757, registered on February 24, 2016.

The Complainant also owns numerous trademark registrations for (the “Second Trademark”), including the European Union Trade Mark Registration for (figurative trademark) No. 009048935, registered on October 12, 2010.

Moreover, the Complainant states that it is the owner of the domain names incorporating its First Trademark, such as <caesars.com>.

The Domain Names were registered on March 18, 2026.

At the time of the filing of the Complaint, the Domain Names resolved to websites in the Russian language p the Complainant’s First Trademark and a variation of the Second Trademark (collectively referred to as the “Trademarks”) and purporting to discuss the Complainant’s online casino offering, including links to its casino games and slot games (the “Website”). The website at the First Domain Name included the following copyright notice: “© Caesars Casino - Official Website.”

As of the date of this Decision, the First Domain Name continues to resolve to the Website, whereas the Second Domain Name does not resolve to an active website.

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 Domain Names.

First, the Complainant contends that the Domain Names are confusingly similar to the First Trademark in which the Complainant has rights.

Second, the Complainant argues that the Respondent has neither rights nor legitimate interests in the Domain Names.

Third, the Complainant submits that the Domain Names were registered and are being used in bad faith.

B. Respondent

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

6. Discussion and Findings

6.1. Procedural Issues

A. Location of the Respondent

Under paragraph 10 of the Rules, the Panel is required to ensure that the Parties are treated with equality and that each Party is given a fair opportunity to present its case, and also that the administrative proceedings take place with due expedition.

The location of the Respondent disclosed by the Registrar appears to be in Ukraine, which is subject to an international conflict at the date of this Decision that may impact case notification. It is therefore appropriate for the Panel to consider, in accordance with its discretion under paragraph 10 of the Rules, whether the proceedings should continue.

Having considered all the circumstances of the case, the Panel is of the view that they should continue.

First, the Panel notes that the Notification of Complaint was done in accordance with the Rules, employing reasonably available means calculated to achieve actual notice to the Respondent.

Second, the Panel observes that the Domain Names were registered on March 18, 2026, during an ongoing international conflict. This indicates that the Respondent had access to the Internet at the relevant time and was able to register and exercise control over the Domain Names. In these circumstances, the Panel considers it reasonable to infer that the Respondent is capable of receiving electronic communications and therefore should have received, at a minimum, Notification of Complaint by email in the present proceedings. There is also no evidence on record that the Notification of Complaint email has not been successfully delivered at the Respondent's email address disclosed by the Registrar. Lastly, the Panel notes that the Website discusses access to the Complainant's online offerings for the users from the Russian Federation, which indicates that the Respondent may not be actually located in Ukraine.

Third, the Panel notes that, for the reasons set out later in this Decision, it has no serious doubt that the Respondent registered and used the Domain Names in bad faith, with the intention of unfairly targeting the Complainant's trademark and its goods.

Having considered all the circumstances of the case, the Panel is of the view that the proceedings should continue. The Panel will therefore proceed to render its Decision.

6.2. Substantive Issues – Three Elements

Paragraph 4(a) of the Policy places a burden on the Complainant to prove the presence of three separate elements, which can be summarized as follows:

- (iv) the Domain Names are identical or confusingly similar to a trademark or service mark in which the Complainant has rights;
- (v) the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in the Domain Names; and
- (vi) the Domain Names have been registered and are being used in bad faith.

The applicable standard of proof in UDRP cases is the “balance of probabilities” or “preponderance of the evidence”; some panels have also expressed this as an “on balance” standard. Under this standard, a party should demonstrate to a panel’s satisfaction that it is more likely than not that a claimed fact is true. See section 4.2 of the WIPO Overview of WIPO Panel Views on Select UDRP Questions (“[WIPO Overview 3.1](#)”).

A. Identical or Confusingly Similar

Under the first element, the Complainant must establish that the Domain Names are identical or confusingly similar to the Trademarks in which the Complainant has rights.

As noted above, the Complainant holds valid rights in the Trademarks. The Domain Names incorporate the First Trademark in its entirety. As numerous UDRP panels have held, in cases where a domain name incorporates the entirety of a trademark, the domain name will normally be considered confusingly similar to that mark. See section 1.7 of the [WIPO Overview 3.1](#).

The addition of the terms “casino” and “online”, together with hyphens, does not prevent a finding of confusing similarity between the Domain Names and the Complainant’s First Trademark. Panels have consistently held that where the relevant trademark is recognizable within the disputed domain name, the addition of other terms (whether descriptive, geographical, pejorative, meaningless, or otherwise) would not prevent a finding of confusing similarity under the first element. See section 1.8 of the [WIPO Overview 3.1](#).

The Top-Level Domain (“TLD”) “.com” in the Domain Names is viewed as a standard registration requirement and as such is typically disregarded under the first element confusing similarity test. See section 1.11.1 of the [WIPO Overview 3.1](#).

Given the above, the Panel finds that the Domain Names are confusingly similar to the Complainant’s First Trademark. Thus, the Panel finds the first element of the Policy has been established.

B. Rights or Legitimate Interests

Under the second element, the Complainant must prove that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in the Domain Names.

A right or legitimate interest in the Domain Names may be established, in accordance with paragraph 4(c) of the Policy, if the Panel finds any of the following circumstances:

- (i) that the Respondent has used or made preparations to use the Domain Names or a name corresponding to the Domain Names in connection with a bona fide offering of goods or services prior to the dispute; or
- (ii) that the Respondent is commonly known by the Domain Names, even if the Respondent has not acquired any trademark rights; or

- (iii) that the Respondent is making a legitimate noncommercial or fair use of the Domain Names without intent for commercial gain to misleadingly divert consumers or to tarnish the Trademarks.

In the present case, the Panel finds that the Complainant has established a prima facie case that the Respondent does not have any rights or legitimate interests in the Domain Names, and the burden of production shifts to the Respondent. See section 2.1 of the [WIPO Overview 3.1](#). Although given the opportunity, the Respondent has not submitted any evidence indicating that any of the circumstances foreseen in paragraph 4(c) of the Policy are present in this case.

On the contrary, it results from the evidence on record that the First Trademark in which the Complainant has rights predates the Respondent's registration of the Domain Names. There is no evidence in the case record that the Complainant has licensed or otherwise permitted the Respondent to use the First Trademark or to register the Domain Names incorporating this trademark. There is also no evidence to suggest that the Respondent has been commonly known by the Domain Names.

The Panel considers that the composition of the Domain Names coupled with the use of the Domain Names affirms the Respondent's intention of taking unfair advantage of the likelihood of confusion between the Domain Names and the Complainant as to the origin or affiliation of the Website.

Moreover, it results from the evidence on record that the Respondent does not make use of the Domain Names in connection with a bona fide offering of goods or services, nor does it make a legitimate noncommercial or fair use of the Domain Names. On the contrary, at the time of the filing of the Complaint, the Domain Names resolved to the Website prominently displaying the Complainant's Trademarks and purporting to discuss the Complainant's online casino offering, included links to its online casino and gambling-related services. The website at the First Domain Name included the following copyright notice: "© Caesars Casino - Official Website." As of the date of this Decision, the First Domain Name continues to resolve to the Website, whereas the Second Domain Name does not resolve to an active website. Such use of the Domain Names in this case does not confer rights or legitimate interests on the Respondent.

In sum, the Respondent has failed to invoke any circumstances, which could demonstrate, pursuant to paragraph 4(c) of the Policy, any rights or legitimate interests in respect of the Domain Names. Thus, there is no evidence in the case file that refutes the Complainant's prima facie case. The Panel concludes that the second element of the Policy has been established.

C. Registered and Used in Bad Faith

Under the third element, the Complainant must prove that the Domain Names have been registered and are being used in bad faith.

Bad faith under the UDRP is broadly understood to occur where a respondent takes unfair advantage of or otherwise abuses a complainant's mark. See section 3.1 of the [WIPO Overview 3.1](#).

Under paragraph 4(b) of the Policy, evidence of bad faith registration and use includes, without limitation:

- (i) circumstances indicating the domain name was registered or acquired primarily for the purpose of selling, renting, or otherwise transferring the domain name registration to the owner of a trademark or to a competitor of the trademark owner, for valuable consideration in excess of the documented out-of-pocket costs directly related to the domain name; or
- (ii) circumstances indicating that the domain name was registered in order to prevent the owner of a trademark from reflecting the mark in a corresponding domain name, provided it is a pattern of such conduct; or
- (iii) circumstances indicating that the domain name was registered primarily for the purpose of disrupting the business of a competitor; or

(iv) circumstances indicating that the domain name has intentionally been used in an attempt to attract, for commercial gain, Internet users to a website or other online location, by creating a likelihood of confusion with a trademark as to the source, sponsorship, affiliation, or endorsement of the website or location or of a product or service on a website or location.

As indicated above, the Complainant's First Trademark predates the registration of the Domain Names. The Panel finds that the Respondent was or should have been aware of the Complainant's First Trademark at the time of registration. This finding is supported by the content of the Website, which prominently displays both of the Complainant's Trademarks and discusses its services related to the casino and online gambling sector. Moreover, it has been proven to the Panel's satisfaction that the Complainant's Trademarks are well known and unique to the Complainant, at least in the casino and online gambling sector. Thus, the Respondent could not have been unaware of the reputation of the Trademarks.

Furthermore, the Domain Names have been used in bad faith. Having regard to the totality of the circumstances, including the Respondent's incorporation of the Complainant's First Trademark in the Domain Names and the use of the Website as described above, the Panel finds that the Respondent has intentionally attempted to attract, for commercial gain, Internet users to the Website associated with the Domain Names by creating a likelihood of confusion with the Complainant's Trademarks as to the source, sponsorship, affiliation, or endorsement of this Website.

As of the date of this Decision, the First Domain Name continues to resolve to the Website, whereas the Second Domain Name does not resolve to an active website. Considering the overall circumstances of this case, the Panel finds that the Respondent's current passive holding of the Second Domain Name does not prevent a finding of bad faith.

From the inception of the UDRP, panelists have found that the non-use of a domain name (including a blank or "coming soon" page) would not by itself prevent a finding of bad faith under the doctrine of passive holding. While panelists will look at the totality of the circumstances in each case, factors that have been considered relevant in applying the passive holding doctrine include: (i) the degree of distinctiveness or reputation of the complainant's mark, (ii) the failure of the respondent to submit a response or to provide any evidence of actual or contemplated good-faith use, (iii) the respondent's taking active steps to conceal its identity or (iv) the use of false or inaccurate contact details (noted to be in breach of the respondent's registration agreement). See section 3.3 of the [WIPO Overview 3.1](#).

In the present case, the Panel notes in particular the distinctiveness and reputation of the Complainant's Trademarks, the Respondent's failure to submit any Response or evidence of actual or contemplated good-faith use, the composition of the Second Domain Name, which wholly incorporate the Complainant's First Trademark together with the term "online-casino" corresponding to the Complainant's business, and its prior use. Accordingly, the Panel finds that the current passive holding of the Second Domain Name does not prevent a finding of bad faith.

For the reasons discussed above, the Panel finds the third element of the Policy has been established.

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 Domain Names <caesarscasino-online.com> and <caesarsonline-casino.com> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Piotr Nowaczyk/

Piotr Nowaczyk

Sole Panelist

Date: June 22, 2026