

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

Novomatic AG v. Kostiantin Mamaiev, Mamaiev Kostiantyn
Case No. D2026-1930

1. The Parties

The Complainant is Novomatic AG, Austria, represented by Salomonowitz Attorneys-at-Law, Austria.

The Respondents are Kostiantin Mamaiev, Russian Federation, and Mamaiev Kostiantyn, Ukraine.

2. The Domain Names and Registrar

The disputed domain names <casinoadmiral-club.com>, <casino-admiral-enter.top>, <casinoadmiral-enter.win>, <casinoadmiralenter.win>, <casinoadmiralgo.com>, <casinoadmiralgo.win>, <casino-admiralvhod.win>, <casinoadmiralvhod.win>, and <casinoadmiralwin.win> are registered with NameSilo, LLC. (the “Registrar”).

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the “Center”) on May 5, 2026. On May 5, 2026, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain names. On May 5, 2026 the Registrar transmitted by email to the Center its verification response disclosing registrant and contact information for the disputed domain names which differed from the named Respondent (NameSilo, LLC) and contact information in the Complaint.

The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on May 8, 2026 with the registrant and contact information of nominally multiple underlying registrants revealed by the Registrar, requesting the Complainant to either file separate complaints for the disputed domain names associated with different underlying registrants or alternatively, demonstrate that the underlying registrants are in fact the same entity and/or that all domain names are under common control. The Complainant filed an amended Complaint on May 10, 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 Respondents 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 Respondents did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondents' default on June 5, 2026.

The Center appointed Federica Togo as the sole panelist in this matter on June 11, 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

It results from the Complainant's undisputed allegations that it is a company active in casino games and betting activities.

The Complainant is the registered owner of many trademarks consisting and/or containing ADMIRAL, e.g. European Union Trademark Registration No. 004134433, ADMIRAL, word, registered on August 14, 2006 for goods and services in classes 9, 16, 28, 36, 37, 41, 42, and 43.

In addition, it uses the domain name <admiral.ag> for promoting its Admiral-casinos and betting activities.

The disputed domain names were registered as follows:

<casinoadmiralgo.win> on November 1, 2025;
<casino-admiral-enter.top> on September 26, 2025;
<casino-admiralvhod.win> on November 7, 2025;
<casinoadmiral-club.com> on May 16, 2022;
<casinoadmiral-enter.win> on January 21, 2026;
<casinoadmiralenter.win> on November 1, 2025;
<casinoadmiralgo.com> on October 15, 2020;
<casinoadmiralvhod.win> on July 21, 2025; and
<casinoadmiralwin.win> on July 13, 2023.

All the disputed domain names (but <casinoadmiralgo.com>) are registered by Kostiantin Mamaiev. The disputed domain name <casinoadmiralgo.com> is registered by Mamaiev Kostiantyn.

All the disputed domain names resolve to a website displaying in a prominent way the Complainant's mark and logo and offering online casino/gambling services.

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 the disputed domain names are identical (in the distinctive part) or at least confusingly similar to the Complainant's trademarks ADMIRAL, since the disputed domain names contain these marks in its entirety. The addition of the terms "casino", "win", "go" etc. is not qualified to exclude confusion, since the term is mere descriptive for the services offered under the disputed domain names.

The Complainant further contends that the Respondents have no rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain names. According to the Complainant, the Complainant's rights out of the registered trademarks date back to 1980 (Austrian trademark) and 2004 (European Union trademark). The Respondents have no relationship with or permission from the Complainant for the use of the trademarks ADMIRAL. The Respondents have neither been commonly known by the disputed domain names or the sign ADMIRAL nor have acquired any respective trademark rights. The Respondents use the disputed domain names to offer infringing slot games and to provide illegal gambling.

Furthermore, the Complainant contends that the disputed domain names were registered and are being used in bad faith. According to the Complainant, the Respondents registered the disputed domain names long after the Complainant had registered its respective trademarks and long after the Complainant had installed its website, which then was copied by the Respondents. The Complainant's Admiral-stores, ADMIRAL-Casinos, the admiral website, and the ADMIRAL trademarks are so well known, that the Respondents without any doubt were aware of, when registering the disputed domain names. The Respondents' websites are only used to offer illegal copies of the Complainant's famous slot games and to provide illegal gambling. The websites are therefore designed to mislead the Complainant's customers.

B. Respondents

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

6. Discussion and Findings

6.1. Procedural issues

A. Consolidation: Multiple Respondents

The amended Complaint was filed in relation to nominally different domain name registrants. The Complainant alleges that the domain name registrants are the same entity or mere alter egos of each other, or under common control. The Complainant requests the consolidation of the Complaint against the multiple disputed domain name registrants pursuant to paragraph 10(e) of the Rules.

The disputed domain name registrants did not comment on the Complainant's request.

Paragraph 3(c) of the Rules states that a complaint may relate to more than one domain name, provided that the domain names are registered by the same domain name holder.

In addressing the Complainant's request, the Panel will consider whether (i) the disputed domain names or corresponding websites are subject to common control; and (ii) the consolidation would be fair and equitable to all Parties. See WIPO Overview of WIPO Panel Views on Select UDRP Questions (["WIPO Overview 3.1"](#)), section 4.11.2.

As regards common control, the Panel notes that the Complainant submitted sufficient evidence to justify the consolidation in terms of common control of the disputed domain names or corresponding websites.

As set forth in section 4.11.2 of [WIPO Overview 3.1](#): "Panels have considered a range of factors, typically present in some combination, as useful to determining whether such consolidation is appropriate, such as similarities in or relevant aspects of (i) the registrants' identity(ies) including pseudonyms, (ii) the registrants' contact information including email address(es), postal address(es), or phone number(s), including any pattern of irregularities, (iii) relevant IP addresses, name servers, or webhost(s), (iv) the content or layout of websites corresponding to the disputed domain names, (v) the nature of the marks at issue (e.g., where a registrant targets a specific sector), (vi) any naming patterns in the disputed domain names (e.g., <mark-country> or <mark-goods>), (vii) the relevant language/scripts of the disputed domain names particularly where they are the same as the mark(s) at issue, (viii) any changes by the respondent relating to any of the

above items following communications regarding the disputed domain name(s), (ix) any evidence of respondent affiliation with respect to the ability to control the disputed domain name(s), (x) any (prior) pattern of similar respondent behavior, or (xi) other arguments made by the complainant and/or disclosures by the respondent(s).”

The Panel considers the consolidation as appropriate, taking into consideration the following factors:

- 1) all disputed domain names follow the same naming pattern by incorporating the entirety of the Complainant’s ADMIRAL trademark plus the term “casino” and another term
- 2) all disputed domain names have the same Registrar;
- 3) the content and the layout of the websites corresponding to the disputed domain names is similar (i.e. displaying an online casino/gambling);
- 4) both registrants’ contact information uses the same email address;
- 5) both registrants’ contact information indicates Kiev in the postal address.

On the balance of probabilities and taking into account the above circumstances of the present case, the Panel finds that the disputed domain names are under common control.

As regards fairness and equity, the Panel sees no reason why consolidation of the disputes would be unfair or inequitable to any Party.

Accordingly, the Panel decides to consolidate the disputes regarding the nominally different disputed domain name registrants (referred to below as “the Respondent”) in a single proceeding.

B. Further Procedural Considerations

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 that the administrative proceeding takes place with due expedition. Since one of the Respondent’s mailing addresses is stated to be in Ukraine, which is subject to an international conflict at the date of this Decision that may impact case notification, it is 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 it should. The Panel notes that the Notification of the Complaint was successfully sent to the email address disclosed for the Respondent (which is identical for both registrants) by the Registrar in its Registrar verification response related to the disputed domain names. There is no indication that the email notification has not been successfully delivered.

Finally, the Panel notes that, for the reasons which are set out later in this Decision, the Panel has no serious doubt (albeit in the absence of any Response) that the Respondent registered and has used the disputed domain names in bad faith. The Panel therefore concludes that the Respondent has been given a fair opportunity to present its case, and so that the administrative proceedings take place with due expedition the Panel will proceed to a Decision accordingly.

6.2 Substantive issues

Paragraph 15(a) of the Rules instructs this Panel to “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 requires a complainant to prove each of the following three elements in order to obtain an order that each disputed domain name be transferred or cancelled:

- (i) the disputed domain name is identical or confusingly similar to a trademark or service mark in which the Complainant has rights; and
- (ii) the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the disputed domain name; and
- (iii) the disputed domain name has been registered and is being used in bad faith.

The Panel will therefore proceed to analyze whether the three elements of paragraph 4(a) of the Policy are satisfied.

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 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 entirety of the mark ADMIRAL is identically reproduced within the disputed domain names. Accordingly, the disputed domain names are confusingly similar to the mark for the purposes of the Policy, [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.7.

Although the addition of other terms here, "casino", "go", "enter", "vhod", "club", "enter", and "win" may bear on assessment of the second and third elements, the Panel finds the addition of such terms does not prevent a finding of confusing similarity between the disputed domain names and the mark for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.8.

The Panel finds 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.

Regarding the composition of the disputed domain names, the Panel notes that the disputed domain names contain the Complainant's registered trademark ADMIRAL plus the addition of the term "casino" which is within the trademark owner's field of commerce (plus other terms such as "go", "enter", "club", "enter" and "win", respectively). This Panel finds it most likely that the composition of the disputed domain names

signals an intention on the part of the Respondent to confuse Internet users seeking or expecting the Complainant. This is corroborated by the content of the website to which the disputed domain names resolve, displaying in a prominent way the Complainant's ADMIRAL mark and allegedly offering services in the Complainant's area of activity.

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.

In the present case, the Panel notes that the disputed domain names resolve to websites displaying in a prominent way the Complainant's mark and logo and offering online casino/gambling services. For the Panel, it is therefore evident that the Respondent positively knew the Complainant's mark. Consequently, and in the absence of any evidence to the contrary, the Panel is convinced that the Respondent knew that the disputed domain names included the Complainant's trademark when it registered the disputed domain names.

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.

On this regard, the further circumstances surrounding the disputed domain names' registration and use confirm the findings that the Respondent has registered and is using the disputed domain names in bad faith:

- (1) the nature of the disputed domain names, incorporating the Complainant's mark plus the addition of the term "casino" in the Complainant's field of activity.
- (2) the content of the websites to which the disputed domain names resolve (i.e. websites displaying in a prominent way the Complainant's mark and logo and allegedly offering competing services);
- (3) a clear absence of rights or legitimate interests coupled with no response for the Respondent's choice of the disputed domain names;
- (4) the Respondent concealing its identity through a privacy service.

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 <casinoadmiral-club.com>, <casino-admiral-enter.top>, <casinoadmiral-enter.win>, <casinoadmiralenter.win>, <casinoadmiralgo.com>, <casinoadmiralgo.win>, <casino-admiralvhod.win>, <casinoadmiralvhod.win>, and <casinoadmiralwin.win> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Federica Togo/

Federica Togo

Sole Panelist

Date: June 25, 2026