

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

Full House LLC v. david potskhveria
Case No. D2026-2182

1. The Parties

The Complainant is Full House LLC, Georgia, represented by Mikadze Gegetchkori Taktakishvili LLC, Georgia.

The Respondent is david potskhveria, Georgia.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <crocobet.net> 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 May 20, 2026. On May 21, 2026, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On May 21, 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 May 22, 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 27, 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 June 3, 2026. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was June 23, 2026. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent’s default on June 29, 2026.

The Center appointed Assen Alexiev as the sole panelist in this matter on July 6, 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 was founded with its registered office in Tbilisi, Georgia. It operates a gambling website, offering online sports betting, slots, casino games, and poker, which website is located at the domain name <crocobet.com>, registered on February 5, 2008. The Complainant's other domain name <crocobet.ge>, registered on September 15, 2016, redirects to the same website.

The Complainant is the owner of the Georgian trademark registration ( **crocobet** ET trademark") with registration No. 28033, registered on December 26, 2016, for services in International Class 41.

The disputed domain name was registered on January 30, 2017. It currently resolves to a landing webpage of the Registrar displaying sponsored links to third party websites.

The Respondent has not provided any information about itself and its activities. Its contact details provided by the Registrar indicate that it is an individual with an address in Tbilisi, Georgia.

5. Parties' Contentions

A. Complainant

The Complainant states that the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to its CROCOBET trademark, because it incorporates entirely the dominant "crocobet" verbal element of the trademark. The Complainant points out that its trademark predates the registration of the disputed domain name.

According to the Complainant, the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the disputed domain name, because the Complainant has never authorised it to use the CROCOBET trademark or to register any domain name incorporating this trademark, and the Respondent is not commonly known as "Crocobet", and has not acquired any trademark rights in that name. The Complainant submits that the Respondent has not used the disputed domain name in connection with any bona fide offering of goods or services or carried out a legitimate noncommercial or fair use of the disputed domain name. The Complainant adds that the composition of the disputed domain name suggests an association with betting or gambling activities, which is a highly regulated business sector, and the Respondent is not licensed to provide gambling-related services.

The Complainant contends that the disputed domain name was registered and is being used in bad faith. It submits that the CROCOBET trademark has been used in connection with online gambling and betting services for many years and was registered before the disputed domain name. The Complainant notes that the registrant of the disputed domain name is an individual with an address in Tbilisi, Georgia, while the Complainant is a Georgian company operating in Georgia. According to the Complainant, it is therefore likely that the Respondent has registered the disputed domain name with knowledge of the Complainant's business and trademark. The Complainant points out in this regard that the disputed domain name was registered shortly after the Complainant registered the CROCOBET trademark. According to the Complainant, the disputed domain name was registered to prevent the Complainant from reflecting its trademark in a corresponding domain name and to exploit the goodwill of the CROCOBET trademark. The Complainant submits that the passive holding of the disputed domain name by the Respondent does not prevent a finding of bad faith in the circumstances of the present case, particularly where any conceivable use of the disputed domain name by the Respondent would likely mislead Internet users into believing that the disputed domain name is associated with or operated by the Complainant.

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 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 the CROCOBET trademark for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.2.1.

The Panel finds that the CROCOBET trademark is recognisable within the disputed domain name, because it identically reproduces the textual component of the trademark, which is its relevant element for the purposes of the test for confusing similarity. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), sections 1.7 and 1.10. Accordingly, the disputed domain name is identical to the CROCOBET trademark for the purposes of the Policy.

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 recognised 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 disputed domain name is confusingly similar to the Complainant's CROCOBET trademark and reproduces identically its "crocobet" textual component without any other elements. This creates a high risk of implied affiliation with the Complainant. Section 2.5.1 of the [WIPO Overview 3.1](#). The Respondent has not provided any plausible explanation why it registered the disputed domain name and how it intends to use it. It is also notable that both parties are located in the capital of Georgia.

Considering the above, there is nothing to contradict the prima facie case made by the Complainant that the Respondent does not have rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name.

The Panel therefore 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.

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.

Considering the disputed domain name (which is identical to the Complainant's trademark) resolves to a landing page of the Registrar containing sponsored links to third party websites, which is considered as "use" of the disputed domain name by the Respondent, the Respondent cannot then disclaim responsibility for the appearance of these links, which may redirect to third party websites Internet users attracted by the confusing similarity of the disputed domain name to the Complainant's trademark. This supports a finding of bad faith registration and use of the disputed domain name under paragraph 4(b)(iv) of the Policy.

The Panel therefore 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 <crocobet.net> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Assen Alexiev/

Assen Alexiev

Sole Panelist

Date: July 16, 2026