

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

Tipico Group Ltd. v. Dan Byk, Daniil Bukov
Case No. D2026-2223

1. The Parties

The Complainant is Tipico Group Ltd., Malta, represented by Boehmert & Boehmert, Germany.

The Respondent is Dan Byk, Daniil Bukov, Russian Federation.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <tipico.casino> is registered with NameSilo, LLC (the “Registrar”).

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the “Center”) on May 22, 2026. On May 22, 2026, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On the same date, 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, PrivacyGuardian.org) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on May 26, 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 27, 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 28, 2026. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was June 17, 2026. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent’s default on June 18, 2026.

The Center appointed Eva Fiammenghi 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, Tipico Group Ltd., is a company incorporated in Malta and operates as one of the leading providers of sports betting and online gaming services in Europe. Founded in 2004, the Complainant has developed into a major international operator in the betting and gaming sector, offering services both online and through retail outlets.

The Complainant owns multiple trademark registrations for TIPICO in numerous jurisdictions, including but not limited to the following:

- European Union Trade Mark TIPICO (word), Reg. No. 003939998, filed on July 19, 2004 and registered on September 23, 2005, in class 41;
- European Union Trade Mark TIPICO (figurative), Reg. No. 011339835, registered on May 3, 2013, in classes 3, 7, 9, 14, 16, 25, 28, 32, 33, 34, 35, 36, 38, 41, 42, 43, and 45; and
- European Union Trade Mark TIPICO (figurative), Reg. No. 017913149, registered on May 16, 2019, in classes 9, 14, 16, 25, 28, 32, 34, 35, 36, 38, 41, 42, 43, and 45.

These trademarks are used in connection with betting, gambling, entertainment, and related services.

The Complainant operates its principal online services under its trademark TIPICO and owns various domain names incorporating the mark.

The disputed domain name was registered on April 16, 2026.

The disputed domain name resolves to a website offering online casino services, prominently displaying the TIPICO mark and promoting gambling services, including cryptocurrency-based betting. The website presents itself as a gaming platform and invites users to register and engage with casino games.

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.

The Complainant submits that the disputed domain name is identical to its trademark TIPICO, as it reproduces the mark in its entirety.

The Complainant further asserts that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the disputed domain name. The Respondent is not affiliated with the Complainant and has not been authorized to use its trademark.

Finally, the Complainant argues that the disputed domain name was registered and is being used in bad faith. The disputed domain name was registered many years after the Complainant's trademarks, and its use for a website offering competing gambling services demonstrates an intent to exploit the reputation of the Complainant's trademark for commercial gain.

The Complainant requests the transfer of the disputed domain name.

B. Respondent

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

6. Discussion and Findings

Under paragraph 4(a) of the Policy, to succeed a complainant must prove that:

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

These elements are discussed in turn below. In considering these elements, paragraph 15(a) of the Rules provides that the Panel shall decide the Complaint on the basis of statements and documents submitted and in accordance with the Policy, the Rules and any other rules or principles of law that the Panel deems applicable.

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.

The entirety of the trademark is reproduced within the disputed domain name. Accordingly, the disputed domain name is identical to the mark for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.7.

The applicable Top-Level Domain ".casino" is typically disregarded under the first element assessment.

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 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 Complainant has not authorized, licensed, or otherwise permitted the Respondent to use its TIPICO trademark in any manner, including as part of a domain name. There is no evidence in the record that the Respondent is commonly known by the disputed domain name.

On the contrary, the disputed domain name resolves to a website offering gambling services using the Complainant's trademark, which constitutes an attempt to impersonate or create an association with the Complainant. Such use cannot confer rights or legitimate interests on the Respondent.

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) provides a non-exhaustive list of circumstances that may indicate bad faith.

In the present case, the Panel finds that the Respondent registered the disputed domain name well after the Complainant's trademarks had been registered and had become established in the field of betting and gambling services.

The disputed domain name is identical to the Complainant's trademark and is used in connection with a website offering gambling services similar to those of the Complainant. This strongly suggests that the Respondent was aware of the Complainant and its trademark rights at the time of registration.

By using the disputed domain name, the Respondent has intentionally attempted to attract Internet users, for commercial gain, to its website by creating a likelihood of confusion with the Complainant's mark as to the source, sponsorship, affiliation, or endorsement of the website or of the services offered on it.

Such conduct falls squarely within the example of bad faith set out in paragraph 4(b)(iv) of the Policy.

The Panel therefore finds that the disputed domain name was registered and is being used in bad faith.

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 <tipico.casino> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Eva Fiammenghi/

Eva Fiammenghi

Sole Panelist

Date: July 7, 2026