

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

Novomatic AG v. Anna Anna
Case No. D2026-2253

1. The Parties

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

The Respondent is Anna Anna, Ukraine.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <admi-ral.online> is registered with NameCheap, Inc. (the “Registrar”).

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the “Center”) on May 26, 2026. On May 27, 2026, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On May 28, 2026, the Registrar transmitted by email to the Center its verification response confirming that the Respondent is listed as the registrant and providing the contact details. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on June 1, 2026, providing the registrant and contact information disclosed by the Registrar.

The Center verified that 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 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 24, 2026.

The Center appointed Andrew Brown K.C. as the sole panelist in this matter on July 9, 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 headquartered in Vienna, Austria. It has used the trademark ADMIRAL since 1980 for casino and related gambling services. The Complainant's rights to the ADMIRAL trademark in the European Union (EU) date back to 2004.

The Complainant owns a number of relevant registrations for the trademark ADMIRAL ("the ADMIRAL Trademark") including:

Territory	Number	Trademark	Registration Date	Class
EU	004134433	ADMIRAL	August 14, 2006	9, 16, 28, 36, 37, 41, 42, 43
EU	015570005	ADMIRAL	October 27, 2016	41
China	9615327	ADMIRAL	March 21, 2016	41
United Kingdom	00915570005	ADMIRAL	October 27, 2016	41
International Registration	598347	ADMIRAL	December 17, 1992	9, 28, 36, 37, 41, 42
Austria	2232/1980	ADMIRAL	October 3, 1980	9

The disputed domain name was registered on May 22, 2026. The disputed domain name resolves to a Google Play Store webpage which offers slot games and gambling services via an app to Internet users.

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 it has trademark rights to the ADMIRAL Trademark in respect of slot games and gambling services and that it operates ADMIRAL stores and ADMIRAL casinos and ADMIRAL sports betting services.

The Complainant contends that the disputed domain name is identical to or at least confusingly similar to its ADMIRAL Trademark as it contains the Complainant's ADMIRAL Trademark in its entirety. Further, the Complainant asserts that the suffix ".online" does not qualify to exclude confusion.

The Complainant contends that the respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the disputed domain name. In this regard the Complainant states that:

- (a) the Complainant's rights to the ADMIRAL Trademark date back to 1980 (Austria) and 2004 (EU).
- (b) the Respondent has no relationship with or permission from the Complainant to permit use of the Complainant's ADMIRAL Trademark.
- (c) the Respondent has not been commonly known by the disputed domain name nor the ADMIRAL sign nor has it acquired any trademark rights in the ADMIRAL Trademark.
- (d) the Respondent is using the disputed domain name in violation of the Complainant's registered trademark rights and is offering infringing slot games and provides illegal gambling services, pretending to be the official Google Play Store.

The Complainant states that the disputed domain name has been registered in bad faith. It asserts that the Respondent registered the disputed domain name long after the Complainant had registered trademarks for its ADMIRAL Trademark in various jurisdictions and long after the Complainant had commenced use of its websites at the domain names <admiral.ag>; <casinoadmiral.cz/de>; and <sports.admiral.at/de>;.

The Complainant relies on the fact that the landing page at the disputed domain name has been copied from one of its own websites. The Complainant says that its ADMIRAL Trademark is so well-known that the Respondent was undoubtedly aware of it when registering the disputed domain name. Further, the Complainant asserts that the Respondent had a duty to check trademark registries before or when it registered the disputed domain name.

As to use in bad faith, the Complainant states that the disputed domain name is used to offer illegal copies of the Complainant's famous slot games and to provide illegal gambling services. The Complainant states that the Respondent is using the disputed domain name to attract Internet users for commercial gain by creating a likelihood of confusion as to source, sponsorship, affiliation and endorsement with the Complainant's ADMIRAL Trademark.

The Complainant states that counterfeit copies of its goods and services are on offer at the disputed domain name.

Finally, the Complainant says that the disputed domain name prevents it from reflecting its trademark in a corresponding domain name.

B. Respondent

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

6. Discussion and Findings

Preliminary Procedural Issue

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 proceeding takes place with due expedition.

Since the Respondent's location is stated to be in Ukraine, which is subject to an international conflict at the date of this Decision that may affect 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.

Although the Written Notice was not able to be delivered by post to the Respondent, it appears that the Notification of Complaint email was delivered at the Respondent's email address, as provided by the Registrar. Therefore, there is no evidence that the case notification was not successfully delivered to the disclosed Respondent's email address.

It is moreover noted 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 name in bad faith and with the intention of unfairly targeting the Complainant's ADMIRAL Trademark. The Panel concludes that the Parties have been given a fair opportunity to present their case. The Panel therefore decides that the administrative proceedings should continue (see *Netbet Enterprises Ltd v. Privacy Service provided by Withheld for Privacy ehf / Vladimir Vladimir, Crowd inc*, WIPO Case No. [D2022-1420](#)).

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, namely the ADMIRAL Trademark, for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.2.1.

The Complainant further finds that the Complainant's ADMIRAL Trademark is clearly recognizable within the disputed domain name. Accordingly, the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to the mark for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.7.

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 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 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 finds that the disputed domain name has been registered in bad faith for the following reasons:

(a) The Complainant has clearly demonstrated its rights in the ADMIRAL Trademark and that this trademark was well known from the 1980's onward and certainly for many years prior to registration of the disputed domain name on May 22, 2026;

(b) The Panel finds that the Respondent knew of the Complainant's ADMIRAL Trademark prior to registration of the disputed domain name. This is confirmed by the landing page created at the disputed domain name upon registration which displays a Google Play Store website where the Respondent has

offered infringing and potentially counterfeit copies of the Complainant's well-known slot games. The landing page produced images of Apps which used the Complainant's ADMIRAL Trademark.

The Panel is also satisfied that the Respondent has used the disputed domain name in bad faith for the following reasons:

- (a) The Complainant has provided evidence that the disputed domain name has been used to offer infringing slot games and to provide infringing gambling services including by holding itself out as the official Google Play Store for the Complainant's gambling services. It is likely that Internet users encountering the disputed domain name and the landing page will be misled or deceived into believing that this has been licensed, authorized or endorsed by the Complainant when this is not the case;
- (b) From the disputed domain name, the Respondent is offering potentially counterfeit copies of the Complainant's goods and services;
- (c) The disputed domain name prevents the Complainant from reflecting its ADMIRAL Trademark in a corresponding domain name;
- (d) The Panel is entitled to draw and does draw adverse inferences from the failure of the Respondent to respond to the Complaint and the allegations made by the Complainant.

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 <admi-ral.online> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Andrew Brown K.C./

Andrew Brown K.C.

Sole Panelist

Date: July 17, 2026