

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

Novomatic AG v. Stanislav Novak

Case No. D2026-2254

1. The Parties

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

The Respondent is Stanislav Novak, Ukraine.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <book-of-ra-life.win> is registered with Dynadot 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 30, 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 (Dynadot Privacy Service / The RDAP server redacted the value) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on June 2, 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 June 2, 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 June 5, 2026. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was June 25, 2026. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent’s default on June 29, 2026.

The Center appointed Kiyoshi Tsuru as the sole panelist in this matter on July 3, 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 an Austrian company active in the gaming and casino technology sector. The Complainant is the owner of a portfolio of trademark registrations for BOOK OF RA, including, among others:

Territory	Registration Number	Trademark	Registration Date	Class (es)
European Union ("EU")	004451431	BOOK OF RA	May 24, 2006	9
EU	012456828	BOOK OF RA 	April 23, 2014	9
United States of America	4800800	BOOK OF RA	August 25, 2015	9 and 41

According to the record, the Complainant's rights in the BOOK OF RA trademark date back to at least 2006. The BOOK OF RA mark is used by the Complainant in connection with a slot game offered, among other channels, through the Complainant's own website and its affiliated online gaming platform.

The disputed domain name was registered on May 19, 2026. As evidenced in the Complaint, the disputed domain name resolved to a website offering an online slot game under the heading "BOOK OF GODS," featuring Egyptian-themed imagery (including an Anubis figure, a pharaoh figure, and scarab motifs) and a "SPIN" button.

The disputed domain name currently resolves to a website promoting a different online gambling product, identified as "Lucky Haven" and attributed to "Tech Innovations Inc.," offering casino-style gambling content available for download.

The Respondent is Stanislav Novak, an individual with a declared address in Ukraine, as disclosed by the Registrar.

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 the following:

I. Identical or confusingly similar

That the Complainant is the owner of numerous trademark registrations for BOOK OF RA, including in the European Union, the United Kingdom, Chile, and the United States of America, several of which are registered in class 9 and cover, among other goods, casino games. That the disputed domain name is identical, in its distinctive part, or at least confusingly similar to the Complainant's BOOK OF RA trademark, because the disputed domain name incorporates said trademark in its entirety.

That the terms “life” and “win” are merely descriptive and that their addition does not prevent a finding of confusing similarity.

II. Rights or Legitimate Interests

That the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name. That the disputed domain name is being used by the Respondent in violation of the applicable law and in infringement of the Complainant’s trademark rights. That the Complainant’s rights in the BOOK OF RA trademark substantially predate the registration of the disputed domain name. That the Complainant owns, inter alia, a European Union trademark registration for BOOK OF RA dating from 2006.

That the Respondent is not affiliated with the Complainant in any way and has not been licensed, authorized, or otherwise permitted the Respondent to use the BOOK OF RA trademark or to register any domain name incorporating said mark.

That the Respondent has neither been commonly known by the disputed domain name nor by the mark BOOK OF RA, nor has it acquired any corresponding trademark rights thereto. That the Respondent uses the infringing disputed domain name to offer infringing slot games and to provide illegal gambling services, and also uses images relating to the BOOK OF RA trademark in the promotion of said illegal casino game.

III. Registered and Used in Bad Faith

That the Respondent registered and is using the disputed domain name in bad faith. That the Respondent registered the disputed domain name long after the Complainant had registered its trademarks and long after the Complainant had established its website, which the Respondent then copied, and that the Complainant’s Book of Ra games and the BOOK OF RA trademarks are so well known that the Respondent, without any doubt, was aware of them when registering the disputed domain name.

That the Respondent had a duty to check trademark registries when registering the disputed domain name, that the website to which the disputed domain name resolved was used to offer illegal copies of the Complainant’s famous slot games and to provide illegal gambling, and that said website was therefore designed to mislead the Complainant’s customers.

That the disputed domain name, which wholly incorporates the Complainant’s trademarks, is used to attract, for commercial gain, Internet users to the Respondent’s website by creating a likelihood of confusion with the Complainant’s trademarks as to the source, sponsorship, affiliation, or endorsement of the website or its products.

That the Respondent is taking unfair advantage of the Complainant’s trademark rights and preventing the Complainant from reflecting its trademark in a corresponding domain name.

B. Respondent

The Respondent did not reply to the Complaint, as it did not submit a Response.

6. Discussion and Findings

Procedural Issue – 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.

The record shows that the Center's electronic notification of the Complaint was successfully transmitted to the email address for the registrant disclosed by the Registrar, and the record does not contain any bounce-back or other indication that such notification was not successfully delivered. The Written Notice sent by courier to the Respondent's address in Ukraine was, according to the tracking record, subject to a misrouting incident and was ultimately not delivered due to the recipient's absence, notwithstanding two delivery attempts.

Having considered all the circumstances of the case, including that email notification to the Respondent's address of record was not shown to have failed, that the Rules do not require successful delivery by every method employed but rather that the Center discharge its obligation to employ reasonably available means, and that the Respondent has at no point contacted the Center to report a notification difficulty, the Panel is of the view that it should proceed to decide the case on the existing record.

The Panel finds that the Center discharged its notification obligations under paragraphs 2(a) and 4 of the Rules, and that the Respondent was afforded a fair opportunity to present its case (see *Sanofi v. Alex Foster*, WIPO Case No. [D2025-2068](#); *SportPesa Holdings Ltd. v. Olena Obriezkova*, WIPO Case No. [D2025-2973](#)).

Paragraph 4(a) of the Policy sets out the three requirements that the complainants must prove in order to successfully request remedies:

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

Given the Respondent's default and therefore, failure to specifically address the case merits as they relate to the three UDRP elements, the Panel may decide this proceeding based on the Complainant's undisputed factual allegations under paragraphs 5(f), 14(a), and 15(a) of the Rules (see WIPO Overview of WIPO Panel Views on Select UDRP Questions ("[WIPO Overview 3.1](#)"), section 4.3; see also *Verner Panton Design v. Fontana di Luce Corp*, WIPO Case No. [D2012-1909](#)).

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. See [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 record shows that the entirety of the mark is reproduced within the disputed domain name. Accordingly, the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to the mark for the purposes of the Policy (see [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.8. see also *Accenture Global Services Limited v. Sheetal Gaikwad*, WIPO Case No. [D2025-1168](#); *Bailamia Investments Ltd v. Name Redacted*, WIPO Case No. [D2025-0464](#)).

Although the addition of the term "life", insertion of hyphens separating the constituent elements of the mark, as well as the generic Top-Level Domain (gTLD) ".win", may bear on the assessment of the second and third elements, the Panel finds that the addition of such terms does not prevent a finding of confusing similarity

between the disputed domain name and the mark for the purposes of the Policy.

Although, the addition of a gTLD in a domain name is viewed as a standard registration requirement and is disregarded under the confusing similarity test (see [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.11.1; see also *Fat Face Holdings Limited v. fang zhi qiang*, WIPO Case No. [D2024-0481](#)).

Based on the available record, 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 case 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 record also shows that the Complainant has affirmed that it has no relationship with the Respondent and has not authorized the Respondent’s use of the BOOK OF RA mark. The Complainant has stated that the Respondent is not commonly known by the disputed domain name.

Based on the available record, 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) 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.

The record shows that the disputed domain name was registered on May 19, 2026, long after the Complainant’s BOOK OF RA trademark had acquired substantial recognition and was registered in connection with online slot games, and that the disputed domain name had been used to resolve to a website offering unauthorized online gambling content in the same Egyptian-themed genre as the Complainant’s gambling product. The full incorporation of the Complainant’s distinctive mark in the disputed domain name, together with the nature of the content to which it resolved indicates that the Respondent registered the disputed domain name with the Complainant’s trademark in mind, which constitutes bad faith (see [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 3.2.1; see also *SportPesa Holdings Ltd. v. Olena Obriezkova*, WIPO Case No. [D2025-2973](#); *Global Brother SRL v. Volodymyr Makhynia*, WIPO Case No. [D2025-4247](#)).

The Respondent’s conduct falls within paragraph 4(b)(iv) of the Policy in that he has intentionally attempted to attract, for commercial gain, Internet users to its website, by creating a likelihood of confusion with the Complainant’s mark as to the source, sponsorship, affiliation, or endorsement of said website.

Based on the available record, the Panel finds that 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 disputed domain name <book-of-ra-life.win> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Kiyoshi Tsuru/

Kiyoshi Tsuru

Sole Panelist

Date: July 17, 2026