

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

MRG IP Limited v. Eugene Gonzales

Case No. D2026-2338

1. The Parties

The Complainant is MRG IP Limited, Malta, represented by Haseltine Lake Kempner LLP, United Kingdom.

The Respondent is Eugene Gonzales, Spain.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <mr-greencasino.com> is registered with URL Solutions, Inc. (the “Registrar”).

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the “Center”) on May 29, 2026. On June 1, 2026, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On June 2, 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 (Redacted) 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 amended Complaint on June 3, 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 9, 2026. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was June 29, 2026. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent’s default on June 30, 2026.

The Center appointed Petra Pecar as the sole panelist in this matter on July 8, 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 a company incorporated under the laws of Malta. The Complainant's business activity is in the online gaming and sports betting sector under the MR GREEN brand.

The Complainant is the owner of the European Union word mark MR GREEN Registration No. 006678461, registered on February 19, 2009 in International Classes 28 and 41; and the European Union word mark MR GREEN Registration No. 015820533, registered on January 10, 2017 in International Class 9.

The Complainant operates the domain names <mrgreen.com> and <mrgreen.co.uk>, through which online gaming and sports betting services are offered under the MR GREEN brand.

The disputed domain name was registered on April 3, 2024. At the time of filing of the Complaint, it resolved to a website offering gambling and betting services identical to those offered by the Complainant and stating it was "Mr Green Casino Official Website in Ireland." At the time of this Decision, the disputed domain name resolves to an inactive webpage.

The Complainant contacted the Registrar on March 17, 2026, and received responses on March 17, 19, and 27, 2026.

The Respondent is an individual reportedly from Spain.

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 is the owner of registered trademarks for MR GREEN, covering, inter alia, gambling, casino, lottery, and entertainment services, all of which predate the registration of the disputed domain name. The Complainant further contends that the disputed domain name incorporates the MR GREEN mark in its entirety, differing only by the insertion of a hyphen and the addition of the descriptive term "casino". According to the Complainant, these elements do not prevent a finding of confusing similarity, while the ".com" generic Top-Level Domain ("gTLD") is disregarded for the purposes of the comparison.

The Complainant further contends that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name, is neither affiliated with nor authorized by the Complainant, and is not commonly known by the disputed domain name. The Complainant also asserts that the Respondent used the disputed domain name to divert Internet users to a website designed to appear as an official MR GREEN website and to take advantage of the Complainant's marks.

The Complainant further contends that the disputed domain name was registered and is being used in bad faith to attract Internet users by creating a likelihood of confusion with the Complainant's marks. According to the Complainant, the associated website offers online gaming, gambling, and betting services under the "Mr Green" name, reproduces the Complainant's branding, and falsely presents itself as an official and licensed website.

B. Respondent

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

6. Discussion and Findings

Even if the Respondent did not file a Response to the Complainant's contentions, the Panel shall consider the issues present in the case based on the statements and documents submitted by the Complainant. "A Panel shall 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", as indicated in paragraph 15(a) of the Rules.

Under paragraph 4(a) of the Policy, the Complainant is required to prove each of the following three elements:

- (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 has been registered and is being used in bad faith.

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 mark 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 registered marks for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.2.1.

Although the addition of the hyphen and term "casino" may bear on assessment of the second and third elements, the Panel finds the addition does not prevent a finding of confusing similarity between the disputed domain name and the mark for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.8.

Furthermore, it is well accepted practice by UDRP panels that a gTLD, such as ".com", is typically disregarded when assessing whether a domain name is identical or confusingly similar to a trademark (see section 1.11.1 of the [WIPO Overview 3.1](#)). For that reason, the Panel accepts not to take into consideration the gTLD ".com" when assessing confusing similarity of the disputed domain name.

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.

According to the Complainant, the Respondent is not affiliated with, connected to, or otherwise authorized by the Complainant to use the MR GREEN mark or to register a domain name incorporating such mark or a variation thereof. The Complainant further states that the disputed domain name was registered after the Complainant had commenced use of and registered its MR GREEN mark, and that there is no evidence that the Respondent is commonly known by the disputed domain name or by any corresponding name.

The Panel finds that the Complainant has established a prima facie case that the Respondent lacks rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name, which the Respondent has not rebutted. The disputed domain name currently resolves to an inactive webpage, and there is no evidence before the Panel that the Respondent has used, or made demonstrable preparations to use, the disputed domain name in connection with a bona fide offering of goods or services, or for any legitimate noncommercial or fair use. Rather, the disputed domain name used to resolve to a website offering gambling and betting services identical to those offered by the Complainant, displaying a very similar logo and stating it was "Mr Green Casino Official Website in Ireland." In addition, the composition of the disputed domain name, consisting of the Complainant's MR GREEN mark together with the term "casino", which is descriptive of the Complainant's field of business, coupled with the prior use of the disputed domain name, indicates the Respondent's intention of taking unfair advantage of the likelihood of confusion between the disputed domain name and the Complainant as to the origin or affiliation of the website. Accordingly, the Panel finds that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the disputed domain name.

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 name was registered approximately 15 years after the registration of the Complainant's MR GREEN mark and long after the Complainant had commenced use of that mark. The disputed domain name incorporates the Complainant's MR GREEN mark, with a hyphen inserted between "mr" and "green", followed by the descriptive term "casino", which is directly related to the Complainant's field of business. This composition together with the prior use of the disputed domain name impersonating the Complainant support the inference that the Respondent was aware of and sought to create a misleading association with the Complainant. In the absence of any explanation from the Respondent for its choice of the disputed domain name, the Panel considers that its registration was unlikely to have been coincidental.

Based on the evidence provided by the Complainant, the Panel notes that the disputed domain name resolved to a website offering gambling and betting services identical to those offered by the Complainant, displaying a very similar logo and stating it was "Mr Green Casino Official Website in Ireland."

Panels have held that the use of a domain name for illegitimate activity – here, passing off – constitutes bad faith. See [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 3.4.

The Panel further notes that the disputed domain name currently resolves to an inactive website. Having reviewed the totality of the circumstances, including the composition of the disputed domain name, its prior use to impersonate the Complainant, the Respondent's lack of authorization, and the Respondent's failure to

respond to the Complaint, the Panel finds that the current passive holding of the disputed domain name does not prevent a finding of bad faith under the Policy.

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 <mr-greencasino.com> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Petra Pecar/

Petra Pecar

Sole Panelist

Date: July 22, 2026