

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

Circus Belgium S.A. v. Yordan Yordanov, Astramania, Grigorijs Vekss, Ryszard Klimek, Nastia Sarachova, Aleksander Kus, Iehor Pronin, Name Redacted
Case No. D2026-2361

1. The Parties

The Complainant is Circus Belgium S.A., Belgium, represented by Cogitus SRL, Belgium.

The Respondents are Yordan Yordanov, Astramania, Bulgaria; Grigorijs Vekss, Latvia; Ryszard Klimek, Poland; Nastia Sarachova, Ukraine; Aleksander Kus, Poland; Iehor Pronin, Ukraine; and Name Redacted¹, Romania.

2. The Domain Names and Registrars

The disputed domain names <circuscasinos-nl.com>, and <circuscasinos-fr.com> are registered with Hosting Concepts B.V. d/b/a Registrar.eu; <circuscasinos-be.com> is registered with DevExpanse Ltd d/b/a Regery.com; <royalcircuscasino.com>, <circuscasino-fr.com>, <circuscasino-uk.com>, and <circuscasino-es.com> are registered with NameCheap, Inc.; and <casinocircus-be.com> is registered with Dynadot LLC (collectively, the “Registrars”).

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the “Center”) on June 1, 2026. On June 2, 2026, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrars requests for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain names. On June 2, June 3, and June 4, 2026, the Registrars transmitted by email to the Center their verification responses disclosing registrant and contact information for the disputed domain names which differed from the named Respondents and contact information in the Complaint.

¹ The Respondent appears to have used the name of a third party when registering the disputed domain name <circuscasino-uk.com>. In light of the potential identity theft, the Panel has redacted the Respondent’s name from this decision. However, the Panel has attached as Annex 1 to this decision an instruction to the Registrar regarding transfer of the disputed domain name, which includes the name of the Respondent. The Panel has authorized the Center to transmit Annex 1 to the Registrar as part of the order in this proceeding, and has indicated Annex 1 to this decision shall not be published due to the exceptional circumstances of this case. See *Banco Bradesco S.A. v. FAST-12785241 Attn. Bradescourgente.net / Name Redacted*, WIPO Case No. [D2009-1788](#).

The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on June 10, 2026 with the registrant and contact information of the nominally multiple underlying registrants disclosed by the Registrars, requesting the Complainant either to file separate complaints for the disputed domain names associated with different underlying registrants or, alternatively, to demonstrate that the underlying registrants were the same entity or that the disputed domain names were under common control. The Complainant filed an amended Complaint on June 11, 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 Respondents of the Complaint, and the proceedings commenced on July 7, 2026. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was July 27, 2026.

On July 8, 2026, the Center received an email communication from the email address associated with the registrant of the disputed domain name <circuscasinos-be.com>. On July 28, 2026, a third party contacted the Center asserting that her identity and contact details had been used without her knowledge or authorization in connection with the disputed domain name <circuscasino-uk.com>.

The Center appointed Evan D. Brown as the sole panelist in this matter on August 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 is a Belgian company active in the casino and gambling sector. It owns numerous trademark registrations for CIRCUS and CIRCUS CASINO, including European Union Trade Mark Registration No. 006071914 for CIRCUS CASINO, registered on October 23, 2008, and United Kingdom Trade Mark Registration No. UK00906071914 for CIRCUS CASINO, registered on October 23, 2008. The Complainant also owns, among others, Spanish Trademark Registration No. M3091174 for CIRCUS, registered on January 17, 2014.

The Complainant has authorized Gambling Management S.A., a company within the same corporate group, to use certain CIRCUS marks in connection with the operation of the online casino website at <circus-casino.be> and related promotional activities.

The disputed domain names were registered between November 2025 and May 2026. More specifically, <circuscasino-fr.com> was registered on November 13, 2025; <circuscasino-uk.com> on February 19, 2026; <casinocircus-be.com> on March 4, 2026; <royalcircuscasino.com> and <circuscasino-es.com> on April 15, 2026; <circuscasinos-be.com> on April 29, 2026; and <circuscasinos-nl.com> and <circuscasinos-fr.com> on May 12, 2026.

The record contains screenshots, principally taken in May 2026, showing websites associated with the disputed domain names offering or promoting online casino and gambling services under CIRCUS or CIRCUS CASINO branding. Several of the websites were presented as localized versions of a CIRCUS casino service for particular national markets and included registration, login, bonus, or other gambling-related features. The record also contains evidence that users interacting with certain of the websites were directed to unrelated third-party gambling platforms.

5. Parties' Contentions

A. Complainant

The Complainant contends that the disputed domain names are confusingly similar to trademarks in which the Complainant has rights; that the Respondents have no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the disputed domain names; and that the disputed domain names were registered and are being used in bad faith.

B. Respondents

The Respondents did not submit a formal Response.

In an informal communication concerning the disputed domain name <circuscasinos-be.com>, the sender stated that it had access only to that website, that the website had been removed, and that it did not have access to the other websites at issue in this proceeding.

A third party submitted an informal communication denying that she had registered, owned, or had any involvement with any of the disputed domain names. She asserted that her personal information had been used without her knowledge or consent and identified discrepancies between her actual contact information and the registration information associated with the disputed domain name <circuscasino-uk.com>.

6. Discussion and Findings

6.1. Procedural Issues

A. Location of the Respondents

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.

The location of some registrants 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 proceeding should continue.

Having considered all the circumstances of the case, the Panel is of the view that it should.

The record shows that the Notification of Complaint email was sent to the Respondents' email addresses disclosed by the Registrars; and the Center's postal notification was sent to the Respondents' mailing address disclosed by the Registrars by registered mail. The Respondents thus appear to have received at least the electronic notice of the Complaint and would have been able to formulate and file a Response in the administrative proceeding they wished to do so. Furthermore, the disputed domain names were registered between 2025 and 2026, during the international conflict, suggesting that the Respondents are able to access the Internet and maintain control of the disputed domain names, and reaffirms that the Respondents more likely than not received at least electronic notice of this proceeding.

The Panel therefore concludes that the Respondents have been given a fair opportunity to present their case, and so that the administrative proceeding takes place with due expedition, the Panel will proceed to a decision accordingly.

B. Consolidation of Multiple Respondents

There are seven nominal underlying registrants disclosed by the Registrars in connection with the eight disputed domain names. The Complainant requests that all of the domain name disputes be consolidated into this matter. Consolidation is proper, so the Complainant's request for consolidation is granted.

Paragraph 10(e) of the Rules states that a "[p]anel shall decide a request by a Party to consolidate multiple domain name disputes in accordance with the Policy and these Rules". Paragraph 10(c) of the Rules provides, in relevant part, that "the [p]anel shall ensure that the administrative proceeding takes place with due expedition". Section 4.11.2 of the WIPO Overview of WIPO Panel Views on Select UDRP Questions ("[WIPO Overview 3.1](#)") provides that where a complaint is filed against multiple respondents, panels consider whether the disputed domain names or corresponding websites are subject to common control, and whether consolidation would be fair and equitable to all parties. This is the framework reflected in the panels' prior consolidation decisions.

The record indicates that the disputed domain names are under common control. The following facts support this conclusion:

- All eight disputed domain names follow a closely related naming pattern, combining the Complainant's CIRCUS mark with the term "casino" or "casinos", in some instances together with a geographic identifier or another term.
- The websites associated with the disputed domain names concern the same commercial field and use CIRCUS or CIRCUS CASINO branding in connection with online gambling services.
- All eight disputed domain names use Cloudflare nameservers and were registered within the period from November 2025 through May 2026.
- In particular, the domain names <circuscasinos-nl.com> and <circuscasinos-fr.com> were registered within seconds of one another, through the same Registrar, by the same disclosed registrant, and use the same nameservers.
- The disclosed registration data contain further similarities. Five registrants whose listed addresses are in Bulgaria or Poland use Ukrainian (+380) telephone numbers, and two disclosed registrants use similarly structured email addresses.

Considered together, these naming, website, technical, timing, and registration-data similarities support the conclusion that the disputed domain names are subject to common control.

The Panel has considered the informal communication concerning the disputed domain name <circuscasinos-be.com>, in which the sender stated that it had access only to that website and did not have access to the other websites at issue. The Panel does not find that statement sufficient to outweigh the circumstances described above. In particular, the communication does not explain the substantial coordination reflected in the disputed domain names, their registration data, and their use.

The Panel also finds that consolidation would be fair and equitable. The Respondents were provided notice of the proceeding, the disputed domain names raise substantially overlapping factual and legal issues, and no Respondent has identified any prejudice that would result from consolidation. Consolidation also promotes procedural efficiency.

Accordingly, the conditions for proper consolidation of the disputed domain names into one matter are present here. See [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 4.11.2; *B&B HOTELS v. Catech-dd-truest, CA tech-dd trust.LCD, dxc dx, lcd, dxc dx, lcd, ROJUST, Oldisc.LCD*, WIPO Case No. [D2024-4501](#).

C. Respondent Identity

An individual whose identity appeared in the registration information for the disputed domain name <circuscasino-uk.com> informed the Center that she had never registered or been involved with the disputed domain name and that her personal information had been used without her authorization. She identified

specific discrepancies between her actual contact information and the registration data, including a different email address and telephone number and a discrepancy in the street address.

On the balance of probabilities, the Panel finds that the identity of this individual was used in connection with the registration of <circuscasino-uk.com> without her authorization. The Panel has therefore redacted her name from this Decision. The Panel has attached as Annex 1 to this Decision an instruction to the concerned Registrar regarding transfer of the disputed domain name <circuscasino-uk.com>. Annex 1 shall not be published due to the exceptional circumstances of this case.

6.2. Substantive Issues

A. Identical or Confusingly Similar

Paragraph 4(a)(i) of the Policy requires the Complainant to establish rights in a trademark or service mark and that the disputed domain names are identical or confusingly similar to that mark.

The Complainant has established rights in the CIRCUS mark through its trademark registrations. A registered trademark provides a clear indication that the rights in the mark shown on the trademark certificate belong to its respective owner. See [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.2.1; *Advance Magazine Publishers Inc., Les Publications Conde Nast S.A. v. Voguechen*, WIPO Case No. [D2014-0657](#).

The CIRCUS or CIRCUS CASINO marks are readily recognizable in each of the disputed domain names. The addition of the geographic identifiers such as “nl”, “be”, “fr”, “uk”, and “es”, the term “royal”, or the reversal of the order of “casino” and “circus” does not prevent a finding of confusing similarity. See [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), sections 1.7 and 1.8.

The Panel therefore finds that the Complainant has established the first element under the Policy.

B. Rights or Legitimate Interests

The Panel evaluates this element of the Policy by first looking to see whether the Complainant has made a prima facie showing that the Respondents lack rights or legitimate interests in respect of the disputed domain names. If the Complainant makes that showing, the burden of production of demonstrating rights or legitimate interests shifts to the Respondents (with the burden of proof always remaining with the Complainant). See [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 2.1; *AXA SA v. Huade Wang*, WIPO Case No. [D2022-1289](#).

On this point, the Complainant asserts, among other things, that: (1) the Respondents are not affiliated with the Complainant and have not been authorized or licensed to use the CIRCUS mark; (2) the Respondents are not commonly known by the disputed domain names; (3) the Respondents have not used the disputed domain names in connection with a bona fide offering of goods or services or for any legitimate noncommercial or fair use; and (4) instead, the Respondents have used the disputed domain names in connection with websites displaying CIRCUS or CIRCUS CASINO branding and presenting online casino and gambling services in a manner suggesting an affiliation with the Complainant. The Complainant further asserts, and has submitted supporting evidence, that certain of the disputed domain names redirect to unrelated third-party gambling platforms.

The Panel finds that the Complainant has made the required prima facie showing. The Respondents have not presented evidence to overcome this prima facie showing. And nothing in the record otherwise tilts the balance in the Respondents' favor.

Use of a domain name for passing off can never confer rights or legitimate interests on a respondent. See [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 2.13.1.

Accordingly, the Panel finds that the Complainant has established this second element under the Policy.

C. Registered and Used in Bad Faith

Paragraph 4(a)(iii) of the Policy requires the Complainant to establish that the disputed domain names were registered and are being used in bad faith.

The Complainant's trademark rights predate the registration of all of the disputed domain names. More importantly, the composition of the disputed domain names and the content of the associated websites tend to demonstrate that the Respondents had the Complainant and its CIRCUS mark in mind when registering the disputed domain names. Each disputed domain name combines the CIRCUS mark with terminology directly related to the Complainant's casino activities, and the associated websites use CIRCUS or CIRCUS CASINO branding while presenting online gambling services as if they were official or authorized CIRCUS offerings. These circumstances demonstrate actual awareness of and targeting of the Complainant. See [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 3.2.1.

The Panel therefore finds, on the balance of probabilities, that the Respondents registered the disputed domain names because of the Complainant and its CIRCUS mark.

The record also establishes bad-faith use. Paragraph 4(b)(iv) of the Policy provides that bad faith may be found where a respondent, by using a domain name, intentionally attempts to attract Internet users to its website or other online location for commercial gain by creating a likelihood of confusion with a complainant's mark as to the source, sponsorship, affiliation, or endorsement of the website or of a product or service offered on it.

The Respondents have used the disputed domain names for commercial gambling websites that create the appearance of being official or authorized CIRCUS casino services. The websites invite users to register, log in, claim bonuses, or otherwise engage with online gambling services. The record further shows that users interacting with certain of the websites were directed to unrelated third-party gambling platforms. Such conduct demonstrates an intentional attempt to attract Internet users for commercial gain by creating confusion with the Complainant's CIRCUS mark as to source, sponsorship, affiliation, or endorsement. See Policy, paragraph 4(b)(iv); [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), sections 3.1.4 and 3.4.

The Panel also finds significant the Respondents' use of Belgian gaming licence number A+20635 on several of the websites associated with the disputed domain names. The record shows that this licence number is associated with the official CIRCUS-branded online casino operation in Belgium conducted by Gambling Management S.A. pursuant to authorization from the Complainant. The Respondents had no authorization to use that licence number. Its appearance on websites using the Complainant's CIRCUS branding and offering casino services is further evidence that the Respondents were aware of the Complainant and deliberately sought to create the false impression that the websites were official, licensed, or otherwise affiliated with the Complainant.

The Panel also notes, as an additional circumstance concerning the disputed domain name <circuscasino-uk.com>, that the registration information appears to have used the identity of an uninvolved individual without authorization. False or unauthorized registration information may further support a finding of bad faith when combined with otherwise abusive conduct.

The Panel therefore finds that the disputed domain names were registered and are being used in bad faith. The Complainant has established the third element under 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 names <circuscasinos-nl.com>, <circuscasinos-be.com>, <circuscasinos-fr.com>, <royalcircuscasino.com>, <circuscasino-fr.com>, <circuscasino-uk.com>, <circuscasino-es.com>, and <casinocircus-be.com> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Evan D. Brown/

Evan D. Brown

Sole Panelist

Date: August 20, 2026