

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

Aktiebolaget Trav och Galopp v. Paul Michael Sheehan
Case No. D2026-2449

1. The Parties

The Complainant is Aktiebolaget Trav och Galopp, Sweden, represented by Advokatbyrån Gulliksson AB, Sweden.

The Respondent is Paul Michael Sheehan, United Kingdom.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <atg-casino.org> is registered with Dynadot Inc (the “Registrar”).

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the “Center”) on June 5, 2026. On June 5, 2026, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On June 8, 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 (Super Privacy Service LTD c/o Dynadot) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on June 8, 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 13, 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 17, 2026. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was July 7, 2026. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent’s default on July 10, 2026.

The Center appointed Simone Huser as the sole panelist in this matter on July 24, 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 betting company founded in 1974, which offers horse racing betting in Sweden as well as casino services and betting on other sports.

The Complainant holds the domain name <atg.se>, which hosts its main website.

The Complainant owns trademark registrations in several jurisdictions, including:

- ATG, Swedish Trademark Registration No. 326542, registered on March 6, 1998, in International Class 41; and

-  - European Union Trademark Registration No. 010955151, registered on October 22, 2012, in International Classes 36 and 41.

The disputed domain name was registered on July 16, 2025.

According to the evidence submitted with the Complaint, the disputed domain name resolves to a website incorporating the Complainant's trademark and purporting to offer online gaming, betting and casino services.

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 as follows:

The disputed domain name is confusingly similar to the registered trademark in which the Complainant has rights, because it incorporates the Complainant's ATG trademark in its entirety, and only differs by the addition of the descriptive term "casino".

There is no legitimate relationship or connection between the Complainant and the disputed domain name, and there is no evidence of the Respondent's use of the disputed domain name in connection with a bona fide offering of goods and services. The website at the disputed domain name contains a logo that is identical to the Complainant's registered logo. Hence, the Respondent's website is intended to misleadingly convey to users that they are seeing a website owned and operated by the Complainant.

The Respondent's website purports to offer online gaming, betting and casino services under the Complainant's marks and company name by linking users to external betting, casino or gambling service providers with no connection to the Complainant. The Respondent has intentionally attempted to attract, for commercial gain, Internet users to the Respondent's web site and the linked domain <nv74.casino>, by creating a likelihood of confusion with the Complainant's mark as to the source, affiliation, or endorsement of the Respondent's web site and service. The Respondent has therefore registered and is using the disputed domain name in bad faith.

B. Respondent

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

6. Discussion and Findings

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 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. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.7.

Although the addition of other terms here, "casino", may bear on assessment of the second and third elements, the Panel finds 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. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.8.

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 notes that the disputed domain name resolves to a website featuring services that are the same as the Complainant's services and that the Complainant's trademark and logo ATG is prominently reproduced on the website under the disputed domain name.

The Panel finds that the disputed domain name has been registered and used to mislead unsuspecting Internet users into thinking that the website is owned by, affiliated with or endorsed by the Complainant.

Panels have held that the use of a domain name for illegitimate activity, such as impersonation, can never confer rights or legitimate interests on a respondent. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 2.13.1.

Based on the available record, 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.

Paragraph 4(b) of the Policy sets out a list of non-exhaustive circumstances that may indicate that a domain name was registered and used in bad faith, but other circumstances may be relevant in assessing whether a respondent's registration and use of a domain name is in bad faith. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 3.2.1.

In the view of the Panel, noting that that the Complainant's trademark rights predate the registration of the disputed domain name and considering that the disputed domain name resolves to a website featuring the Complainant's trademark and logo, it is inconceivable that the Respondent could have registered the disputed domain name without knowledge of the Complainant's trademark. In the circumstances of this case, this is evidence of registration in bad faith.

In the view of the Panel, the impression given by the website under the disputed domain name would cause Internet users to believe that the Respondent is somehow associated with the Complainant when, in fact, it is not. The Panel holds that by using the disputed domain name, the Respondent 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 its website in the sense of Policy, paragraph 4(b)(iv).

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

Noting the composition of the disputed domain name, its use, and the failure of the Respondent to submit a response, the Panel finds the Respondent's registration and use of the disputed domain name in the circumstances of this case, constitutes 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 <atg-casino.org> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Simone Huser/

Simone Huser

Sole Panelist

Date: August 7, 2026