

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

Norsk Tipping AS v. YURY ZANCHENKO

Case No. D2026-2468

1. The Parties

The Complainant is Norsk Tipping AS, Norway, represented by Bryn Aarflot AS, Norway.

The Respondent is YURY ZANCHENKO, Ukraine.

2. The Domain Names and Registrar

The disputed domain names <norsktipping-casino-no.com>, <norsk-tipping-no.com> and <norsktipping-no.com> are registered with Name.com, Inc. (the “Registrar”).

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the “Center”) on June 8, 2026. On June 8, 2026, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain names. On June 11, 2026, the Registrar transmitted by email to the Center its verification response, disclosing registrant and contact information for the disputed domain names which differed from the named Respondent (“Redacted For Privacy, Domain Protection Services, Inc.”) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on June 17, 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 18, 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 19, 2026. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was July 9, 2026. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent’s default on July 10, 2026.

The Center appointed Alistair Payne as the sole panelist in this matter on July 14, 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 fully owned by the Norwegian government and administered by the Norwegian Ministry of Culture and Equality. It holds a statutory monopoly on most gaming activities in Norway and has operated under the name NORSK TIPPING since 1948. Under Norwegian gambling regulations, the Complainant is the only company that can legally offer online casino games and betting to the Norwegian market.

The Complainant owns Norwegian word mark registration number 222202 for NORSK TIPPING registered on December 11, 2003. It also owns a European Union trade mark registration under number 017928490 for its logo mark which was registered on November 2, 2018.

The Complainant's official website is "www.norsk-tipping.no". In 2025 the Complainant reported gross gaming revenue of approximately NOK 57 billion, with gaming proceeds distributed to sports, culture and charitable causes throughout Norway. In a country of 5.6 million inhabitants, the Complainant had 2,348,951 customers in 2025, with a digital customer share of 89.6%.

The disputed domain names were all registered on December 8, 2025 by the Respondent based in Ukraine. Each of them resolves to a website labelled as "Norsk Tipping Norge Online Casino" and each website features the Complainant's registered logo mark. They all offer gambling services, including slot machines and login functionality and are in the Norwegian language and appear to be directed at Norwegian customers.

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 names.

Notably, the Complainant contends that its NORSK TIPPING trade mark is wholly incorporated into each of the disputed domain names. It says further that the addition of the words "casino" and/or "no" and/or a hyphen do not distinguish each of the disputed domain names and do not prevent a finding of confusing similarity.

The Complainant submits that it has not licensed, authorised or otherwise permitted the Respondent to use its NORSK TIPPING trade mark or its logo mark in any manner. It says that there is no commercial relationship, affiliation or association between the Complainant and the Respondent and that the Respondent is not commonly known by any of the disputed domain names. The Complainant notes that the Respondent's identity is masked behind a privacy/proxy service and that there is no indication that the Respondent holds any trade mark or other intellectual property rights corresponding to "Norsk Tipping" or any variant thereof.

The Complainant notes that each of the disputed domain names resolves to a website that presents itself as "Norsk Tipping Norge Online Casino" and offers online gambling services including slot machines, bonuses, promotional codes and login functionality, all in Norwegian and directed at Norwegian consumers. It says that each website prominently displays the Complainant's logo mark (being the multi-coloured cross) in the page header and in the browser address bar which creates the unmistakable impression that the websites are operated by, or affiliated with, the Complainant.

According to the Complainant, this use does not constitute a bona fide offering of goods or services, nor a legitimate noncommercial or fair use. It says rather that this use amounts to a fraudulent impersonation of the Complainant, noting that the Respondent is using the Complainant's name, trade mark and figurative mark to deceive Norwegian consumers into believing that the websites are official Norsk Tipping casino platforms, presumably to extract personal data and/or financial payments from those consumers. The Complainant submits that such use cannot confer rights or legitimate interests on the Respondent under any circumstances.

The Complainant notes that it holds an exclusive statutory licence to operate certain forms of gambling in Norway and that the operation of online casinos targeting Norwegian consumers by any other entity is prohibited under the Gambling Act in Norway. It says that this means that the Respondent's purported services are therefore unlawful, which further negates any claim to a right or legitimate interest in any of the disputed domain names.

As far as registration in bad faith is concerned, the Complainant says that its NORSK TIPPING word mark has been registered since 2003 and its logo mark since 2018. It notes that the disputed domain names were all created on December 8, 2025, years after the Complainant's trade mark rights were firmly established. It also says that considering the fame of the NORSK TIPPING brand in Norway and the fact that the Respondent operates websites entirely in Norwegian and that these websites reproduce the Complainant's figurative mark and impersonate its services, the Respondent must have been aware of the Complainant's trade marks at the time of registration of the disputed domain names. It submits further that the coordinated registration of three disputed domain names incorporating "Norsk Tipping" on the same date and each resolving to a website that targets the Complainant's core gambling services, is evidence of a deliberate scheme to exploit the Complainant's goodwill and constitutes registration in bad faith.

The Complainant submits that each of the disputed domain names resolves to a website which does not merely incorporate the NORSK TIPPING mark but also reproduces the Complainant's registered logo mark (the multi-coloured cross device) on the landing pages and in the browser favicon. According to the Complainant, this identical reproduction of a registered figurative trade mark demonstrates not merely awareness, but a calculated effort to copy the Complainant and to deceive Internet users. It says further that the websites offer online casino and gambling services, the very services which constitute the Complainant's statutory monopoly in Norway. The Complainant says that the sites advertise bonuses, slot machines and lotto services, and display headings such as "Norsk Tipping Norge Online Casino - Spill, Bonuser, Mobil Spilleautomater, Og Lotto" and "Du Kan Spille Hos Norsk Tipping Online Norge Casino Akkurat Nå".

It submits that this conduct falls within paragraph 4(b)(iv) of the Policy and amounts to a systematic targeting of Norwegian consumers, noting that all three websites are written entirely in Norwegian, offer services denominated in Norwegian currency (NOK), reference BankID (the Norwegian electronic identification system), and structure their content to mimic the Complainant's legitimate offerings. It says further that the inclusion of "no" (Norway's country code) in each domain name reinforces this geographic targeting.

The Complainant also suggest that it is likely that the Respondent's conduct amounts to phishing and is fraudulent and in bad faith, noting that each of the websites features "Registrer" (Register) and "Logg Inn" (Log In) buttons which solicit users to create accounts and submit personal and financial information under the false impression that they are interacting with the Complainant. It also says that the simultaneous registration of three domain names targeting the same trade mark holder is itself indicative of a pattern of bad faith conduct within the meaning of Policy.

Finally, the Complainant submits that the Respondent's activity is illegal and therefore in bad faith. It says that under the Norwegian Gambling Act, Norsk Tipping AS holds an exclusive statutory licence for certain forms of gambling. The operation of competing online casino services targeting Norwegian consumers without such a licence is unlawful.

B. Respondent

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

6. Discussion and Findings

Further Procedural Considerations

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 mailing address is stated to be in Ukraine, which is subject to an international conflict at the date of this Decision that may impact 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.

Having considered all the circumstances of the case, the Panel is of the view that they should continue. The Panel notes that Notification of Complaint and the Complaint was delivered to the Respondent's email address provided by the Registrar. Further, all three disputed domain names were registered in late 2025, well after the onset of the international conflict. This suggests that the Respondent has Internet access and could have submitted a response, had it wished to do so.

It is moreover noted that, for the reasons which are set out later in this Decision, the Panel has no doubt whatsoever that the Respondent registered and has used the disputed domain names in bad faith and with the intention of unfairly targeting the Complainant's goodwill attaching to its trade mark and in order to mislead Internet users.

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

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 trade 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 a trade mark or service mark for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.2.1.

The Panel finds that the mark is recognisable within each of the disputed domain names. Accordingly, each of the disputed domain names 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, the terms "casino" and/or "no" and a hyphen 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 each of the disputed domain names 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 in relation to each of the disputed domain names.

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.

The Complainant has submitted that it has not licensed, authorised or otherwise permitted the Respondent to use its NORSK TIPPING trade mark or its logo mark in any manner and that there is no commercial relationship, affiliation or association between the Complainant and the Respondent. It has also submitted that the Respondent is not commonly known by any of the disputed domain names, that its identity is publicly masked behind a privacy/proxy service and that there is no indication that the Respondent holds any trade mark or other intellectual property rights corresponding to “Norsk Tipping” or any variant thereof. It has shown that each of the disputed domain names resolves to a website that presents itself as “Norsk Tipping Norge Online Casino” and offers online gambling services including slot machines, bonuses, promotional codes and login functionality. The websites are all in Norwegian and directed at Norwegian Internet users and each displays the Complainant’s logo mark in the page header, thereby creating the unmistakable impression that the websites are operated by, or affiliated with, the Complainant.

The Panel agrees with the Complainant that this use of each of the disputed domain names does not constitute a bona fide offering of goods or services, or a legitimate noncommercial or fair use, but rather amounts to an attempt to impersonate the Complainant and to deceive Norwegian Internet users into believing that the websites are official Norsk Tipping casino platforms. Such use cannot confer rights or legitimate interests on the Respondent. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 2.13.1.

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.

The Complainant’s NORSK TIPPING word mark has been registered since 2003 and its logo mark since 2018. The disputed domain names were all created in a coordinated manner on December 8, 2025, many years after the Complainant’s trade mark rights were firmly established. Also, considering the Complainant’s statutory monopoly on certain types of gambling and the very substantial number of Norwegian users of its services and consequentially the significant degree of repute attaching to its mark and also the fact that the Respondent has used the Complainant’s distinctive logo mark on each of its websites and has attempted to masquerade on each website as if it is the Complainant, the Panel finds that the Respondent must have been aware of the Complainant’s trade marks at the time of registration of each of the disputed domain names. This appears to the Panel to have been a deliberate scheme by the Respondent to exploit the Complainant’s goodwill and constitutes registration of each of the disputed domain names 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.

Under paragraph 4(b)(iv) of the Policy there is evidence of registration and use of the disputed domain name in bad faith where a respondent has used the disputed domain name to intentionally attract, for commercial gain, Internet users to its website by creating a likelihood of confusion with the complainant's trade marks as to the source, sponsorship, affiliation or endorsement of the website.

In this case the Respondent has used each of the disputed domain names to divert Internet users to its websites at which it masquerades as if it is the Complainant. Each of these websites contains the Complainant's NORSK TIPPING mark and a representation of the Complainant's logo mark and appears to be dressed up to confuse Norwegian speaking Internet users into thinking that they are dealing with the Complainant, who has a statutory monopoly on certain types of gambling in Norway. The Respondent has not sought to explain its conduct or to challenge these assertions. The websites are obviously for the Respondent's own commercial gain and this conduct therefore fulfills the requirements of paragraph 4(b)(iv) of the Policy and is evidence of registration and use of the disputed domain names in bad faith.

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 names <norsktipping-casino-no.com>, <norsk-tipping-no.com>, and <norsktipping-no.com> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Alistair Payne/

Alistair Payne

Sole Panelist

Date: July 28, 2026