

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

Rillius Holding Limited v. Marozau Aliaksei

Case No. D2026-2566

1. The Parties

The Complainant is Rillius Holding Limited, Cyprus, internally represented.

The Respondent is Marozau Aliaksei, Uzbekistan.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <париматч.com> [xn--80aaxqmhr4b.com] 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 12, 2026. On June 12, 2026, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On June 15, 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, Super Privacy Service LTD c/o Dynadot) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on June 15, 2026, providing the registrant and contact information disclosed by the Registrar, and inviting the Complainant to submit an amendment to the Complaint. On June 15, 2026, the Complainant confirmed its choice to proceed without amending the Complaint.

The Center verified that 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 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 8, 2026.

The Center appointed Assen Alexiev as the sole panelist in this matter on July 10, 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.

On July 24, 2026, the Panel issued his Procedural Order No.1, whereby he invited the Complainant to file by July 31, 2026, a submission and evidence showing the first use in commerce of the PARI MATCH trademark and scale of operations thereunder at the time of registration of the disputed domain name, and any circumstances supporting a conclusion that the Respondent was or ought to have been aware of the Complainant's use or intended use of the PARI MATCH trademark at the date of registration of the disputed domain name. The Panel also invited the Respondent to file by August 7, 2026, comments to the Complainant's submission, should such be received. On July 31, 2026, the Complainant filed its submission with evidence pursuant to Procedural Order No.1. The Respondent did not file any comments on the Complainant's submission and the evidence attached to it within the time limit fixed by the Panel for doing so.

4. Factual Background

The Complainant was registered in 2020. It is the current owner of the following trademark registrations for ПАРИ МАЧ ("PARI MATCH" in Latin transliteration) or PARI MATCH (jointly, the "PARI MATCH trademark"):

– the Ukrainian trademark **ПАРИ МАЧ** with registration No. 178809, applied for on October 31, 2012 and registered on November 23, 2013 for services in International Classes 35 and 41;

the Ukrainian trademark  with registration No. 178808, applied for on October 31, 2012 and registered on November 25, 2013 for services in International Classes 35 and 41; and

– the International trademark  with registration No. 1298964, registered on October 26, 2015 for services in International Classes 35 and 41.

The Complainant has submitted a Ukrainian media article¹ published in February 2012 stating that the PARI MATCH trademark had been used since 1996 in relation to gambling services offered in more than 400 betting points in more than 100 cities. The Complainant has not clarified which entity and in which territories currently provides gambling services under the PARI MATCH trademark.

The disputed domain name was registered on January 4, 2013. It currently resolves to a landing page with a notice that the disputed domain name is not for sale. The earliest Wayback Machine records for the disputed domain name date from 2017 and display a blank landing page². The Complainant refers to Wayback Machine records for the disputed domain name, which show that in 2024 it redirected to online casino websites.

There is no information about the Respondent in the case file apart from the information confirmed by the Registrar.

¹ <https://web.archive.org/web/20120610195453/www.buker.com.ua/bukmekerskaya-kontora-pari-match/>

² Noting in particular the general powers of a panel articulated inter alia in paragraphs 10 and 12 of the Rules, it has been accepted that a panel may undertake limited factual research into matters of public record if it would consider such information useful to assessing the case merits and reaching a decision. WIPO Overview of WIPO Panel Views on Select UDRP Questions ("[WIPO Overview 3.1](#)"), section 4.8.

5. Parties' Contentions

A. Complainant

The Complainant contends that the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to the Complainant's PARI MATCH trademark, because its Unicode representation (<париматч.com>) incorporates the Cyrillic version of this trademark.

The Complainant submits that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name. It states that the Respondent is not commonly known by the disputed domain name and is not affiliated with the Complainant, and that the Complainant has not authorised the Respondent to use the PARI MATCH trademark or to register any domain name incorporating the same trademark. The Complainant maintains that the Respondent is not using the disputed domain name in connection with a bona fide offering of goods or services, or making a legitimate noncommercial or fair use of it. According to the Complainant, the evidence shows that the disputed domain name has been used to mislead Internet users into believing that the associated website is operated or endorsed by the Complainant, and to redirect users to third-party websites, including websites offering competing or unrelated services.

The Complainant contends that the Respondent has registered and is using the disputed domain name in bad faith. According to the Complainant, the Respondent knew or should have known of the Complainant's existence and rights in the distinctive and well-known PARI MATCH trademark and nevertheless registered the disputed domain name without any permission from the Complainant. The Complainant states that by using the disputed domain name, the Respondent has intentionally attempted to attract, for commercial gain, Internet users to the Respondent's website or other online location by creating a likelihood of confusion with the Complainant's PARI MATCH trademark as to the source, sponsorship, affiliation, or endorsement of the Respondent's website or of the third-party websites to which the disputed domain name has redirected.

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 the PARI MATCH trademark for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.2.1.

The entirety of the Cyrillic version of the PARI MATCH trademark is reproduced within the Unicode version of the disputed domain name, which is also a transliteration of the Latin version of the Complainant's trademark. Accordingly, the disputed domain name is identical to the Cyrillic version of and confusingly similar to the PARI MATCH trademark for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), sections 1.7 and 1.14.

The fact that the Complainant's trademark was registered after the disputed domain name does not prevent the Complainant's standing to file the Complaint and the finding of confusing similarity. Section 1.1.3 of the [WIPO Overview 3.1](#).

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 recognised 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 Unicode version of the disputed domain name is identical to the Cyrillic version of the Complainant’s PARI MATCH trademark, and the Complainant has referred to a third-party online article from 2012 stating that the same trademark had been used for gambling services since 1996. When the Respondent registered the disputed domain name, the PARI MATCH trademark had already been applied for, although it was not yet registered. The Respondent has not disputed this evidence and has not provided any plausible explanation why it has decided to register the disputed domain name and to use it to redirect to an online casino.

In the absence of any alternative explanation, it therefore appears to the Panel as more likely than not that the Respondent had knowledge of the PARI MATCH brand and yet-unregistered trademark when registering the disputed domain name and registered it targeting the PARI MATCH brand’s popularity. Such conduct cannot support a finding of rights or legitimate interests of the Respondent in 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.

The Complainant’s PARI MATCH trademark was applied for on October 31, 2012, and registered on November 23, 2013, and the Complainant has referred to a third-party source stating that gambling services had been provided under the PARI MATCH brand since 1996 through hundreds of physical betting points, and this piece of evidence has not been disputed by the Respondent. The Panel therefore accepts as more likely than not that the PARI MATCH brand has been used in relation to offline gambling services for a long time prior to the registration of the disputed domain name.

In certain limited circumstances where the facts of the case establish that the respondent’s intent in registering the domain name was to unfairly capitalize on the complainant’s nascent (typically as yet unregistered) trademark rights, panels have been prepared to find that the respondent has acted in bad faith. Such scenarios include registration of a domain name following the complainant’s filing of a trademark application, which has been the case here – the Respondent registered the disputed domain name less than

three months after the Complainant made its trademark applications in Ukraine. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 3.8.2.

The disputed domain name was registered on January 4, 2013, and its Unicode version is identical to the Cyrillic version of the Complainant's PARI MATCH trademark. Considering that it is more likely than not that this trademark had already been used for a long period of time prior to the registration of the disputed domain name, the disputed domain name would have at that time appeared to users of the Cyrillic alphabet as an official website for gambling services provided under the PARI MATCH trademark. The Respondent has indeed made the disputed domain name redirect to an online casino.

In the absence of any allegations or evidence suggesting otherwise, the above leads the Panel to the conclusion that it is more likely than not that by registering and 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 PARI MATCH trademark as to the source or affiliation with the PARI MATCH trademark of the casino services offered on the website to which the disputed domain name has redirected. This supports a conclusion that the disputed domain name was registered and is being used in bad faith under paragraph 4(b)(iv) of the Policy.

The Panel therefore 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 <пари́матч.com> [xn--80aaxqmhr4b.com] be transferred to the Complainant.

/Assen Alexiev/

Assen Alexiev

Sole Panelist

Date: August 10, 2026