

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

Caesars License Company, LLC v. Xiaolong Hao
Case No. D2026-2603

1. The Parties

The Complainant is Caesars License Company, LLC, United States of America ("United States"), represented by Greenberg Traurig, LLP, United States.

The Respondent is Xiaolong Hao, India.

2. The Domain Names and Registrar

The disputed domain names <caesarspalaceonlinecasino.club>, <caesars-palace-online-casino.com>, and <caesars-palace-online-casino.org> are registered with Dynadot Inc (the "Registrar").

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the "Center") on June 15, 2026. On June 16, 2026, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain names. On June 17, 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, Super Privacy Service LTD) 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 22, 2026.

The Center verified that the Complaint together with 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 25, 2026. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was July 15, 2026. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent's default on July 16, 2026.

The Center appointed Knud Wallberg as the sole panelist in this matter on July 23, 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 Caesars License Company, LLC is the owner of the CAESARS, CAESARS ENTERTAINMENT and CAESARS PALACE trademark registrations, and through affiliated companies, is the owner and operator of the Caesars Palace casino hotels.

The Complainant holds trademark registrations for CAESARS PALACE in multiple jurisdictions, including the following:

- United States federal trademark registrations numbers 907,696 registered on February 9, 1971, for services in international classes 41 and 42, and 1,004,058 registered on February 4, 1975, for services in international classes 35, 36, 37, 38, 39, 40, 41 and 42.
- Indian trademark registrations numbers 2620535 registered on October 29, 2013, for services in international classes 41 and 43, and 3409661 registered on November 11, 2016, for goods in international class 28.

The Complainant also owns the domain name <caesars.com> which hosts the Complainant's primary website as well as other domain names incorporating the CAESARS and CAESARS PALACE marks such as <caesarspalace.com>.

The disputed domain name <caesarspalaceonlinecasino.club> was registered on September 9, 2025, the disputed domain name <caesars-palace-online-casino.com> was registered on August 21, 2025, and the disputed domain name <caesars-palace-online-casino.org> was registered on August 30, 2025.

The disputed domain names <caesars-palace-online-casino.com> and <caesars-palace-online-casino.org> resolve to websites which, inter alia by reproducing the Complainant's trademarks and product images, gives Internet users the impression that the websites are official websites of the Complainant or its licensee and that the Respondent is an authorised reseller of the Complainant's products. The disputed domain name <caesarspalaceonlinecasino.club> is inactive.

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 the disputed domain names are confusingly similar to its CAESARS PALACE mark. The disputed domain names thus contain the mark in its entirety with the addition of the generic and descriptive terms "online" and "casino".

The Complainant further contends that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain names. The Respondent is not commonly known by the disputed domain names, and has not been authorized, licensed, or otherwise permitted by the Complainant to register and/or use the disputed domain names.

The Complainant finally contends that the Respondent registered and has been using the disputed domain names in bad faith. The disputed domain names all contain the Complainant's well-known CAESARS PALACE mark, and it is inconceivable that the Respondent was unaware of the Complainant's rights in the

CAESARS PALACE mark when he registered the disputed domain names. The disputed domain names <caesars-palace-online-casino.com> and <caesars-palace-online-casino.org> have been used to host websites on which the Respondent passes himself off as the Complainant. The disputed domain name <caesarspalaceonlinecasino.club> has not been used actively to resolve to a website but the Complainant contends that passive holding of a domain name that contains a third-party trademark also constitutes bad faith use.

B. Respondent

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

6. Discussion and Findings

According to paragraph 15(a) of the Rules, the Panel shall decide the Complaint in accordance with the Policy, the Rules and any rules and principles of law that it deems applicable and on the basis of the statements and documents submitted by the Parties.

In accordance with paragraph 4(a) of the Policy, the Complainant must prove that each of the three following elements are satisfied:

- (i) the disputed domain names are identical or confusingly similar to a trademark or service mark in which the Complainant has rights; and
- (ii) the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the disputed domain names; and
- (iii) the disputed domain names have been registered and is being used in bad faith.

Paragraph 4(a) of the Policy states that the burden of proving that all these elements are present lies with the Complainant. At the same time, in accordance with paragraph 14(b) of the Rules, if a party, in the absence of exceptional circumstances, does not comply with any provision of, or requirement under, the Rules, or any request from the Panel, the Panel shall draw such inferences there from as it considers appropriate.

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 names. 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 names. Accordingly, the disputed domain names are 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, "online" and "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 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.

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 names. 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 names such as those enumerated in the Policy or otherwise.

Moreover, the Panel finds that the composition of the disputed domain names, further supported by the content therein, effectively impersonate or suggest sponsorship or endorsement by the Complainant. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 2.5.1.

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.

In the present case, the Panel notes that the Respondent has registered and used two of the disputed domain names namely <caesars-palace-online-casino.com> and <caesars-palace-online-casino.org> for hosting websites which, inter alia by reproducing the Complainant’s trademarks and product images, gives Internet users the impression that the websites are official websites of the Complainant or its licensee and that the Respondent is an authorised reseller of the Complainant’s products. This is not the case, and the Panel therefore finds that the Respondent by registering and using these disputed domain names intentionally attempted to attract, for commercial gain, Internet users to its website by creating a likelihood of confusion with the Complainant’s trademarks as to the source, sponsorship, affiliation, or endorsement of its website as per paragraph 4(b)(iv) of the Policy.

Regarding the disputed domain name <caesarspalaceonlinecasino.club>, previous UDRP panels have found that the non-use of a domain name (including a blank or “coming soon” page) would not by itself prevent a finding of bad faith under the doctrine of passive holding. To the contrary, in looking at the totality of circumstances in each case, panels have found that the registration and non-use of a domain name can still constitute bad faith for purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 3.3. Having reviewed the available record, the Panel notes the distinctiveness or reputation of the Complainant’s trademark, and the composition of the disputed domain name, together with the pattern of registration of the other two domain names and finds that in the circumstances of this case the 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 names <caesarspalaceonlinecasino.club>, <caesars-palace-online-casino.com> and <caesars-palace-online-casino.org> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Knud Wallberg/

Knud Wallberg

Sole Panelist

Date: August 6, 2026