

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

Quickspace Marketing Management LLC v. Srdan Andelkovic, Sunwin Vibes Limitada, nguyen van nam, Thai Hoang Nguyen
Case No. D2026-2628

1. The Parties

The Complainant is Quickspace Marketing Management LLC, United Arab Emirates, internally represented.

The Respondents are Srdan Andelkovic, Sunwin Vibes Limitada, Costa Rica; nguyen van nam, Thai Hoang Nguyen, Vietnam.

2. The Domain Names and Registrars

The disputed domain names <hitclub.app>, <hittclub.app> and <hit686.club> are registered with Name.com, Inc.

The disputed domain names <hitclubs.tv>, <hitclubv.win>, <hitclubz.win>, <789clubk.win>, <789clubv.win>, and <789clubx.games> are registered with Nicenic International Group Co., Limited.

The disputed domain name <hittclub.tv> is registered with Spaceship, Inc.

Name.com, Inc., Nicenic International Group Co., Limited, and Spaceship, Inc. are hereinafter collectively referred to as the “Registrars”.

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the “Center”) on June 17, 2026. On June 17, 2026, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrars a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain names. On June 18, 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 (Srdan Andelkovic, Sunwin Vibes Limitada, Unknown Registrants) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on June 19, 2026, with the registrant and contact information of nominally multiple underlying registrants revealed by the Registrars, requesting the Complainant to either file separate complaint(s) for the disputed domain names associated with different underlying registrants or alternatively, demonstrate that the underlying registrants are in fact the same entity and/or that all domain names are under common control. The Complainant filed an amended Complaint on June 24, 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 June 26, 2026. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was July 16, 2026. The Respondents did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondents’ default on July 17, 2026.

The Center appointed Luca Barbero as the sole panelist in this matter on August 4, 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 company based in the United Arab Emirates which owns and operates, also via its authorized licensees, entertainment gaming platforms, mobile application games, and associated services.

The Complainant has provided evidence of ownership of several trademark registrations consisting of, or comprising, HITCLUB and 789CLUB, including the following:

- European Union Trade Mark registration No. 019188206 for HIT CLUB (word mark), filed on May 16, 2025, and registered on August 31, 2025, in classes 9, 41, 42 and 43;
- European Union Trade Mark registration No. 019188318 for HITCLUB (word mark), filed on May 16, 2025, and registered on August 31, 2025, in classes 9, 41, 42 and 43;
- European Union Trade Mark registration No. 019188307 for HIT.CLUB (word mark), filed on May 16, 2025, and registered on August 31, 2025, in classes 9, 41, 42 and 43;
- United States of America (“United States”) trademark registration No. 8151630 for HITCLUB (word mark), filed on July 24, 2025, and registered on February 24, 2026, in international classes 9, 41 and 42;
- United States trademark registration No. 8151629 for HIT.CLUB (word mark), filed on July 24, 2025, and registered on February 24, 2026, in international classes 9, 41 and 42;
- United Kingdom trademark registration No. UK00004287523 for HITCLUB (word mark), filed on October 31, 2025, and registered on March 13, 2026, in classes 9, 41, 42 and 43;
- European Union Trade Mark registration No. 019188308 for HIT CLUB (figurative mark), filed on May 16, 2025, and registered on August 31, 2025, in international classes 9, 41, 42 and 43;
- European Union Trade Mark registration No. 019211565 for 789.CLUB (word mark), filed on July 2, 2025, and registered on November 14, 2025, in classes 9, 41 and 42;
- German trademark registration No. 302025110858 for 789CLUB (word mark), filed on June 4, 2025, and registered on June 25, 2025, in classes 9, 41 and 42;
- German trademark registration No. 302025110857 for 789 CLUB (word mark), filed on June 4, 2025, and registered on June 17, 2025, in classes 9, 41 and 42; and

- European Union Trade Mark registration No. 019247833 for 789 CLUB (figurative mark), filed on September 17, 2025, and registered on January 11, 2026, in international classes 9, 35, 38, 41 and 42.

The Complainant also owns the domain names <789.club>, registered on May 7, 2014, and <hit.club>, registered on June 12, 2020, which are both used by the Complainant's authorized licensees to provide online gambling services under the trademarks 789CLUB and HITCLUB.

The disputed domain names <hitclubs.tv>, <hitclubv.win>, <hitclubz.win>, <789clubx.games>, <789clubv.win>, and <789clubk.win> are registered in the name of Srdan Andelkovic, Sunwin Vibes Limitada ("the first Respondent"), located in Costa Rica; the disputed domain name <hittclub.tv> is registered in the name of Thai Hoang Nguyen ("the second Respondent"), located in Vietnam; and the disputed domain names <hittclub.app>, <hitclub.app>, and <hit686.club> are registered in the name of nguyen van nam ("the third Respondent"), located in Vietnam.

According to the records, the first Respondent filed a European Union Trade Mark application for a figurative mark identical to the 789.CLUB mark of the Complainant, on June 9, 2025, in classes 41 and 42. Such application was withdrawn after the Complainant sent a Cease and Desist letter to the first Respondent, on September 12, 2025, in which it requested the withdrawal of such trademark application and the transfer of other domain names encompassing the 789CLUB mark that the first Respondent had registered and which are not the subject of this proceeding.

The first Respondent also applied for registration in the United Kingdom of a figurative mark identical to the HIT CLUB mark of the Complainant, on August 1, 2025. Such application, which resulted in a registration on December 19, 2025, was subsequently cancelled following the Complainant's filing of a declaration of invalidity of the registration under the provisions of Sections 47(1), 47(2)(a) and 47(2)(b) of the Trade Marks Act 1994.

The disputed domain names <hittclub.tv>, registered on April 12, 2026, <hittclub.app> and <hitclub.app>, registered on April 11, 2026, <hit686.club>, registered on March 27, 2026, <hitclubs.tv>, registered on January 11, 2026, <hitclubv.win> and <hitclubz.win>, registered on February 22, 2026, <789clubk.win>, registered on February 7, 2026, <789clubx.games>, registered on February 6, 2026, and <789clubv.win>, registered on February 2, 2026, all currently point to inactive websites. However, according to the Complainant's submissions, which have not been contested by the Respondents, prior to the present proceeding the disputed domain names were used in connection with websites which mimicked the layout, structure, visual appearance, content, and overall trade dress of the websites "www.hit.club" and "www.789.club" operated by the Complainant's authorized licensees.

Screenshots of the websites to which nine of the ten disputed domain names resolved prior to this proceeding have been provided in Annex A.2 and A.3 to the Complaint. No screenshot has been submitted with regard to the disputed domain name <789clubk.win>.

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 the trademarks HITCLUB and 789CLUB, and to the visually equivalent variants thereof, in which the Complainant has rights, since the addition of letters, numbers, or punctuation does not prevent a finding of confusing similarity where the Complainant's trademark remains clearly recognizable in a disputed domain name.

The Complainant claims that the Respondents have no rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain names since: (i) the Respondents registered without authorization the disputed domain names, which are virtually identical and confusingly similar to the Complainant's distinctive and well-known trademarks HITCLUB and 789CLUB, and used them for business activities similar to those of the Complainant; (ii) the Respondents are not commonly known by the disputed domain names; (iii) the Respondents' prior use of the disputed domain names cannot be characterized as a bona fide offering of goods or services as the Respondents' websites prominently featured the Complainant's trademarks and promoted services that competed directly with the Complainant, without disclaiming the lack of relationship between the Complainant and the Respondents, thereby creating a direct likelihood of confusion as to their source, sponsorship, or affiliation; and (iv) there is no evidence that the Respondents are engaged in any legitimate noncommercial or fair use of the disputed domain names, as the Respondents' clear intent appears to be commercial gain, achieved by misleadingly diverting consumers and capitalizing on the Complainant's established reputation.

With reference to the bad faith requirement, the Complainant contends that considering the Complainant's trademarks and domain names consist of arbitrary and distinctive combinations of words and numbers, it is implausible that the Respondents' adoption and use of the same was merely fortuitous. The Complainant submits that the Respondents indeed knowingly and willfully targeted the Complainant's trademark rights.

The Complainant further submits that the first Respondent was aware of the Complainant's trademark rights prior to the registration of the disputed domain names, as evidenced by the Complainant's Cease and Desist letter sent to the first Respondent on September 12, 2025, demanding that it cease any use of the Complainant's 789CLUB marks, transfer domain names similar to such marks that are not included in this proceeding, and withdraw the first Respondent's application for the European Union Trade Mark 789.CLUB. The Complainant further submits that the first Respondent, through its legal representative, confirmed its intention to withdraw that trademark application, which was subsequently withdrawn on October 15, 2025.

The Complainant additionally states that the first Respondent's bad faith is also highlighted by its failure to reply to the Cease and Desist letter sent by the Complainant on November 14, 2025 regarding the unauthorized use of its HITCLUB trademark and the registration of other domain names identical or similar thereto, and by the fact that the first Respondent did not contest the Complainant's declaration of its invalidity concerning its United Kingdom HITCLUB trademark registration, which was subsequently cancelled.

The Complainant points out that, even if some of the disputed domain names were inactive or inaccessible at the time of the filing of the Complaint, they anyway pose a risk of deceptive use such as email fraud or impersonation and their passive holding should not prevent a finding of bad faith considering: (i) the disputed domain names incorporate the Complainant's distinctive marks; (ii) the disputed domain names have been used to offer virtually identical gambling services to those offered by the Complainant utilizing branding that closely mirrored the Complainant's marks; (iii) the disputed domain names exhibit clear indicia of typosquatting in view of their composition; and (iv) the Respondents' use of a privacy protection services further demonstrates their bad faith.

The Complainant also claims that the Respondents have engaged in a systematic pattern of cybersquatting, through the repeated and deliberate targeting of the Complainant's registered trademarks via the registration and commercial use of corresponding domain names for similar activities and the registration of domain names corresponding to third-party marks. The Complainant also submits that the first Respondent also holds a documented history of adverse UDRP findings involving the same or similar conduct towards unrelated third parties, as it was involved as respondent in the prior cases *Sunwin Information Technology LLC v. Srdan Andelkovic*, *Sunwin Vibes Limitada*, *Sunwin Vibes*, *Sunwin Vibes Content Writing Service*, *Srdan Andelkoic*, *Sunwin Vibes Limitada*, WIPO Case No. [D2025-5040](#); and *Central Professional Unit Solution Co. Ltd. v. Srdan Andelkovic*, *Sunwin Vibes Limitada*, WIPO Case No. [D2025-5111](#).

B. Respondents

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

6. Discussion and Findings

6.1 Preliminary procedural issue: consolidation of multiple Respondents

The amended Complaint was filed in relation to nominally different domain name registrants.

The Complainant alleges that the domain name registrants are the same entity or mere alter egos of each other, or under common control. The Complainant requests the consolidation of the Complaint against the multiple disputed domain name registrants pursuant to paragraph 10(e) of the Rules.

The disputed domain name registrants did not comment on the Complainant's request.

Paragraph 3(c) of the Rules states that a complaint may relate to more than one domain name, provided that the domain names are registered by the same domain name holder.

In addressing the Complainant's request, the Panel will consider whether (i) the disputed domain names or corresponding websites are subject to common control; and (ii) the consolidation would be fair and equitable to all Parties. See WIPO Overview of WIPO Panel Views on Select UDRP Questions (["WIPO Overview 3.1"](#)), section 4.11.2.

The Complainant asserts that the disputed domain names, although registered in the name of different entities, are under common control since, notwithstanding the disputed domain name <hittclub.tv> is registered in the name of the second Respondent and the disputed domain names <hittclub.app>, <hitclub.app> and <hit686.club> are registered to the third Respondent, all the disputed domain names are actually owned and controlled by the first Respondent, considering the substantial commonalities among the websites to which the disputed domain names resolved, as shown by the screen captures of the websites obtained from a proprietary phishing detection platform provided in Annex A3 to the Complaint. These commonalities encompass comparable website presentations that exhibit shared design, color schemes, structural elements, and the nature of the advertised goods and services.

Particularly, the Complainant submits that:

- i) the disputed domain names <hittclub.app>, <hitclub.app>, and <hit686.club>, registered by the third Respondent, initially resolved to websites identical to those to which the disputed domain names <hitclubz.win> and <hitclubv.win>, owned by the first Respondent, resolved;
- ii) the disputed domain name <hittclub.tv> resolved to a website mirroring the layout, structure, and content of the website at the domain name <hitclub.inc> which, though not a primary subject of the Complaint, is linked to the first Respondent on the basis of the registration records, which associate that domain name with contact details used by the first Respondent to register other domain names;
- iii) the use of different identities and addresses was a calculated deception designed to obscure the actual ownership and bypass consolidation under the Policy, thus hindering the enforcement of the Complainant's trademark rights.

As regards common control, the Panel notes that the elements highlighted by the Complainant and referenced above demonstrate a common control of the disputed domain names by the Respondents. The Panel further notes that such conclusion is corroborated by the similarities in the composition of the disputed domain names and the circumstance that they have been all registered in a short period of time, between February and April 2026, and have been used in connection with similar websites.

As regards fairness and equity, the Panel sees no reason why consolidation of the disputes would be unfair or inequitable to any Party.

Accordingly, the Panel decides to consolidate the disputes regarding the nominally different disputed domain name registrants (referred to below as “the Respondents”) in a single proceeding.

6.2. Substantive Issues

According to paragraph 15(a) of the Rules: “A Panel shall decide a complaint on the basis of the statements and documents submitted and in accordance with the Policy, these Rules and any rules and principles of law that it deems applicable.” Paragraph 4(a) of the Policy directs that the Complainant must prove each of the following:

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

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 trademarks or service marks for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.2.1. Indeed, the Complainant has provided evidence of ownership of several valid trademark registrations for the word marks HITCLUB and 789CLUB as well as for the variants HIT CLUB, HIT.CLUB, 789 CLUB and 789.CLUB, in several jurisdictions.

The Panel finds that the Complainant’s trademarks are recognizable in the disputed domain names. Moreover, the Panel also finds that the disputed domain names consist of clear misspellings or variations of the Complainant’s trademarks, as they reproduce the marks in their entirety with the mere addition of letters (“l”, “s”, “v”, “z”, “t”, “k”, “x”) or numbers (“686”). Accordingly, the disputed domain names are confusingly similar to the marks for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), sections 1.7 and 1.9.

The generic Top-Level Domain (“gTLD”) can be disregarded being a standard registration requirement and the Panel has thus not considered the “.tv”, “.app”, “.win” and “.games” gTLDs under the first element confusing similarity test. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.11.1.

However, the Panel considered the gTLD suffix “.club” for comparison purposes in the case of the disputed domain name <hit686.club>, given that the gTLD suffix, forms part of the Complainant’s HITCLUB trademark to which the disputed domain name is compared. Indeed, where the applicable gTLD and the second-level portion of the domain name in combination contain the relevant trademark, panels may consider the domain name in its entirety for purposes of assessing confusing similarity. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.11.3.

Therefore, 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 Respondents 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 Respondents lack rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain names. The Respondents have not rebutted the Complainant's prima facie showing and have 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.

The Panel notes that there is no relation, disclosed to the Panel or otherwise apparent from the record, between the Respondents and the Complainant. The Respondents are not licensees of the Complainant, nor have the Respondents otherwise obtained an authorization to use the Complainant's trademarks. Moreover, there is no indication before the Panel that the Respondents are commonly known by the disputed domain names.

Moreover, according to the records, the Respondents do not have trademark rights in the names encompassed in the disputed domain names. As highlighted above, the first Respondent's European Union Trade Mark application for the figurative mark 789.CLUB and the United Kingdom trademark registration for the figurative mark HITCLUB have been respectively withdrawn and cancelled prior to this proceeding.

Furthermore, there is no evidence showing that the Respondents might have used or made preparations to use the disputed domain names in connection with a bona fide offering of goods or services or a legitimate noncommercial or fair use without the intention of misleadingly diverting consumers or tarnishing the Complainant's trademarks.

Indeed, the Complainant submitted that all the disputed domain names were used in connection with websites providing gambling services in direct competition with the Complainant and mimicking the layout, structure, visual appearance, logos content, and overall trade dress of the Complainant's official websites. The Complainant has provided screenshots demonstrating the use of the disputed domain names in the manner described above (with the sole exclusion of <789clubk.win>). The Panel finds that the contents of the Respondents' websites were designed to reinforce the impression of an affiliation with the Complainant. Panels have categorically held that the use of a domain name for illegal activity, including passing off, can never confer rights or legitimate interests on a respondent. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 2.13.1.

In addition, there is no evidence showing that the disputed domain name <789clubk.win>, currently not resolving to an active website and for which evidence of a prior active use has not been submitted, was ever used in connection with a bona fide offering of goods or services or a legitimate noncommercial or fair use without intent for commercial gain to misleadingly divert consumers or to tarnish the Complainant's trademarks.

Therefore, the Panel finds the second element of the Policy has also 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 in light of: (i) the prior registration and use of the trademarks HITCLUB and 789CLUB and variants thereof by the Complainant; and (ii) the offering of gambling services under the said marks on the websites “www.789.club” and “www.hit.club” operated by the Complainant's authorized licensees, the Respondents knew or should have known of the Complainant and its mark at the time of registration of the disputed domain name. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#) section 3.2.2.

Indeed, considering the disputed domain names are confusingly similar to the Complainant's trademarks, the distinctiveness of the marks, and the references to said marks made on the websites to which at least nine of the disputed domain names resolved prior to this proceeding, the Panel finds that the Respondents were actually aware of, and intended to target, the Complainant's trademarks.

Moreover, in light of the correspondence exchanged between the Complainant and the first Respondent prior to this proceeding regarding the latter's registration and use of other domain names encompassing the Complainant's marks and the first Respondent's filing of trademark applications for figurative marks identical to the ones of the Complainant for similar services, the Respondents (which appear to be aliases of the same entity or at the very least entities and individuals acting in concert) were clearly aware of the Complainant's prior trademark rights.

The Panel also finds that the circumstance that the disputed domain names consist of clearly intentional misspelling of the Complainant's marks and domain names signals an intention on the part of the Respondents to confuse users seeking or expecting the Complainant.

The Panel further finds that the Respondents' use of the disputed domain names in connection with the websites described above, offering gambling services identical to those offered by the Complainant and imitating the layout and content of the Complainant's official websites, amounts to bad faith under paragraph 4(b)(iv) of the Policy, since the Respondents intentionally attempted to attract Internet users to their websites for commercial gain by creating a likelihood of confusion with the Complainant's trademarks as to the source, sponsorship, affiliation or endorsement of their websites.

The disputed domain names do not currently resolve to active websites. Panels have found that the non-use of a domain name would not prevent a finding of bad faith under the doctrine of passive holding. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 3.3. Having reviewed the available record, the Panel notes the distinctiveness of the Complainant's trademarks and the composition of the disputed domain names and, considering: (i) the failure of the Respondents to submit a Response and to provide any evidence of actual or contemplated good-faith use; (ii) the Respondents' concealing their identity in the public Whois records; and (iii) the implausibility of any good faith use to which the disputed domain names may be put, finds that in the circumstances of this case the passive holding of the disputed domain names does not prevent a finding of bad faith under the Policy.

Lastly, the first Respondent's involvement as respondent and losing party in prior domain name disputes decided under the Policy as well as in the first Respondent's registration of additional domain names encompassing the Complainant's trademarks further support a finding of bad faith.

Therefore, the Panel finds that the Complainant has established the third element of the Policy as well.

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 <hitclubb.app>, <hitclubs.tv>, <hitclubv.win>, <hitclubz.win>, <hittclub.app>, <hittclub.tv>, <hit686.club>, <789clubk.win>, <789clubv.win> and <789clubx.games> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Luca Barbero/

Luca Barbero

Sole Panelist

Date: August 18, 2026