

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

CIRCUS BELGIUM S.A. v. Yury Zanchenko, Name Redacted, Priya Chawla, Tomas Hermach, Vasyl Tomyshynets, Company Quality Guaranteed, Sofiia Shkliaruk, Stefan Hristov, Name Redacted
Case No. D2026-2677

1. The Parties

The Complainant is CIRCUS BELGIUM S.A., Belgium, represented by COGITUS SRL, Belgium.

The Respondents are Yury Zanchenko, Ukraine, Name Redacted¹, Priya Chawla, India, Tomas Hermach, Czech Republic, Vasyl Tomyshynets, Company Quality Guaranteed, Ukraine, Sofiia Shkliaruk, Ukraine, Stefan Hristov, Bulgaria, Name Redacted¹.

2. The Domain Names and Registrars

The disputed domain names <circuscasinobe.com> and <circuscasino-win.com> are registered with Spaceship, Inc., <circuscasinobelgie.com> is registered with Dynadot Inc, <circus-casino-belgique.com> and <circuscasinobelgium1.com> are registered with URL Solutions, Inc., <circuscasino.bet> is registered with Devexpanse Ltd d/b/a Regery.com, <circus-casino-nederland.com> is registered with Name.com, Inc., <circuscasino--nederland.com> is registered with Realtime Register B.V., and <circuscasino.win> is registered with Hosting Concepts B.V. d/b/a Registrar.eu (the "Registrars").

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the "Center") on June 19, 2026. On June 23 and 26, 2026, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrars a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain names. On June 23, 24, 25, 26, and 29, the Registrars transmitted by email to the Center their verification response disclosing registrant and contact information for the disputed domain names which differed from the named Respondents (Redacted For Privacy, Domain Protection Services, Inc., The RDAP server redacted the value, REDACTED, Dynadot Privacy Service, Super Privacy Service LTD c/o Dynadot) and contact information in the Complaint.

¹ The Respondents appear to have used the name of third parties when registering the disputed domain names <circuscasino.bet> and <circuscasino.win>. In light of the potential identity theft, the Panel has redacted the Respondents' names from this Decision. However, the Panel has attached as Annex 1 to this Decision an instruction to the Registrars regarding transfer of the disputed domain names <circuscasino.bet> and <circuscasino.win>, which includes the name of the Respondents. The Panel has authorized the Center to transmit Annex 1 to the Registrars as part of the order in this proceeding, and has indicated Annex 1 to this Decision shall not be published due to the exceptional circumstances of this case. See *Banco Bradesco S.A. v. FAST-12785241 Attn. Bradescourgente.net / Name Redacted*, WIPO Case No. D2009-1788.

The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on June 30, 2026 with the registrant and contact information of nominally multiple underlying registrants revealed by the Registrars, requesting the Complainant to either file separate complaints 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 the amended Complaints on July 2 and 9, 2026.

The Center verified that the Complaint together with the amended Complaints 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 July 10, 2026. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was July 30, 2026. The Center received emails from third parties on July 16 and 23, 2026 respectively regarding potential identity theft. The Respondents did not submit any formal Response. The Center notified the Parties of the commencement of Panel appointment process on August 5, 2026.

The Center appointed Luca Barbero as the sole panelist in this matter on August 11, 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 Belgium company active in the gaming and entertainment sector. It operates online platforms, including "www.circus-casino.be", which holds licenses issued by the Belgian Gaming Commission (Commission des Jeux de Hasard), authorizing it to offer online casino games and sports betting.

The Complainant is the owner of numerous trademark registrations for CIRCUS and CIRCUS CASINO, including the following:

- European Union trademark registration No. 018670434 for CIRCUS (word mark), filed on March 12, 2022, and registered on November 7, 2022, in classes 9, 28, 41, 42 and 43;
- European Union trademark registration No. 011664547 for CIRCUS (figurative mark), filed on March 18, 2013, and registered on May 17, 2014, in classes 9, 28 and 41;
- European Union trademark registration No. 018025773 for CIRCUS (figurative mark), filed on May 13, 2019, and registered on October 20, 2020, in classes 9, 28 and 41;
- United Kingdom trademark registration No. UK00918025773 for CIRCUS (figurative mark), filed on May 13, 2019, and registered on October 20, 2020, in classes 9, 28 and 41;
- European Union trademark registration No. 006071914 for CIRCUS CASINO (figurative mark), filed on July 5, 2007, and registered on October 23, 2008, in classes 9, 37 and 41;
- United Kingdom trademark registration No. UK00906071914 for CIRCUS CASINO (figurative mark), filed on July 5, 2007, and registered on October 23, 2008, in classes 9, 37 and 41.

The Complainant is also owner of the domain names <circus.nl>, registered on April 15, 1997, and <circus-casino.be>, registered on January 21, 2010, which are both used by the Complainant to provide its gambling services under the trademarks CIRCUS and CIRCUS CASINO.

The disputed domain names: <circuscasino.bet>, registered on August 15, 2025, <circuscasino.win>, registered on September 5, 2025, <circus-casino-nederland.com>, registered on November 7, 2025, <circuscasinobelgie.com>, registered on March 17, 2026, <circuscasinobe.com>, registered on May 5, 2026, <circuscasino--nederland.com>, registered on May 13, 2026, <circus-casino-belgique.com> and <circuscasinobelgium1.com>, registered on June 4, 2026, and <circuscasino-win.com>, registered on June 5, 2026 all, with the exclusion of the currently inactive <circuscasino.bet>, resolve to websites that reproduce the Complainant's trademarks and promote gambling services, providing links to third party-gambling websites. The screenshots submitted as Annex 11 to the Complaint – which have not been challenged by the Respondents - show that <circuscasino.bet> resolved prior to this proceeding to a website with substantially the same contents as the other disputed domain names.

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 CIRCUS and CIRCUS CASINO in which the Complainant has rights, as they all incorporate the Complainant's trademarks in their entirety with the mere addition of the geographical terms "belgie", "be", "belgique", "belgium" and "nederland", the number "1", hyphens in some cases, the descriptive word "win" and the generic Top Level Domains ("gTLDs") ".com", ".bet" and ".win", all of which do nothing to dispel confusion, but on the contrary, reinforce the impression of an official association with the Complainant.

The Complainant claims that the Respondents have no rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain names since: i) the Complainant has not authorized, licensed or permitted the Respondents to use its CIRCUS or CIRCUS CASINO trademarks and the Respondents are not affiliated with, sponsored by, or endorsed by the Complainant in any way; ii) the Respondents are not commonly known by the disputed domain names or the holders of any relevant trademark rights; iii) the disputed domain names have not been used in connection with a bona fide offering of goods or services since all disputed domain names have pointed to websites reproducing or imitating "the Complainant's CIRCUS / CIRCUS CASINO identity, including the mark, logo, favicon, colour scheme, casino interface, bonus offers, registration/login functions and regulatory references", targeting users located in Belgium, Netherlands (Kingdom of the) and other European countries and presenting themselves as official or authorized "Circus Casino" platform, while in turn redirecting users to third-party websites which do not offer any genuine CIRCUS CASINO services.

The Complainant emphasizes that none of the third-party gambling operators to which the disputed domain names redirect holds a license issued by the Netherlands Gambling Authority (Kansspelautoriteit, "KSA"), which is the sole authority competent to license remote games of chance for the Dutch market, and none is recorded in the KSA's public register of licensees.

In addition, the Complainant highlights that some of the websites to which the disputed domain names redirect reproduce real regulatory or corporate data connected with the Complainant. In particular, the website to which <circuscasino.bet> previously resolved expressly identified the alleged operator as the Complainant and cited the Belgian license of the authorized operator of the Complainant's official Belgian online casino activities. Similarly, the website to which the disputed domain name <circuscasino.win> resolves is described as "Circus Casino Netherlands", identifies the Complainant's authorized Dutch operator Betca B.V. as gambling operator, refers to the Dutch Gaming Authority KSA and even uses one of the Complainant's official email addresses. Likewise, the website at the disputed domain name <circuscasino--

nederland.com> cites the Belgian origin and history of the Circus Casino business, and the Dutch license of Betca B.V.

The Complainant further submits that the Respondents also used the Complainant's favicon in connection with the websites at the disputed domain names <circus-casino-nederland.com> and <circuscasino.win> and that with reference to the former disputed domain name, the registrant is an individual who has already been named as respondent in prior UDRP proceedings brought by the Complainant, each of which resulted in an order to transfer domain names built on the very "CIRCUS / CASINO / Netherlands pattern" present in this case.

With reference to the circumstances evidencing bad faith, the Complainant indicates that considering: i) the registration of the disputed domain names occurred long after the Complainant had acquired and used its CIRCUS and CIRCUS CASINO trademarks for casino, gambling and betting services, including in Belgium and Netherlands (Kingdom of the); ii) the disputed domain names reproduce the distinctive element "Circus" together with the term "casino" and/or with gambling or geographic terms such as "bet", "win", "belgique", "belgie", "belgium", "be", and "nederland", additions which reinforce confusion by referring precisely to the Complainant's regulated business and core markets; and iii) the content of the websites to which the disputed domain names resolve or resolved, the Respondents were actually aware of, and intended to target, the Complainant and its trademarks when registering the disputed domain names.

The Complainant submits that the Respondents are using the disputed domain names for impersonation and commercial diversion purposes, by pointing them to websites using a classic bait-and-switch scheme where Internet users looking for the Complainant are attracted by the Complainant's marks and then monetized through third-party gambling platforms. The Complainant also contends that, though some websites contain disclaimers, their overall presentation contradicts any alleged independence since the Respondents are using the Complainant's mark as the name of the service, reproduce casino-operator interfaces, invoke regulated status, invite registration and redirect users to commercial gambling destinations.

The Complainant further states that, by using the Complainant's marks together with licensing references, responsible-gaming language and identity-verification terminology, the Respondents mislead consumers not only as to commercial origin, but also as to legality, regulatory supervision, player protection, payment safety and data security.

The Complainant concludes that the registration of multiple domain names following the same scheme and used in connection with the websites described above shows a pattern which falls under paragraph 4(b)(ii) of the Policy while the use of the disputed domain names to attract Internet users for commercial gain by creating confusion with the Complainant's marks falls within paragraph 4(b)(iv) of the Policy.

B. Respondents

The Respondents did not reply to the Complainant's contentions. However, as detailed in the procedural history, the Center received email communications from the third parties with reference to the disputed domain names <circuscasino.bet> and <circuscasino.win>, on July 16 and July 23, 2026, in which they indicated that their names and contact information were used without their consent for the registration of the said disputed domain names.

6. Discussion and Findings

6.1. Preliminary Procedural issue: location of three Respondents

Under paragraph 10 of the Rules, the Panel needs to ensure that the Parties are treated with equality, that each Party is given a fair opportunity to present its case, and that the administrative proceeding takes place with due expedition.

The Panel notes that, according to the Whois records, three of the Respondents (Yury Zanchenko, Vasyl Tomyshynets, Company Quality Guaranteed, and Sofiia Shkliaruk) are based in Ukraine, which is subject to an international conflict at the date of this Decision that may impact case notification. Therefore, it is appropriate for the Panel to consider, in accordance with its discretion under paragraph 10 of the Rules, whether the proceeding should continue. The Panel is of the view that it should.

The Panel notes that, in the case of the Respondents Vasyl Tomyshynets, Company Quality Guaranteed, and Sofiia Shkliaruk, even if the courier has been unable to complete delivery of the Written Notice to the addresses which the Respondents have provided in Ukraine (noting the delivery attempt is marked “Delivery failed: Recipient absent”), a physical attempt at delivery to the Respondents’ addresses was able to be effected even if the Respondents were not present at that time.

Furthermore, notice has been delivered i) electronically to the Respondents’ email addresses, and ii) via the “Domain Holder Contact Request Form” provided by the Registrars for Yury Zanchenko and Sofiia Shkliaruk.

The Panel also notes that the disputed domain names owned by the said Respondents were registered on November 7, 2025, March 17, 2026, and June 4, 2026, after the commencement of the present conflict, and the Respondents provided the said addresses to the Registrars at the point of registration notwithstanding the ongoing conflict. The Panel further notes that the Respondents have not opposed to the continuation of the proceedings.

Moreover, the Complainants have specified in the Complaint that any challenge made by the Respondents to any decision to transfer the disputed domain names shall be referred to the jurisdiction of the courts at the location of the principal offices of the concerned Registrars.

Furthermore, as detailed below, the Panel finds that the Respondents registered and have used the disputed domain names in bad faith to target the Complainants’ rights in their CIRCUS and CIRCUS CASINO trademarks.

The Panel concludes that the Parties have been given a fair opportunity to present their case and, in order to ensure that the administrative proceeding takes place with due expedition, will now proceed to a Decision.

6.2 Consolidation: 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.

As regards common control, the Panel notes that the Complainant asserted that the disputed domain names, although registered in the name of different entities, are under common control since:

- i) all nine disputed domain names follow the same distinctive construction, consisting in the Complainant’s CIRCUS and CIRCUS CASINO marks reproduced in full, combined with terms that designate the Complainant’s own field of activity or markets, namely, “casino”, “bet”, “win”, “be”, “belgie”, “belgique”,

“belgium” and “nederland”;

- ii) the disputed domain names <circus-casino-belgique.com> and <circuscasinobelgium1.com> share the same registrant and Registrar and were created on the same day (June 4, 2026);
- iii) the websites to which the disputed domain names resolve do not merely share a theme, as several funnel users to the very same third-party gambling sites. Particularly, the disputed domain names <circuscasino-win.com> and <circuscasinobe.com> both redirect to the website “www.slotlair13.com”; <circuscasino.bet> and <circuscasino.win> both redirect to the website at “www.98gamblerina68.com”; and <circuscasinobelgie.com> and <circuscasinobelgium1.com> both redirect to the website “www.spinboss3.com”. The Complainant submits that independent, unconnected registrants do not, by coincidence, monetize the Complainant’s marks through the same destination casinos;
- iv) the redirection URLs of the websites to which the disputed domain names resolve carry affiliate-tracking parameters belonging to the same affiliate-marketing platform, namely, the same affiliate account and the same affiliate fingerprint;
- v) the websites at the disputed domain names <circuscasino.win>, <circuscasino--nederland.com> and <circus-casino-nederland.com> independently usurp the genuine Dutch KSA license belonging to the Complainant’s authorized Dutch operator Betca B.V., and recite the same fabricated back-story (a purported “joint venture of Gran Casino, the Van der Valk Hotel Group and Gaming1 / Ardent Group”). In the same way, the website at <circuscasino.bet> usurped the Complainant’s real Belgian license and the name of its actual operator. The Complainant asserts that the reuse of the very same usurped license numbers, operator names and group narrative across multiple domain names is content-level proof of a common source, not the product of independent invention;
- vi) eight of the nine disputed domain names resolve through Cloudflare name servers and the associated websites are built on the same template;
- vii) the registrant information provided for the disputed domain names is irregular, alias-like and inconsistent registrant data; and
- viii) the Respondent Yury Zanchenko has previously been named in UDRP proceedings concerning domain names “built on the same CIRCUS / CASINO / NETHERLANDS pattern”.

The Panel finds that the uncontested elements highlighted by the Complainant and referenced above demonstrate a common control of the disputed domain names by the Respondents.

As regards fairness and equity, the Panel therefore 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.

6.3. 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 trademarks and the disputed domain names. 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. Indeed, the Complainant has provided evidence of the registration of CIRCUS and CIRCUS CASINO marks in numerous jurisdictions.

The Complainant's marks are recognizable in the disputed domain names. Accordingly, the disputed domain names are confusingly similar to the marks for the purposes of the Policy. WIPO Overview 3.1, section 1.7.

Although the addition of other terms, here, "belgie", "be", "belgique", "belgium", "nederland" and "win", and the number "1" 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 marks for the purposes of the Policy. WIPO Overview 3.1, section 1.8.

As to the gTLDs ".com", ".bet" and ".win", they are standard registration requirement and can be disregarded under the first element confusing similarity test. WIPO Overview 3.1, section 1.11.1. Accordingly, the disputed domain names are confusingly similar to the Complainant's marks for the purposes of the Policy.

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 the disputed domain names.

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.

According to the evidence on record, there is no relationship between the Complainant and the Respondents, and the Complainant has not authorized the Respondents to register or use its trademarks or the disputed domain names. Moreover, there is no element from which the Panel could infer that the Respondents have rights over the disputed domain names, or that the Respondents might be commonly known by the disputed domain names.

The Panel notes that all disputed domain names resolved, and with the exclusion of the currently inactive <circuscasino.bet> still resolve, to websites reproducing the Complainant's trademarks, imitating the layout and content of the Complainant's official websites and promoting online casino services in direct competition with the Complainant. The websites also include statements and information apt to suggest that the websites are operated by the Complainant or one of their licensed operators and provide links to other gambling websites which compete with the Complainant's gambling services. The Panel finds that the disclaimers published on some of the websites at the disputed domain names are not sufficient to prevent confusion since they have been published in lower characters, are not clearly visible and are contradicted by the other content displayed on the websites, which is clearly designed to reinforce the impression of an affiliation with the Complainant.

In view of the above, the Panel finds that the Respondents have not used the disputed domain names in connection with a bona fide offering of goods or services or legitimate noncommercial or fair use without intent for commercial gain to misleadingly divert consumers or to tarnish the Complainant's trademarks.

Moreover, prior Panels have held that the use of a domain name for illegal activity, including passing off, or other types of fraud, can never confer rights or legitimate interests on a respondent. WIPO Overview 3.1, section 2.13.1.

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.

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 present case, the Panel notes that in light of i) the prior registration and use of the trademarks CIRCUS and CIRCUS CASINO by the Complainant, including on the Complainant's websites "www.circus-casino.be" and "www.circus.nl", promoting the Complainant's online casino and gambling services; ii) the confusing similarity of the disputed domain names with the Complainant's CIRCUS and CIRCUS CASINO marks and the Complainant's domain names <circus-casino.be> and <circus.nl >; and iii) the content of the websites to which the disputed domain names resolve or previously resolved, featuring reproductions or imitations the Complainant's marks, layout and content similar to that of the Complainant's official websites and the regulatory or corporate data connected with the Complainant or its authorized operator, the Respondents were clearly aware of, and intended to target, the Complainant and its trademarks at the time of registration of the disputed domain names.

In view of the above-described content of the websites to which the disputed domain names resolved, the Panel finds that the Respondents intentionally attempted to attract Internet users to their websites for commercial gain, by creating a likelihood of confusion with the Complainant's marks as to the source, sponsorship, affiliation or endorsement of their websites according to paragraph 4(b)(iv) of the Policy.

As mentioned above, the disputed domain name <circuscasino.bet> does not currently resolve to an active website. Panels have found that the non-use of a domain name 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 trademarks, and the composition of the disputed domain name, and finds that in the circumstances of this case the current passive holding of the disputed domain name does not prevent a finding of bad faith under the Policy.

The Panel also finds that the provision to the Registrars of third-party contact information in connection with two of the disputed domain names (<circuscasino.bet> and <circuscasino.win>) at the time of registration and the involvement of one of the Respondents (Yury Zanchenko) in three prior UDRP cases brought by the Complainant against him and concluded with transfers in favor of the Complainant, 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 <circuscasinobe.com>, <circuscasinobelgie.com>, <circus-casino-belgique.com>, <circuscasinobelgium1.com>, <circuscasino.bet>, <circus-casino-nederland.com>, <circuscasino--nederland.com>, <circuscasino.win> and <circuscasino-win.com> be transferred to the Complainant.

Luca Barbero

Sole Panelist

Date: August 25, 2026