

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

RoyalCasino.com Ltd. v. Tzahi Miller

Case No. D2026-2750

1. The Parties

The Complainant is RoyalCasino.com Ltd., Malta, represented by Holst, Law Limited Liability Partnership, Denmark.

The Respondent is Tzahi Miller, Israel, represented by FIRON Law Firm, Israel.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <royalscasino2.com> is registered with GoDaddy.com, LLC (the “Registrar”).

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the “Center”) on June 24, 2026. On June 25, 2026, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On June 25, 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 (Registration Private) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on June 29, 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 30, 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 July 7, 2026. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was July 27, 2026. The Response was filed with the Center on July 23, 2026.

The Center appointed Evan D. Brown as the sole panelist in this matter on July 28, 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 provides land-based and online casino services. It owns the trademark ROYALCASINO, for which it enjoys the benefits of registration in a number of jurisdictions (e.g., European Union Trade Mark Reg. No. 018046973, registered on April 28, 2020). The Complainant asserts, and has provided evidence, that it has used ROYAL CASINO in connection with casino services since at least as early as 1991.

According to the RDAP records, the disputed domain name was registered on April 15, 2024. The Respondent has used the disputed domain name for an active online casino website operating under the name ROYALS CASINO. The website offers, among other things, casino games, live casino games, slots, jackpots, and promotions.

5. Parties' Contentions

A. Complainant

The Complainant contends that the disputed domain name is identical or confusingly similar to the Complainant's trademark; that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the disputed domain name; and that the disputed domain name was registered and is being used in bad faith.

B. Respondent

The Respondent disputes the contentions raised by the Complainant under all three elements of the Policy.

As for the first element, the Respondent asserts that the Complainant has overstated the distinctiveness of the words Royal Casino when applied to casino services, and the exclusivity of the Complainant's rights thereto. In support of this assertion, the Respondent has provided evidence of numerous third-party registrations in multiple jurisdictions for the mark ROYAL CASINO and similar marks in connection with casino services. Examples include Ukrainian Trademark Reg. No. 340785 for ROYAL CASINO (stylized with design); Spanish Trademark Reg. Nos. N0365997 and N0365998 for ROYAL CASINO (stylized with design); and Georgian Trademark Reg. No. 37004 for the word mark ROYAL CASINO.

On the second element of the Policy, the Respondent asserts it has rights and legitimate interests in the disputed domain name because the Respondent registered the disputed domain name for use in line with a defined territorial intention, namely Gulf Cooperation Council and North African Arabic-speaking countries. Moreover, the Respondent asserts that the website is operated by a licensed operator for that distinct market, with access from the Complainant's asserted markets restricted, and does not impersonate or claim affiliation with the Complainant.

Concerning the third element under the Policy, the Respondent likewise asserts that the disputed domain name was neither registered nor used in bad faith because it was intended for use by a licensed operator serving a distinct territorial market, with technical and regulatory restrictions preventing access from the Complainant's asserted markets. The Respondent further denies targeting, impersonating, or seeking to divert Internet users from the Complainant, and contends there is no evidence that it registered the disputed domain name to exploit the Complainant's trademark rights.

6. Discussion and Findings

To succeed, the Complainant must demonstrate that all of the elements listed in paragraph 4(a) of the Policy have been satisfied: (i) the disputed domain name is identical or confusingly similar to a trademark or service mark in which the Complainant has rights, (ii) the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the disputed domain name, and (iii) the disputed domain name has been registered and is being used in bad faith.

The applicable standard of proof in proceedings under the Policy is the balance of probabilities. See WIPO Overview of WIPO Panel Views on Select UDRP Questions ("[WIPO Overview 3.1](#)"), section 4.2.

The Panel finds that the Complainant has established the first element of the Policy. For the reasons set forth below, however, the Panel finds that the Complainant has not established the second and third elements.

A. Identical or Confusingly Similar

This first element functions primarily as a standing requirement. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.7. 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. *Id.* This element requires the Panel to consider two issues: first, whether the Complainant has rights in a relevant mark; and second, whether the disputed domain name is identical or confusingly similar to that mark.

A registered trademark provides a clear indication that the rights in the mark shown on the trademark certificate belong to its respective owner. See *Advance Magazine Publishers Inc., Les Publications Conde Nast S.A. v. Voguechen*, WIPO Case No. [D2014-0657](#). The Complainant has demonstrated its rights in the ROYALCASINO mark by providing evidence of its trademark registrations. See [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.2.1.

The disputed domain name presents the ROYALCASINO mark in a readily recognizable, minor variant form. Such a variation does not prevent a finding of confusing similarity. See [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), sections 1.7 and 1.9.

The Respondent's assertions concerning the asserted weakness of the Complainant's mark and third-party registrations for ROYAL CASINO and similar marks does not alter this conclusion. The strength of the Complainant's rights and the Respondent's asserted reason for selecting the disputed domain name are not ordinarily matters for determination under the first element, but may be relevant to the Panel's assessment under the second and third elements. See [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.7.

It is also standard practice when comparing a disputed domain name to a complainant's trademark to disregard the applicable Top-Level Domain as a standard registration requirement. See [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.11.1.

The Panel therefore finds that the Complainant has established the first element under the Policy

B. Rights or Legitimate Interests

The Panel evaluates this element by first considering whether the Complainant has made a prima facie showing that the Respondent lacks rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name. If so, the burden of production shifts to the Respondent, while the ultimate burden of proof remains with the Complainant. See [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 2.1.

The Complainant asserts that it has not licensed or authorized the Respondent to use the ROYALCASINO mark, that the Respondent is not commonly known by the disputed domain name, and that the Respondent uses the disputed domain name commercially for casino services. The Panel finds these assertions sufficient to establish a prima facie case.

The Respondent, however, has come forward with evidence that the disputed domain name was registered for an actual casino operation directed to Gulf Cooperation Council and North African Arabic-speaking countries. The Respondent has submitted evidence of an arrangement under which Sunflower Seed B.V., described as a licensed operator, would operate the website for that market, together with evidence of territorial and technical restrictions applicable to the website.

[WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 2.2 recognizes that rights or legitimate interests may arise from bona fide use, or demonstrable preparations for use, before notice of the dispute. Relevant evidence may include a genuine business plan and other contemporaneous circumstances showing that the asserted activity is not pretextual. Here, the Respondent has provided documentary evidence supporting its explanation for the registration and use of the disputed domain name.

The nature of the terms is also relevant. The Respondent has provided evidence that ROYAL CASINO and similar expressions have been registered and used by third parties in the casino sector in multiple jurisdictions. Such evidence does not itself confer rights or legitimate interests. See [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 2.10.1. It does, however, bear on whether the Respondent selected the disputed domain name because of the Complainant or for reasons independent of it.

The Panel also considers the geographic circumstances. Here, the Complainant has not asserted that it provides casino services outside Denmark or Greenland, and the evidence identifies a physical casino location in Denmark. Nor has the Complainant asserted that it is licensed or authorized to provide online casino services in the territories targeted by the Respondent.

The Panel has also undertaken limited factual research concerning the Complainant's website. See [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 4.8. The Panel observes that the account-creation process permits only the telephone prefixes +45 and +299, corresponding to Denmark and Greenland, and that the Complainant's Questions and Answers page states that a user may be unable to create a gaming account if the user does not have a Danish postal address. These circumstances are consistent with the geographically limited nature of the Complainant's online offering.

Against that background, the Respondent's evidence that its website was designed for a separate territorial audience, together with technical and regulatory restrictions intended to exclude the Complainant's asserted markets, supports its explanation for the registration and use of the disputed domain name.

Although both parties provide casino services, the issue under the Policy is not simply whether they operate in the same field, but whether the Complainant has established that the Respondent lacks rights or legitimate interests within the meaning of the Policy.

Considering the Respondent's evidence of pre-Complaint commercial use and planning, third-party use and registrations involving ROYAL CASINO and similar expressions, the distinct territorial business model, and the absence of persuasive indicia that the Respondent intended to trade off the Complainant's trademark rights, the Panel finds that the Complainant has not carried its burden on the second element.

Accordingly, the Panel finds that the Complainant has not established the second element under the Policy

C. Registered and Used in Bad Faith

The Policy requires a complainant to establish that the disputed domain name was both registered and is being used in bad faith.

Paragraph 4(b)(iv) identifies bad faith where a respondent intentionally attempts to attract Internet users for commercial gain by creating a likelihood of confusion with the complainant's mark as to source, sponsorship, affiliation, or endorsement.

Certain circumstances in this case favor the Complainant. Its trademark rights predate registration of the disputed domain name, the disputed domain name closely corresponds to the ROYALCASINO mark, and the Respondent uses it for the same general category of services. These circumstances warrant particular consideration of whether the Respondent targeted the Complainant. The central question is whether, on the balance of probabilities, the Respondent selected the disputed domain name because of the Complainant and its ROYALCASINO mark, intending to take unfair advantage of the Complainant's trademark rights.

[WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 3.2.2 explains that, where a complainant's mark is widely known or highly specific, a panel may more readily infer that a respondent knew or should have known of the complainant's rights. See *eBay Inc. v. Renbu Bai*, WIPO Case No. [D2014-1693](#) (the panel found the respondent "knew or should have known" of the complainant's mark where the complainant's mark was "long-established and well-known internationally"). Where a mark is not inherently distinctive, corresponds to ordinary terminology, and the evidence of reputation in the respondent's market is limited, panels may be reluctant to infer targeting. See *Limited Stores, LLC v. Infinite Wireless*, WIPO Case No. [D2013-1269](#).

The Complainant has established longstanding trademark rights, but has not demonstrated that the ROYALCASINO mark enjoys a reputation materially extending beyond Denmark and Greenland. The words "royal" and "casino" are ordinary words, and "casino" directly describes the industry in which both parties operate. The Respondent has also provided evidence of numerous third-party trademark registrations involving ROYAL CASINO and closely similar expressions in the casino sector. While this does not diminish the validity of the Complainant's trademark registrations, it undermines any assertion that the Respondent's selection of the disputed domain name necessarily targeted the Complainant.

The Panel does not regard geographic separation, standing alone, as dispositive. As noted in [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 3.2.2, the global nature of the Internet means that a respondent cannot necessarily disclaim knowledge or targeting merely because it operates in another jurisdiction.

Here, however, the geographic evidence forms part of a broader factual picture. The Complainant's own website and onboarding process appear directed to Denmark and Greenland. The Respondent, in turn, has provided evidence that the disputed domain name was registered for a casino operation aimed at Gulf Cooperation Council and North African Arabic-speaking countries, together with technical, onboarding, and regulatory measures intended to restrict access from the Complainant's asserted markets.

The Respondent has therefore presented a credible, evidence-supported explanation for its selection and use of the disputed domain name independent of the Complainant or its trademark.

See [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 3.2.1. The associated website does not claim affiliation with the Complainant or otherwise hold itself out as the Complainant. Nor is there evidence that the Respondent approached the Complainant to sell the disputed domain name, engaged in a pattern of blocking registrations, or otherwise acted in a manner from which targeting may reasonably be inferred.

The Respondent's use is plainly commercial, but paragraph 4(b)(iv) requires more. The Respondent must have intentionally sought commercial gain by creating confusion with the Complainant's mark. See [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), sections 3.1 and 3.1.4. On this record, the Panel is not persuaded that the Respondent selected the disputed domain name for that purpose.

Taking the record as a whole, the Panel finds that the Complainant has not established, on the balance of probabilities, that the Respondent registered the disputed domain name because of the Complainant or with the intention of exploiting the Complainant's ROYALCASINO mark.

Accordingly, the Panel finds that the Complainant has not established the third element under the Policy.

7. Decision

For the foregoing reasons, the Complaint is denied.

/Evan D. Brown /

Evan D. Brown

Sole Panelist

Date: August 12, 2026