

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

Evolution AB v. Edmund Ong, Marketing
Case No. D2026-2841

1. The Parties

The Complainant is Evolution AB, Sweden, represented by Zacco Sweden AB, Sweden.

The Respondent is Edmund Ong, Marketing, United States of America ("United States" or "U.S.").

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <evolution-gaming.bet> 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 30, 2026. On June 30, 2026, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On July 2, 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 / Domains by Proxy, LLC) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on July 3, 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 amendment to the Complaint on July 3, 2026.

The Center verified that the Complaint together with the amendment to 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 July 10, 2026. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was July 30, 2026. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent's default on August 7, 2026.

The Center appointed Meera Chature Sankhari as the sole panelist in this matter on August 13, 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, Evolution AB, is a Swedish company group founded in 2006. The company claims to develop, produce, market and license fully integrated business-to-business casino solutions to online operators and land-based casinos worldwide. The company has operations in more than 15 countries spanning across several continents, with over 800 customers operating their services, and employs more than 22,000 people across Europe and North America. Over the years, the Complainant has made several company acquisitions and operates various brands including EVOLUTION and EVOLUTION GAMING.

The Complainant holds several trademark registrations through its wholly-owned subsidiary, Evolution Malta Limited, that comprise the word EVOLUTION and EVOLUTION GAMING in numerous classes including Class 9, 28, 41 and 42. The marks are registered in several jurisdictions around the world, including but not limited to:

- International Registration, for EVOLUTION (device mark), Registration No. 1670152, dated December 3, 2021;
- U.S. Trademark (USPTO), for EVOLUTION GAMING (word mark), Registration No. 5833804, dated August 13, 2019;
- United Kingdom Trademark (UKIPO), for EVOLUTION GAMING (word mark), Registration No. UK00916691503, dated December 18, 2017;
- European Union Trademark (EUIPO), for EVOLUTION GAMING (device mark), Registration No. 9320854, dated August 9, 2011.

The Complainant also owns the domain names incorporating the EVOLUTION and EVOLUTION GAMING trademarks, such as <evolution.com> and <evolutiongaming.com>.

The disputed domain name <evolution-gaming.bet> was registered on September 15, 2021. The disputed domain name redirects to a website with casino or gambling gaming content.

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 name.

Notably, the Complainant contends that the disputed domain name <evolution-gaming.bet> is confusingly similar to its EVOLUTION trademark and confusingly similar or even identical to its EVOLUTION GAMING trademark. The Complainant's trademarks have been registered and used in numerous countries for a long period of time, including the European Union, the United Kingdom, and the United States. The Complainant claims further that it has been extensively using the EVOLUTION GAMING trademark for over a decade, and that it has garnered substantial reputation and has been recognized in many countries, which were taken into consideration in the previous UDRP decisions.

The Complainant argues that the disputed domain name consists of the Complainant's EVOLUTION and EVOLUTION GAMING trademarks in its entirety, with the only difference being the insertion of a hyphen between the terms "evolution" and "gaming". The Complainant also contends that the addition of the generic Top-Level Domain ("gTLD") ".bet" does not have any impact on the overall impression of the dominant portion of the disputed domain name and is therefore irrelevant when determining the similarity between the trademark and the disputed domain name.

The Complainant contends that the Respondent does not have any rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name. To the best of the Complainant's knowledge, the Respondent i) was never authorized or licensed by the Complainant to use its trademarks as a domain name or otherwise; ii) has no business relationship with the Complainant and iii) is not an authorized representative of the Complainant's products and services. The Complainant alleges that the disputed domain name will mislead the public into believing it is associated with or operated by the Complainant. The Complainant also fears that there is a risk of dilution of the Complainant's well-known trademark. The Complainant further alleges that the Respondent has chosen and registered the disputed domain name to exploit the Complainant's trademark in order to generate traffic and income by redirecting the disputed domain name to a commercial website featuring the Complainant's games along with marks and services of its competitors, with no disclaimer that accurately and prominently discloses that the Respondent is not related to the Complainant.

In support of its allegations with respect to the use of the disputed domain name, the Complainant has submitted a screenshot and the MP4 video recording of the disputed domain name being redirected to another website.

The Complainant contends that the disputed domain name was registered and used in bad faith due to the following reasons: (i) that the Respondent was fully aware of the Complainant's registered EVOLUTION GAMING trademark and its business at the time of registering the disputed domain name; (ii) it was registered and used to create a false impression that the disputed domain name and website are affiliated with or operated by the Complainant, for either commercial, illicit or fraudulent purposes; and (iii) it was used to attract Internet users to its own website, for commercial gain, by creating a likelihood of confusion with the Complainant's marks as to source, sponsorship, affiliation, or endorsement.

B. Respondent

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

6. Discussion and Findings

The Complainant herein being the parent company of the wholly-owned subsidiary that owns the trademark registrations and rights in the EVOLUTION GAMING and EVOLUTION trademarks, has established its rights in and to the trademarks in question as well as its right to file the present complaint. Accordingly, the Panel notes that the Complainant has sufficient rights in the EVOLUTION GAMING and EVOLUTION trademarks, notwithstanding that the registrations are held in the name of its subsidiary. Such rights are sufficient to establish standing under the UDRP. WIPO Overview of WIPO Panel Views on Select UDRP Questions ("[WIPO Overview 3.1](#)"), section 1.4.1.

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 3.1](#), section 1.7.

The Complainant has shown rights in respect of trademarks EVOLUTION and EVOLUTION GAMING for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.4.1.

The entirety of the marks EVOLUTION and EVOLUTION GAMING is reproduced within the disputed domain name. Accordingly, the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to the relevant marks for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.7.

In the present case, the Panel notes that the only difference between the Complainant's registered trademark EVOLUTION GAMING and the disputed domain name is the addition of a hyphen in between the two terms in the disputed domain name, which alone cannot prevent the Panel from a finding of confusing similarity between the disputed domain name <evolution-gaming.bet> and the Complainant's trademark EVOLUTION GAMING for the purposes of the Policy.

Concerning the gTLD ".bet", it is well-established that it is viewed as a standard registration requirement and as such is disregarded under the first element confusing similarity test. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.11.1.

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 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.

The Panel notes the Complainant's EVOLUTION GAMING mark was registered prior to registration of the disputed domain name, and that the Complainant has confirmed that it never had a business relationship with the Respondent, and that the Respondent is not making a bona fide offering of goods and services or legitimate noncommercial or fair use of the disputed domain name.

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 Panel specifically concurs with the Complainant's allegation that the Respondent's disputed domain name was being used to generate traffic and income by redirecting the disputed domain name to a commercial website featuring the gambling games along with marks and services of its competitors.

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, given the nature of the disputed domain name, the date of its registration, and the use of the disputed domain name to redirect users to a competing gambling website, the Panel finds that the Respondent was fully aware of the Complainant's mark at the time of registering the disputed domain name

and targeted the Complainant's business and EVOLUTION GAMING trademark, which predates the registration by over a decade.

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.

The Respondent's use of the disputed domain name for intentionally attempting to attract and redirect Internet users to a commercial website, creating a likelihood of confusion with the Complainant's mark as to the source, sponsorship, affiliation, or endorsement, in order to generate income for itself, constitutes evidence of bad faith registration and use of the disputed domain name under paragraph 4(b)(iv) of 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 name <evolution-gaming.bet> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Meera Chature Sankhari/

Meera Chature Sankhari

Sole Panelist

Date: September 7, 2026