

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

Evolution AB v. Pavel Bloshanevich

Case No. D2026-2842

1. The Parties

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

The Respondent is Pavel Bloshanevich, Ukraine.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <evolution-games.net> is registered with Hosting Concepts B.V. d/b/a Registrar.eu. (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 1, 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 (Redacted for Privacy) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on July 1, 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 1, 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 8, 2026. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was July 28, 2026. The Respondent sent an email communication to the Center on July 9, 2026.

The Center appointed Stefan Bojovic 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. Further Procedural Considerations

Under paragraph 10 of the Rules, the Panel is required to ensure that the Parties are treated with equality and that each Party is given a fair opportunity to present its case, and also that the administrative proceeding takes place with due expedition. Since the Respondent's mailing address is stated to be in Ukraine which is subject to an international conflict at the date of this Decision that may impact case notification, it is appropriate for the Panel to consider, in accordance with its discretion under paragraph 10 of the Rules, whether the proceedings should continue.

Having considered all the circumstances of the case, the Panel is of the view that they should. The Panel notes that the Center sent the Notification of Complaint by email to the Respondent at its email address as registered with the Registrar, and in response received an informal email communication from the Respondent who has apparently received the Notification of Complaint.

The Panel concludes that the Parties have been given a fair opportunity to present their case, and so that the administrative proceedings take place with due expedition the Panel will proceed to a Decision accordingly.

5. Factual Background

The Complainant is a Swedish company group founded in 2006 that develops, produces, markets and licenses fully integrated business-to-business casino solutions to online operators and land-based casinos world-wide. The Complainant has operations in more than 15 countries spanning across several continents. The Complainant has more than 800 customers operating its services and employs more than 22,000 people across Europe and North America.

In October 2020, the Complainant underwent a corporate and market rebranding from EVOLUTION GAMING to EVOLUTION.

The Complainant, through its wholly-owned subsidiary Evolution Malta Limited is the owner of the EVOLUTION and EVOLUTION GAMING trademarks which are protected by trademark registrations in several jurisdictions, including the following:

- European Union trademark registration No. 019237146 for EVOLUTION, registered on January 23, 2026;
- International Trademark Registration No. 1670152 for EVOLUTION (word/device), registered on December 3, 2021; and
- European Union trademark registration No. 016691503 for EVOLUTION GAMING, registered on December 18, 2017.

The Complainant also owns several domain names reflecting its EVOLUTION and EVOLUTION GAMING trademarks, such as <evolution.com> and <evolutiongaming.com>.

The disputed domain name was registered on January 22, 2026, and it resolves to a website prominently reproducing the Complainant's EVOLUTION and EVOLUTION GAMING trademarks and logos and providing various information about the Complainant and its business. The website at the disputed domain name also contains a copyright notice at the bottom of the page that reads "© Copyright 2026 Evolution Gaming Games". The website also contains prominent links inviting users to "Play Evolution Games", which, according to the Complainant, redirect users to third-party gambling websites.

6. 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 is confusingly similar to the Complainant's trademarks. The addition of generic, descriptive, or geographical terms (such as "games") within the disputed domain name does not prevent a finding of confusing similarity. Finally, the addition of the generic Top-Level Domain ("gTLD") ".net" 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 confusing similarity between the Complainant's trademark and the disputed domain name.

With reference to rights or legitimate interests in respect of the disputed domain name, the Complainant contends that no license or authorization of any kind has been given by the Complainant to the Respondent to register or use the EVOLUTION or EVOLUTION GAMING trademarks as a domain name or otherwise, and the Complainant has found no information indicating that the Respondent is trading under any company name corresponding to the disputed domain name or that it has any other rights to the name. Neither is the Respondent an authorized representative of the Complainant's products or services and has never had a business relationship with the Complainant. There is a considerable risk that the public will perceive the disputed domain name is either owned by the Complainant or that there is a relationship with the Complainant. The Respondent is not using the disputed domain name in connection with a bona fide offering of goods or services. Instead, the Respondent is using the disputed domain name to host a commercial website. The Complainant argues that the Respondent is, for financial gain, attempting to unfairly capitalize on the reputation and goodwill of the Complainant and the Complainant's trademarks. The Respondent is using the Complainant's protected trademarks and logotypes on several occasions, including on the website header. The Respondent is also using numerous images and media that are copyright of the Complainant, without the Complainant's authorization. The footer of the website states "© Evolution Gaming Games", but provides no genuine information about the Respondent, and there is no disclaimer that accurately and prominently discloses the Respondent's relationship with the Complainant. Finally, the website contains links redirecting Internet users to third-party services that are not in any way related to the Complainant.

With reference to the circumstances evidencing bad faith, the Complainant contends that the disputed domain name is registered several years after the Complainant first obtained registered rights for EVOLUTION trademark, and over a decade after obtained the rights for EVOLUTION GAMING trademark. Given the widespread use, reputation and recognition of the Complainant's trademarks and its related services and products, and the aforementioned use of disputed domain name, it is obvious that the Respondent was fully aware of the Complainant at the time of registration, and that it was the Complainant's business and trademarks that motivated the Respondent to register and use the disputed domain name. In the Complainant's view, the Respondent, by registering and using the disputed domain name, has intentionally attempted to attract, for commercial gain, Internet users to its own website, by creating a likelihood of confusion with the Complainant's trademarks as to the source, sponsorship, affiliation, or endorsement of the Respondent's website.

B. Respondent

The Respondent did not provide a formal response to the Complainant's contentions. However, on July 9, 2026, the Respondent sent an email to the Center acknowledging the receipt of the Complaint and indicating that a thorough internal review of the domain name registration and use has been conducted.

The Respondent adds that after the careful review of all aspects of its activities related to the disputed domain name, they confirmed acting in full compliance with applicable laws and regulations and that the disputed domain name was used lawfully and in good faith.

The Respondent concludes that all content and services associated with the disputed domain name are provided lawfully, with full respect for the rights of third parties and that the Respondent has legitimate interests in the disputed domain name, and that there are no instances of bad faith registration or use on its part.

7. Discussion and Findings

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 stipulates that the Complainant must prove each of the following:

- (i) that the disputed domain name is identical or confusingly similar to a trademark or service mark in which the complainant has rights;
- (ii) that the respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the disputed domain name; and
- (iii) that the disputed domain name has been registered and is 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 a trademark or service mark for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.2.1.

The entirety of the Complainant’s EVOLUTION trademark is reproduced within the disputed domain name, while the dominant element “evolution” of the Complainant’s EVOLUTION GAMING trademark, along with the term “games”, is also present in the disputed domain name. Accordingly, the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to the Complainant’s trademarks for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.7.

Although the addition of other terms (here, “games”) may bear on assessment of the second and third elements, the Panel finds the addition of such term does not prevent a finding of confusing similarity between the disputed domain name and the mark for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.8.

In addition, it is well established that “.net”, as a gTLD, is disregarded in the assessment of the confusing similarity between the disputed domain name and the trademark. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.11.1.

The Panel, therefore, finds that 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 name. The Respondent has briefly sought to rebut the Complainant's prima facie case, however, the Panel finds that the arguments advanced are insufficient to demonstrate rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name.

The Panel recognizes that the provision of information concerning the Complainant and its products may, in appropriate circumstances, constitute fair use. The circumstances of the present case, however, do not support such a finding. The disputed domain name itself combines the Complainant's EVOLUTION trademark with the term "games", which directly relates to the Complainant's business. The website to which the disputed domain name resolves prominently reproduces the Complainant's EVOLUTION and EVOLUTION GAMING trademarks and logos and is presented as an "Evolution Gaming Platform Review", without a clear and prominent disclosure that it is operated independently of the Complainant. On the contrary, the website contains a copyright notice stating "© Copyright 2026 Evolution Gaming Games", which further reinforces the impression that the website is operated by or affiliated with the Complainant. The website also contains prominent links inviting users to "Play Evolution Games", which, as alleged by the Complainant, redirect users to third-party gambling websites. These circumstances further undermine the characterization of the Respondent's use as a genuine noncommercial informational or review website. Judging whether a respondent's use of a domain name constitutes a legitimate fair use will often hinge on whether the corresponding website content prima facie supports the claimed purpose (e.g., for referential use, commentary, criticism, praise, or parody), is not misleading as to source or sponsorship, and is not a pretext for tarnishment or commercial gain. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 2.5.3.

The Panel further notes that, according to the record, there is no relationship between the Respondent and the Complainant and that the Respondent is not a licensee of the Complainant, nor has the Respondent otherwise obtained an authorization to use the Complainant's EVOLUTION and EVOLUTION GAMING trademark. The Respondent has provided no evidence from which the Panel could infer that it has rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name or that it is commonly known by the disputed domain name.

The Panel also finds that the composition of the disputed domain name, which contains the Complainant's EVOLUTION trademark in combination with the term "games" coupled with the use to which the disputed domain name has been put, signals the Respondent's intention of taking unfair advantage of the likelihood of confusion between the disputed domain name and the Complainant as to the origin or affiliation of the website at the dispute domain name.

Having in mind the above, 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.

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 the Respondent must have been well aware of the Complainant and its EVOLUTION and EVOLUTION GAMING trademarks at the time of the registration of the disputed domain name. Namely, the first registration and use of the Complainant's trademarks predate the registration of the disputed domain name by years, making it unlikely that the Respondent was not aware of

the Complainant's trademark at the time of registration of the disputed domain name. Furthermore, the composition of the disputed domain name is such that it corresponds to the Complainant's field of business and makes direct reference to it. Such composition and the content of the website to which the disputed domain name resolves leave no room for doubt as to the Respondent's knowledge of the Complainant and its trademarks and demonstrate that the Respondent had the Complainant in mind when registering the disputed domain name.

Due to the above, the Panel finds that the disputed domain name has been registered in bad faith.

The Panel further considers that the Respondent has intentionally attempted to attract Internet users to its website by creating a likelihood of confusion with the Complainant's EVOLUTION and EVOLUTION GAMING trademarks as to the source, sponsorship, affiliation, or endorsement of the website. The choice of the disputed domain name, the prominent reproduction of the Complainant's trademarks and logos, the absence of a clear disclosure of the Respondent's lack of affiliation with the Complainant, and the copyright notice falsely suggesting ownership by "Evolution Gaming Games" all support this conclusion. This finding is further reinforced by the prominent links inviting users to "Play Evolution Games", suggesting that the Respondent's exploitation of the Complainant's trademarks is not merely for the provision of independent information platform but is intended to attract and redirect Internet users.

Having reviewed the record, the Panel finds the Respondent's registration and use of the disputed domain name constitutes bad faith under the Policy.

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

8. 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-games.net> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Stefan Bojovic/

Stefan Bojovic

Sole Panelist

Date: August 27, 2026