ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

NSUS Group Inc., Bracelet IP Limited v. William Erickson, 1978
Case No. D2026-2849

1. The Parties

The Complainants are NSUS Group Inc., Canada, and Bracelet IP Limited, Ireland, represented by Markmonitor, United Kingdom.

The Respondent is William Erickson, 1978, United States of America (“US”).

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <mywsop.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 30, 2026. On July 1, 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 7, 2026, providing the registrant and contact information disclosed by the Registrar, and inviting the Complainant to submit an amendment to the Complaint. The Complainants filed an amended Complaint on July 9, 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 17, 2026. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was August 6, 2026. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent’s default on August 11, 2026.

The Center appointed Taras Kyslyy as the sole panelist in this matter on August 12, 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 Complainants are two entities within a group of related companies. The First Complainant, NSUS Group Inc., is a private business consultancy and investment group operating in the iGaming industry. It was established in 2018 and is headquartered in Canada. It conducts business on a global scale and employs approximately 700 people worldwide. The First Complainant's principal headquarters are located in North York, Toronto, and it also maintains a significant operational base in South Korea. In addition, the First Complainant has offices across Europe and Asia, including in Ireland, Malta, the United Kingdom, Germany, the Isle of Man, and cities such as Manila and Seoul, giving it a presence in around nine locations internationally. The First Complainant's core business involves the development, operation, and support of online gaming platforms, with a particular focus on online poker.

The Second Complainant – Bracelet IP Limited – is an intellectual property holding company within the NSUS Group incorporated in Dublin, Ireland.

The Complainants expanded their portfolio through the acquisition of the WSOP brand (which stands for World Series of Poker) in October 2024 for approximately USD 500 million. The Second Complainant owns a number of WSOP-formative trademark registrations in various jurisdictions for instance the US trademark registration WSOP No. 3499073, registered on September 9, 2009, and US trademark registration WSOP.COM WORLD SERIES OF POKER No. 4591524, registered on August 26, 2014.

The disputed domain name was registered on December 5, 2025 and resolves to a parked webpage featuring the disputed domain name and stating "Launching Soon".

5. Parties' Contentions

A. Complainants

The Complainants contend that they have satisfied each of the elements required under the Policy for a transfer of the disputed domain name.

Notably, the Complainants contend that the disputed domain name is identical or confusingly similar to the Complainants' trademark. The required Top-Level Domain can be ignored for the purposes of this comparison of the disputed domain name to the Complainants' mark. The disputed domain name incorporates the Complainants' mark in its entirety, merely adding the generic term "my".

The Complainants also contend that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name. The Complainants have found no evidence that the Respondent has been commonly known by the names "WSOP" or "MY WSOP", whether before or after registration of the disputed domain name. The Respondent is not a licensee of the Complainants and has not received any permission, consent, or authorisation from either of the Complainants to use the WSOP name or mark in connection with the registration of the disputed domain name, or otherwise. The Complainants have further found no evidence that the Respondent owns any trademark rights incorporating the term WSOP, nor any evidence that the Respondent has carried on a legitimate business under that name. The Complainants contend that given that the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to their marks, there is no conceivable use to which the disputed domain name would confer any legitimate interest upon the Respondent. The Respondent specifically cannot claim a legitimate "fair use" interest as the nature of the disputed domain name carries a risk of implied affiliation. The disputed domain name incorporates the Complainants' mark together with the term "my". The addition of this common, non-distinctive prefix (namely, "my") which may be understood by

Internet users as indicating a personalized or user-specific version of the Complainants' services effectively impersonates or suggests sponsorship or endorsement by the Complainants. The disputed domain name does not resolve to an active website but to a holding page, which constitutes passive holding and, as such, the disputed domain name has not been used in connection with a bona fide offering of goods or services.

Finally, the Complainants contend that the disputed domain name was registered and is being used in bad faith. The disputed domain name simply adds the possessive determiner "my" which may be perceived by Internet users as suggesting a personalized or user-specific version of the Complainants' services. The Internet users encountering the disputed domain name in search results would reasonably assume that it is affiliated with, or endorsed by the Complainants. The disputed domain name is, at first glance, confusing to Internet users. Passive holding of the disputed domain name constitutes bad faith. The Complainants are well known internationally and their WSOP tournament has been the longest running poker tournament in the world. The disputed domain name does not resolve to an active website. The Respondent has redacted, or allowed the redaction, of its details from the public WhoIs. The disputed domain name incorporates the Complainants' well-known mark in its entirety, plus the possessive determiner "my". As a result, the very nature of the domain name constitutes registration in bad faith. The Respondent chose the Top-Level Domain ".com". The Complainants own registered marks in the term WSOP, and operate their main website at the domain name <wsop.com>. As such, the Top-Level Domain ".com" corresponds to the Complainants' area of business activity and reinforces the bad faith intentions of the Respondent's registration. It is more likely than not that the Respondent knew, or ought reasonably to have known, of the Complainants and their WSOP marks at the time of registering the disputed domain name.

B. Respondent

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

6. Discussion and Findings

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 Complainants have 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 applicable generic Top-Level Domain ("gTLD") in a domain name (e.g., ".com", ".club", ".nyc") is viewed as a standard registration requirement and as such is disregarded under the first element confusing similarity test. Thus, the Panel disregards the gTLD ".com" for the purposes of the confusing similarity test. WIPO Overview 3.1, section 1.11.1.

The entirety of the mark is reproduced within the disputed domain name. Accordingly, the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to the mark for the purposes of the Policy. WIPO Overview 3.1, section 1.7.

Although the addition of other terms here, "my", 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.

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.

Having reviewed the available record, the Panel finds the Complainants have established a prima facie case that the Respondent lacks rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name. The Respondent has not rebutted the Complainants' 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 available evidence does not confirm that the Respondent is commonly known by the disputed domain name, which could demonstrate its rights or legitimate interests (see, e.g., *World Natural Bodybuilding Federation, Inc. v. Daniel Jones, TheDotCafe*, WIPO Case No. D2008-0642).

The Complainants did not license or otherwise agree for use of their prior registered trademarks by the Respondent, and the record contains no evidence of any actual or contemplated bona fide offering of goods or services or legitimate noncommercial use.

Noting the high risk of implied affiliation between the disputed domain name and the well-known trademark of the Complainants, the Panel finds that there is no plausible fair use to which the disputed domain name could be put that would not have the effect of being somehow connected to the Complainants (see, e.g., *Instagram, LLC v. Super Privacy Service LTD c/o Dynadot / Zayed*, WIPO Case No. D2019-2897).

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, the Panel notes that the Respondent registered the disputed domain name confusingly similar to the well-known trademark of the Complainants. Noting the near instantaneous and global reach of the Internet and search engines, and particularly in circumstances where the complainant's mark is widely known (including in its sector) or highly specific and a respondent cannot credibly claim to have been unaware of the mark (particularly in the case of domainers), panels have been prepared to infer that the respondent knew, or have found that the respondent should have known, that its registration would be identical or confusingly similar to a complainant's mark. Further factors, including the nature of the domain name and the chosen Top-Level Domain, may obviate a respondent's claim not to have been aware of the complainant's mark. The Panel finds that the nature of the disputed domain name confusingly similar to the widely-known trademark of the Complainants and chosen gTLD ".com", incorporating the Complainants' trademark and very similar to the Complainants' domain name <wsop.com>, suggests the Respondent knew and targeted the Complainants and their trademark when registering the disputed domain name, which is bad faith. WIPO Overview 3.1, section 3.2.2.

The mere registration of a domain name that is identical or confusingly similar to a famous or widely-known trademark by an unaffiliated entity can by itself create a presumption of bad faith. The Panel is convinced that the Complainants' trademark is well established through long and widespread use and the Complainants have acquired a significant reputation and level of goodwill in their trademark in particular in the US. Thus, the Panel finds that the disputed domain name confusingly similar to the Complainants' trademarks was registered in bad faith. WIPO Overview 3.1, section 3.1.4.

Panels have found that the non-use of a domain name (including a "coming soon" page) 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 and reputation of the Complainants' trademarks, and the composition of the disputed domain name, and finds that in the circumstances of this case the passive holding of the disputed domain name does not prevent a finding of bad faith under the Policy.

The Panel finds that the Complainants have 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 <mywsop.com> be transferred to the Complainants.

/Taras Kyslyy/
Taras Kyslyy
Sole Panelist
Date: August 20, 2026