

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

casino de SPA S.A. v. Stefan Hristov, MAIKLS JANBERGS, MARTA GRYKA, Oleksandra Avdiienko, YURY ZANCHENKO, Zhanna Sokoliuk, Svitlana Zhariuk, Nikita Chornobryvets, Illia Andrieiev, Yevhen Shmyha, SHIYIXIAXUN YY, Vadym Povar, SVITLANA ROMANENKO, YEVHEN CHORNENKYI, Ruslan Izoriia, and OLEKSANDR LISKIN
Case No. D2026-2901

1. The Parties

The Complainant is casino de SPA S.A., Belgium, represented by COGITUS SRL, Belgium.

The Respondents are Stefan Hristov, Bulgaria; MAIKLS JANBERGS, Latvia; MARTA GRYKA, Poland; Oleksandra Avdiienko, Ukraine; YURY ZANCHENKO, Ukraine; Zhanna Sokoliuk, Ukraine; Svitlana Zhariuk, Ukraine; Nikita Chornobryvets, Ukraine; Illia Andrieiev, Ukraine; Yevhen Shmyha, Ukraine; SHIYIXIAXUN YY, United States of America; Vadym Povar, Ukraine; SVITLANA ROMANENKO, Ukraine; YEVHEN CHORNENKYI, Ukraine; Ruslan Izoriia, Ukraine; and OLEKSANDR LISKIN, Ukraine, self-represented.

2. The Domain Names and Registrars

The disputed domain names <casino777-at.com>, <casino777be.com>, <casino777-ca.com>, <casino777-cz.com>, <casino777-fr.com>, <777-casino-at.com>, <777casino-at.com>, <777casino-fr.com>, <777casinofr.com>, <777-casino-hu.com> and <777casino-hu.com> are registered with Dynadot Inc.

The disputed domain name <casino777-be.com> is registered with Spaceship, Inc.

The disputed domain names <casino777-be.net> and <777-casino-be.com> are registered with Devexpanse Ltd d/b/a Regery.com.

The disputed domain name <casino777-nl.com> is registered with Name.com, Inc.

The disputed domain names <777casino-be.com> and <777-casino-es.com> are registered with GoDaddy.com, LLC.

The disputed domain name <777-casino-nl.com> is registered with Hosting Concepts B.V. d/b/a Registrar.eu.

(collectively refers as the "Registrars").

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the “Center”) on July 2, 2026. On July 3, 2026, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrars a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain names. On July 3 to July 7, the Registrars transmitted by email to the Center its verification response disclosing registrant and contact information for the disputed domain names which differed from the named Respondents and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on July 17, 2026 with the registrant and contact information of nominally multiple underlying registrants revealed by the Registrars, requesting the Complainant to either file separate complaint(s) 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 disputed domain names are under common control. The Complainant filed an amended Complaint on July 19, 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 Respondents of the Complaint, and the proceedings commenced on July 22, 2026. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was August 11, 2026. The Respondents did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondents’ default on August 13, 2026. On August 25, 2026, the Center received an email communication from the registrant of the disputed domain name <777-casino-nl.com>.

The Center appointed Vincent Denoyelle as the sole panelist in this matter on August 31, 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 operating in the casino and online gambling sector. The Complainant owns the casino de Spa which opened in 1763.

The Complainant owns numerous trade marks across many jurisdictions in the terms CASINO 777 and 777 (hereinafter the CASINO 777 trade marks) including the following:

- European Union Trade Mark CASINO 777 No. 014632244 registered on March 31, 2016 in classes 9, 28 and 41;
- European Union Trade Mark  No. 018384332 registered on September 11, 2021 in classes 9, 16, 28, 35, 38 and 41; and
- European Union Trade Mark  No. 017178451 registered on January 9, 2018 in classes 9, 28, 35, 38, and 41.

The Complainant further owns numerous domain names, such as <casino777.co.nl>, <casino777.nl>, <casinos-777.nl>, <777-bet.nl>, <777-bingo.nl>, <777-games.nl>, <777-sports.nl> among many others.

The registration date and type of use of each disputed domain name is set out in the table below:

Disputed Domain Name	Registration Date	Type of Use
<casino777-be.com>	May 5, 2026	Directing to a website purporting to be a gambling website, with reproduction of the CASINO 777 word mark. The website contains links to a third-party gambling website, SpinAura.
<casino777-nl.com>	November 7, 2025	Directing to a website purporting to be a gambling website, with reproduction of the CASINO 777 word mark and the 777 trade mark of the Complainant and suggesting affiliation with the Complainant. The website contains links to a third-party gambling website, Spin Million.
<casino777-fr.com>	March 31, 2026	Directing to a website purporting to be a gambling website, with reproduction of the CASINO 777 word mark and the 777 trade mark of the Complainant and suggesting affiliation with the Complainant. The website contains links to a third-party gambling website, WestAce.
<casino777-at.com>	May 15, 2026	Directing to a website purporting to be a gambling website, with reproduction of the CASINO 777 word mark and the 777 trade mark of the Complainant and suggesting affiliation with the Complainant. The website contains links to a third-party gambling website, WestAce.
<casino777-ca.com>	May 15, 2026	Directing to a website purporting to be a gambling website, with reproduction of the CASINO 777 word mark and the 777 trade mark of the Complainant and suggesting affiliation with the Complainant. The website contains links to a third-party gambling website, Casoola.
<casino777-cz.com>	May 15, 2026	Directing to a website purporting to be a gambling website, with reproduction of the CASINO 777 word mark and the 777 trade mark of the Complainant and suggesting affiliation with the Complainant. The website states that it is a licensed gambling website. The website contains links to a third-party gambling website, Casoola.
<casino777be.com>	November 24, 2025	Directing to a website purporting to be a gambling website, with reproduction of the 777 trade mark of the Complainant and suggesting affiliation with the Complainant.

		The website contains links to a third-party gambling website, eLuck.
<777-casino-be.com>	December 11, 2025	Directing to a website purporting to be a gambling website, with reproduction of the CASINO 777 word mark (where the terms “casino” and “777” are in reverse order) and 777 logo and suggesting affiliation with the Complainant. The website also states that the website has been approved by the Belgian Gaming Commission. The website contains links to a third-party gambling website, ManekiSpin.
<777-casino-nl.com>	March 23, 2026	Directing to a website purporting to be a gambling website, with reproduction of the CASINO 777 word mark and logo and suggesting affiliation with the Complainant. The website states that it is a licensed gambling website and that it is “100% legal in the Netherlands”. The website contains links to a third-party gambling website, Wildsino.
<777-casino-hu.com>	April 6, 2026	Directing to a website purporting to be a gambling website, with reproduction of the CASINO 777 word mark (where the terms “casino” and “777” are in reverse order) and 777 trade mark of the Complainant and suggesting that it is the Complainant’s Hungarian website. The website contains links to a third-party gambling website, Casoola.
<777-casino-es.com>	November 6, 2025	Directing to a website purporting to be a gambling website, with reproduction of the CASINO 777 word mark (where the terms “casino” and “777” are in reverse order) and 777 trade mark of the Complainant and suggesting affiliation with the Complainant. The website contains links to a third-party gambling website, Cowboy Spin.
<casino777-be.net>	February 28, 2026	Directing to a website purporting to be a gambling website, with reproduction of the CASINO 777 word mark (where the terms “casino” and “777” are in reverse order) and 777 trade mark of the Complainant and impersonating the Complainant including by reference to the Belgian Gaming Commission’s licence of the Complainant. The website contains links to a third-party gambling website, TikiTaka.

<777casino-be.com>	November 6, 2025	Directing to a website purporting to be a gambling website, with reproduction of the CASINO 777 word mark (where the terms “casino” and “777” are in reverse order) and 777 trade mark of the Complainant and suggesting affiliation with the Complainant. The website also states that the website has been approved by the Belgian Gaming Commission. The website contains links to a third-party gambling website, ManekiSpin.
<777casino-fr.com>	September 17, 2025	Directing to a website purporting to be a gambling website, with reproduction of the CASINO 777 word mark (where the terms “casino” and “777” are in reverse order) and 777 trade mark of the Complainant and suggesting affiliation with the Complainant. The website also states that the website has been approved by the Dutch Gaming Authority. The website contains links to a third-party gambling website, LuckyGem.
<777casino-hu.com>	April 6, 2026	Directing to a website purporting to be a gambling website, with reproduction of the CASINO 777 word mark (where the terms “casino” and “777” are in reverse order) and 777 trade mark of the Complainant and suggesting that it is the Complainant’s Hungarian website. The website contains links to a third-party gambling website, Casoola.
<777-casino-at.com>	May 15, 2026	Directing to a website purporting to be a gambling website, with reproduction of the CASINO 777 word mark (where the terms “casino” and “777” are in reverse order) and 777 trade mark of the Complainant and suggesting that it is the Complainant’s Austrian website. The website contains links to a third-party gambling website, Casoola.
<777casino-at.com>	May 15, 2026	Directing to a website purporting to be a gambling website, with reproduction of the CASINO 777 word mark (where the terms “casino” and “777” are in reverse order) and 777 trade mark of the Complainant and suggesting that it is the Complainant’s Austrian website. The website contains links to a third-party gambling website, CowboySpin.

<777casino.fr.com>	June 15, 2026	Directing to a website purporting to be a gambling website, with reproduction of the CASINO 777 word mark (where the terms “casino” and “777” are in reverse order) and 777 trade mark of the Complainant and suggesting affiliation with the Complainant. The website also states that the website has been approved by the Dutch Gaming Authority. The website contains links to a third-party gambling website, Gamblerina.
--------------------	---------------	--

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 all disputed domain names are confusingly similar to its CASINO 777 trade marks.

The Complainant asserts that all disputed domain names point to websites that are illegitimate, (i) reproducing the CASINO 777 trade marks, (ii) passing themselves off as the Complainant or fraudulently suggesting an affiliation with the Complainant, (iii) claiming or suggesting that they have obtained a license from the relevant local gambling authority and (iv) redirecting to third party gambling websites. The Complainant contends that, upon verification, none of the websites associated with the disputed domain names are licensed by the relevant authorities and are thus operating illegally. The Complainant concludes that such use cannot possibly qualify as legitimate noncommercial or fair use and can never confer rights or legitimate interests on a respondent.

The Complainant contends that the Respondents could not reasonably have been unaware of the Complainant, its trade marks, its official domain names and its regulated online gambling activities. The Complainant considers that all disputed domain names are used in bad faith, to fraudulently impersonate the Complainant, divert to third party websites whilst misrepresenting that the respective websites are licensed by the relevant gambling authorities in each jurisdiction where in fact they are not and are thus in breach of the respective gambling laws.

B. Respondent

The Respondents did not reply to the Complainant's contentions. One Respondent (who is the registrant of the disputed domain name <777-casino-nl.com>) sent a communication to the Center on August 25, 2026, two weeks after the deadline for Response of August 11, 2026. The communication essentially denied any link with the other disputed domain names and also claimed that any content that could potentially create confusion regarding the Complainant's rights has been removed or modified and that the Complaint should thus be denied.

6. Discussion and Findings

6.1. First Preliminary Issue: Procedural Consideration - The Respondent's location

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.

The location of some of the Respondents as disclosed by the Registrars appears to be in Ukraine, which is subject to an international conflict on the date of this Decision that may impact case notification. It is therefore appropriate for the Panel to consider, in accordance with its discretion under paragraph 10 of the Rules, whether the proceeding should continue.

The Panel notes that the record shows that the Written Notice sent to 11 of the Respondents could not be delivered to the addresses disclosed by the Registrars in its verification. However, it appears that the Notification of Complaint's emails were delivered to the Respondents' email address, as provided by the Registrars. Therefore, there is no evidence that the case notification was not successfully received by the Respondents.

The Panel concludes that the Respondents who are allegedly located in Ukraine has been given a fair opportunity to present its case, and so that the administrative proceeding takes place with due expedition, the Panel will proceed to a Decision accordingly.

6.2. Second Preliminary Issue: Admissibility of Supplemental Filing from one Respondent

Under the Rules, no express provision is made for supplemental filings by either Party, except in response to a deficiency notification or if requested by the Center or the Panel. Paragraphs 10 and 12 of the Rules in effect grant the Panel sole discretion to determine the admissibility of unsolicited supplemental filings.

Admissibility of supplemental filings is to be assessed based on relevance and foreseeability. See WIPO Overview of WIPO Panel Views on Select UDRP Questions (["WIPO Overview 3.1"](#)), section 4.6.

The Panel will not admit the supplemental filings from the registrant of the disputed domain name <777-casino-nl.com> given that the Respondent had sufficient time and opportunities to submit such filings earlier in the proceeding. Accordingly, there is no need to consider the Complainant's supplemental filing in reply. In any event the supplemental filings would not have affected the Panel's conclusion in these administrative proceedings.

6.3. Third Preliminary Issue: 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.

Only one disputed domain name registrant (the registrant of the disputed domain name <777-casino-nl.com>) commented on the Complainant's request stating: "The Respondent owns and controls only one of the disputed domain names and has no ownership, control, business relationship, or coordinated activity with the registrants of the remaining domain names identified in this proceeding. The Respondent does not know the other named respondents and denies acting in concert with them."

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 3.1](#), section 4.11.2.

As regards common control, the Panel notes that:

- All disputed domain names are structured in the same manner at the second level, namely with the terms "casino" and "777" and a two-letter country code.
- All disputed domain names are essentially used in the same way, namely, (i) reproducing the CASINO 777 trade marks, (ii) passing themselves off as the Complainant or fraudulently suggesting an affiliation with the Complainant, (iii) claiming or suggesting that they have obtained a license from the relevant local gambling authority and (iv) redirecting to third party gambling websites.
- The look and feel of the various websites is highly similar.
- All disputed domain names point to websites that claim to have or suggest that they have been licensed by the relevant gaming authorities. However, the Complainant contends and this has not been disputed by any of the Respondents, that none of the websites have been by the authorities whose approval they purport to have obtained.

All disputed domain names present such strong similarities that the Panel finds that they are subject to common control and the disputed domain name <777-casino-nl.com> is no exception.

As regards fairness and equity, the Panel sees no reason why consolidation of the disputes would be unfair or inequitable to any Party especially in light of the fraudulent activities that all disputed domain names appear to facilitate and the resulting threat to the Complainant and unsuspecting Internet users.

Accordingly, the Panel decides to consolidate the disputes regarding the nominally different disputed domain name registrants (referred to below as "the Respondent") in a single proceeding.

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 names. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.7.

The Complainant has shown rights in respect of a trade mark or service mark for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.2.1.

The Panel finds that the entirety of the CASINO 777 trade mark (in reverse order in some of the disputed domain names) and the 777 trade mark are reproduced within all disputed domain names. Accordingly, the disputed domain names are confusingly similar to the Complainant's trade marks for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.7.

Although the addition of other terms here, respectively, "be", "ca", "cz", "fr", "nl", "at", "es", "hu", 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 Complainant's trade marks 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 Complainant has established a prima facie case that the Respondent lacks rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain names. 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 names such as those enumerated in the Policy or otherwise.

Considering the circumstances of the present case and based on the content of the Complaint and Annexes, the Panel finds that all disputed domain names are used in the same fashion, in order to impersonate, or falsely suggest an affiliation with the Complainant.

Panels have held that the use of a domain name for illegal activities here, claimed fraudulent impersonation, passing off can never confer rights or legitimate interests on a respondent. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 2.13.1.

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 must have been well aware of the Complainant and its CASINO 777 trade marks given (i) the fact that all disputed domain names reproduce the terms “casino” and “777”, (ii) the online visibility of the CASINO 777 trade marks, (iii) the choice of additional terms in each disputed domain name intended to suggest that each disputed domain name is the official website of the Complainant in a particular jurisdiction, (iv) the targeted pattern of registrations and (v) the use of the disputed domain names to fraudulently impersonate and expressly refer to the Complainant.

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.

Considering the circumstances of the present case and based on the content of the Complaint and Annexes, the Panel finds that all disputed domain names are used in the same fashion, in order to impersonate, or create a false impression of affiliation with, the Complainant and to divert Internet users to third-party gambling websites.

Panels have held that the use of a domain name for illegal activity here, claimed fraudulent impersonation, passing off constitutes bad faith. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 3.4.

Having reviewed the record, the Panel finds the Respondent's registration and use of the disputed domain names constitutes bad faith under 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 names <casino777-at.com>, <casino777-be.com>, <casino777be.com>, <casino777-be.net>, <casino777-ca.com>, <casino777-cz.com>, <casino777-fr.com>, <casino777-nl.com>, <777-casino-at.com>, <777casino-at.com>, <777-casino-be.com>, <777casino-be.com>, <777-casino-es.com>, <777casino-fr.com>, <777casinofr.com>, <777-casino-hu.com>, <777casino-hu.com> and <777-casino-nl.com> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Vincent Denoyelle/

Vincent Denoyelle

Sole Panelist

Date: September 14, 2026