

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

KamaGames Entertainment Group Limited v. luhua quan
Case No. D2026-2931

1. The Parties

The Complainant is KamaGames Entertainment Group Limited, Isle of Man, represented by Kosnahan Law, Isle of Man.

The Respondent is luhua quan, China.

2. The Domain Names and Registrar

The disputed domain names <baccaristapp.com>, <baccarist-live-casino.com>, <baccarist-live.com>, <baccaristofficial.com>, <baccarist-portal.com>, and <baccaristsports.com> are registered with Metaregistrar BV (the "Registrar").

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the "Center") on July 3, 2026. On July 3, 2026, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain names. On July 6, 2026, the Registrar transmitted by email to the Center its verification response disclosing registrant and contact information for the disputed domain names which differed from the named Respondent (Redacted for Privacy, Whois Privacy Protection Services) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on July 16, 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 July 17, 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 20, 2026. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was August 9, 2026. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent's default on August 11, 2026.

The Center appointed Andrea Jaeger-Lenz as the sole panelist in this matter on August 21, 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 engages in software and mobile applications which principally focus on the social gaming market, offering games with casino themes, which products including mobile Baccarat, Poker, Roulette, casino slot games and more, which the Complainant licenses internationally to approved third parties, for the exploitation of the Complainant's software and mobile applications on its behalf. Among the Complainant's portfolio is a software and mobile application branded BACCARIST for online baccarat game which can be downloaded via the platforms Steam, Google Play, or the Apple App store (Annex 4 to the Complaint) and has been downloaded more than one million times on the Google Play Store. Other games developed by or on behalf of the Complainant are distributed under the brands Blackjackist, Pokerist or Roulettist (Annexes 4 and 5 to the Complaint). The Complainant owns the following registered trademarks for the brand BACCARIST (as per Annex 3 to the Complaint):

- United Kingdom trademark registration no. 00916926371 BACCARIST (word), registered on October 17, 2017, for goods and services in Classes 9, 41, and 42;
- European Union trademark registration no. 016926371 BACCARIST (word), registered on October 17, 2017, for goods and services in Classes 9, 41, and 42;
- United States of America trademark registration no. 5675852 BACCARIST (word), registered on February 12, 2019, for services in Classes 41, and 42.

Besides the different platforms, the Complainant's BACCARIST social online game is available through the Complainant's approved website under the domain name <baccarist.com>.

The disputed domain names were registered as follows: the disputed domain names <baccaristapp.com>, <baccaristofficial.com> and <baccaristsports.com> were registered on May 27, 2026, and the disputed domain names <baccarist-live-casino.com>, <baccarist-live.com>, and <baccarist-portal.com> were registered on June 4, 2026. Before the filing of the present Complaint, they resolved to virtually identical websites, displaying the content related sports betting, electronic games, live casino and lottery and card games (as per Annex 6 to the Complaint).

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 names are confusingly similar to a trademark in which it has rights. The Complainant points to its trademark registrations for BACCARIST and claims that this trademark is included in its entirety in each of the disputed domain names. To the extent that within the Second-Level Domain of each of the disputed domain names, the mark BACCARIST is followed by "app", "official", "-portal", "sports", "-live-casino", and "-live", respectively, the Complainant holds that each of these terms is merely descriptive and does nothing to remove the confusing similarity with the Complainant's trademark.

On the second element, the Complainant puts forth that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the disputed domain names. According to the Complainant, the Respondent is neither a licensee of the Complainant, nor does it have any association, connection or affiliation with the Complainant or its brand. Further, the Respondent has no right to use the BACCARIST trademark and has not received any authorization of consent to that extent. The Complainant contends that the Respondent cannot claim rights or legitimate interests in any of the disputed domain names either, as – according to searches it has undertaken – the Respondent does not own any trademarks in BACCARIST or similar to that, nor does the Respondent provide its own bona fide offering of goods or services.

On the third element, the Complainant claims that the disputed domain names were registered and are being used in bad faith. As to registration in bad faith, the Complainant finds that its trademark – besides predating the registration of the disputed domain names by far - has gained renown through significant online presence, and that it is obvious from the composition of the disputed domain names as well as the chronological context of their registration that the Respondent registered the disputed domain names with the Complainant in mind. As to use in bad faith, the Complainant points to the disputed domain names resolving to websites with betting and gaming content which compete with the services provided by the Complainant. Consequently, the Respondent is seeking to confuse Internet users, in an attempt to exploit the goodwill of the BACCARIST trademark of the Complainant for commercial gain.

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 names. 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 mark is reproduced and recognizable within each of the disputed domain names. Accordingly, the disputed domain names are 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, "app", "official", "-portal", "sports", "-live-casino", and "-live", respectively, 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 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 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.

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 has registered all six of the disputed domain names consisting of the Complainant's BACCARIST trademark followed by descriptive terms in the online and/or gaming business within a close timely context of eight days difference and has put all disputed domain names to use for websites with betting and gaming content competing with that of 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.

Given the composition of the disputed domain names and use to which the disputed domain names have been put by the Respondent, it is clear that the Respondent knew about the Complainant's trademark and has registered the disputed domain names with the Complainant in mind and in order to profit from the Complainant's trademark by creating confusion as to the source or affiliation of the respective websites among the relevant users for commercial gain, namely to promote its own competing betting and gaming services. 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 <baccaristapp.com>, <baccarist-live-casino.com>, <baccarist-live.com>, <baccaristofficial.com>, <baccarist-portal.com>, and <baccaristsports.com> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Andrea Jaeger-Lenz/

Andrea Jaeger-Lenz

Sole Panelist

Date: September 2, 2026