

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

FURYTECH UNIVERSE LIMITED v. Varty Drisana, Tyreke Theo Jordan Leslie, SVITLANA ROVINSKA, lingling zhang, Ольга Овсиенко, Benjamin Zielinski, Oleksandr Kulik, Jude Myers, Olena Natalych
Case No. D2026-3092

1. The Parties

The Complainant is FURYTECH UNIVERSE LIMITED, Cyprus, represented by Artur Horholiuk, Poland.

The Respondents are Varty Drisana, India; Tyreke Theo Jordan Leslie, United Kingdom; SVITLANA ROVINSKA, Ukraine; lingling zhang, Hong Kong, China; Ольга Овсиенко, Ukraine; Benjamin Zielinski, United Kingdom; Oleksandr Kulik, Ukraine; Jude Myers, Canada; and Olena Natalych, Ukraine.

2. The Domain Names and Registrars

The disputed domain names <betfury-app.com>, <betfury-brasil.com>, <betfurycanada.com>, <betfury-casino.org>, and <betfury.one> are registered with Dynadot Inc.

The disputed domain names <betfury-argentina.com>, <betfury.com.co>, and <betfury.site> are registered with Hosting Concepts B.V. d/b/a Registrar.eu.

The disputed domain names <betfury-casino.net> and <betfury.it.com>¹ are registered with NameCheap, Inc. (the “Registrars”).

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the “Center”) on July 13, 2026. On July 14, 2026, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrars a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain names. On July 15, 2026, and July 16, 2026, the Registrars transmitted by email to the Center their verification response, disclosing registrant and contact information for the disputed domain names which differed from the named Respondent and contact information in the

¹ The Panel notes that <betfury.it.com> is a third-level domain name falling under the .it.com Dispute Resolution Policy which provides that the registrants agree to abide by the results of a UDRP proceeding if informal resolution in coordination with IT.com Domains is unsuccessful. The Complainant has provided evidence that it filed an abuse complaint with IT.com Domains, and the Panel has received no confirmation that any settlement had taken place under the it.com Dispute Resolution Procedure. The Panel will accordingly proceed to a decision under the UDRP.

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 complaints 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 domain names are under common control. The Complainant filed an amended Complaint on July 22, 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 27, 2026. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was August 16, 2026. The Respondents did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondents' default on August 17, 2026.

The Center appointed Edoardo Fano as the sole panelist in this matter on August 20, 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.

The Panel has not received any requests from the Complainant or the Respondents regarding further submissions, waivers or extensions of deadlines, and the Panel has not found it necessary to request any further information from the Parties.

Having reviewed the communication records in the case file, the Panel finds that the Center has discharged its responsibility under the Rules, paragraph 2(a) "to employ reasonably available means calculated to achieve actual notice to the Respondent". Therefore, the Panel shall issue its Decision based upon the Complaint, the Policy, the Rules and the Supplemental Rules and without the benefit of a response from the Respondents.

The language of the proceeding is English, being the language of the Registration Agreements, as per paragraph 11(a) of the Rules.

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 that the administrative proceedings take place with due expedition.

Although some of the Respondents' mailing addresses are 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.

The Panel is of the view that they should. Further to the Rules, the Center transmitted written notice of the Complaint to the Respondents whose mailing addresses are stated to be in Ukraine, namely the registrants of the disputed domain names <betfury-casino.org>, <betfury-argentina.com>, <betfury.site> and <betfury.it.com>. It is noted that the communications to the Respondents' email addresses were delivered, even though the registered postal mail was not able to deliver the written notice to the Respondents as the recipients were absent, with the exception of the Respondent for the disputed domain name <betfury.it.com>, who received also the registered postal mail. The Respondents have not opposed the continuation of the proceedings.

The Panel notes that it is clear the Complainant has been targeted and that this is not a coincidental series of domain names registrations, as is further described herein.

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

5. Factual Background

The Complainant is a Cypriot company operating in the field of gaming, casino, and entertainment products and services. The Complainant holds unregistered trademark rights and established common law rights in the trademark BETFURY, arising from use of the BETFURY trademark since the launch of the BetFury crypto-gambling platform in late 2019, acquiring recognition and goodwill within the cryptocurrency-gaming community, and owns several trademark registrations for BETFURY, among which the following:

- European Union Trade Mark Registration No. 018895476 for BETFURY, registered on October 12, 2023;
- European Union Trade Mark Registration No. 018901121 for BETFURY and design, registered on October 28, 2023; and
- International Trademark Registration No. 1767897 for BETFURY, registered on August 1, 2023.

The Complainant also owns figurative trademark registrations for its “raccoon” logo, including:

- European Union Trade Mark Registration No. 018918034, registered on December 8, 2023; and
- European Union Trade Mark Registration No. 019063635, registered on November 15, 2024.

The Complainant also operates on the Internet, owning several domain name registrations for BETFURY and being “www.betfury.com” its main website.

The Complainant provided evidence in support of the above.

The disputed domain names were registered on the following dates: <betfury-app.com> on August 6, 2025, <betfury-brasil.com> on January 5, 2026, <betfurycanada.com> on January 5, 2026, <betfury-casino.org> on August 21, 2025, <betfury.one> on May 7, 2026, <betfury-argentina.com> on December 20, 2024, <betfury.com.co> on August 18, 2025, <betfury.site> on January 7, 2022, <betfury-casino.net> on October 14, 2025, and <betfury.it.com> on August 21, 2025. When the Complaint was filed, all the disputed domain names resolved to online casino websites, some of them with similar layouts, displaying the Complainant’s BETFURY trademark and “RACCOON” logo, in which there are central call-to-action buttons, such as “Start Now”, “Deposit”, or “Register”, redirecting automatically to third-party gambling websites. Currently, three of the disputed domain names, namely <betfury-argentina.com>, <betfury.com.co> and <betfury.it.com>, are inactive.

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 names.

Notably, the Complainant states that the disputed domain names are confusingly similar to its trademark

BETFURY, as the disputed domain names incorporate the Complainant's trademark in its entirety. Further to section 6.1 below, the Complainant argues that the disputed domain names are under common control and thus addresses the Respondents in the singular. The Complainant asserts that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the disputed domain names since it has not been authorized by the Complainant to register the disputed domain names or to use its trademark within the disputed domain names, it is not commonly known by the disputed domain names and it is not making either a bona fide offering of goods or services or a legitimate noncommercial or fair use of the disputed domain names. The disputed domain names resolve to online casino websites, some of them with similar layouts, displaying the Complainant's trademark BETFURY and "RACCOON" logo, in which there are central call-to-action buttons, such as "Start Now", "Deposit", or "Register", redirecting automatically to third-party gambling websites.

The Complainant submits that the Respondent has registered the disputed domain names in bad faith, since the Complainant's trademark BETFURY is distinctive and known in the field of gaming, casino, and entertainment products and services. Therefore, the Respondent targeted the Complainant's trademark at the time of registration of the disputed domain names, and the Complainant contends that the fraudulent use of the disputed domain names with the purpose to attract, for commercial gain, Internet users by creating a likelihood of confusion with the Complainant's trademark as to an affiliation between the Respondent and the Complainant, qualifies as bad faith registration and use.

B. Respondents

The Respondents have made no reply to the Complainant's contentions and are in default. In reference to paragraphs 5(f) and 14 of the Rules, no exceptional circumstances explaining the default have been put forward or are apparent from the record.

A respondent is not obliged to participate in a proceeding under the Policy, but if it fails to do so, reasonable facts asserted by a complainant – if adequately supported by evidence – may be taken as true, and appropriate inferences, in accordance with paragraph 14(b) of the Rules, may be drawn. WIPO Overview of WIPO Panel Views on Select UDRP Questions ("[WIPO Overview 3.1](#)"), section 4.3.

7. Discussion and Findings

7.1 Consolidation of Multiple Respondents

The Complainant has requested consolidation of multiple respondents and stated that the disputed domain names belong to the same person or organization. No objection to this request was made by the Respondents.

Pursuant to the [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 4.11.2, "[w]here a complaint is filed against multiple respondents, panels look at whether (i) the domain names or corresponding websites are subject to common control, and (ii) the consolidation would be fair and equitable to all parties. Procedural efficiency would also underpin panel consideration of such a consolidation scenario". The Panel may consider a range of factors to determine whether consolidation is appropriate, such as examining relevant registrant contact information, and any naming patterns in the disputed domain names, or other evidence of respondent affiliation that indicate common control of the disputed domain names.

The Complainant's consolidation request is based on the following factors:

- at least five of the ten disputed domain names are linked to Ukraine through postal addresses or telephone records;
- all ten disputed domain names resolve to websites featuring a highly similar and deceptive visual layout, each site prominently displaying the Complainant's BETFURY word and figurative trademarks

together with the distinctive RACCOON mascot. The sites also deploy prominent call-to-action buttons, such as “Register”, “Start Now”, and “Obter Bônus”, which redirect traffic to unauthorized competing online gambling platforms, whose precise destination may vary depending on the user’s geographical location and IP address; and

- every disputed domain name follows the same naming pattern, with the exact BETFURY trademark being combined with a generic or geographical term or extension.

The Panel finds that there is evidence that the disputed domain names are subject to common control, and that it would be procedurally efficient, fair, and equitable to all Parties to accept the Complainant’s consolidation request. The Panel further notes that the Respondents did not object to the consolidation request. The Panel therefore accepts the Complainant’s consolidation request. Hereinafter, the Panel will refer to the Respondents in the singular, i.e., “the Respondent”.

7.2 Substantive Issues

Paragraph 4(a) of the Policy lists three elements, which the Complainant must satisfy in order to succeed:

- (i) the disputed domain names are identical or confusingly similar to a trademark or service mark in which the Complainant has rights;
- (ii) the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the disputed domain names; and
- (iii) the disputed domain names have been registered and are 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 names. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.7.

Based on the unrebutted record presented, the Panel finds that BETFURY has become a distinctive identifier in connection with the Complainant’s services offered under the mentioned sign sufficient to confer trademark rights to the Complainant. The Complainant has also shown registered trademark rights in BETFURY for the purposes of the Policy. The Panel finds the Complainant has established unregistered trademark and registered trademark rights for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), sections 1.2.1 and 1.3.

The Panel finds the trademark BETFURY is recognizable within the disputed domain names. Accordingly, the disputed domain names are confusingly similar to the trademark for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.7.

While the addition of other terms, here “argentina”, “casino”, “app”, “brasil” and “canada”, 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 trademark for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.8.

It is also well accepted that a Top-Level Domain (“TLD”), in this case “.com”, “.net”, “.org”, “.it.com”, “.one”, “.site”, and “.com.co”, is typically disregarded when assessing the confusing similarity between a trademark and a domain name. [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.

While the overall burden of proof in UDRP proceedings is on the complainant, UDRP panels have recognized that proving a respondent lacks rights or legitimate interests in a domain name may result in the often-impossible 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 names. 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 present 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 disputed domain names resolve to online casino websites, some of them with similar layouts, displaying the Complainant’s trademark BETFURY and “RACCOON” logo, in which there are central call-to-action buttons, such as “Start Now”, “Deposit”, or “Register”, redirecting automatically to third-party gambling websites, thereby creating a misleading impression of association with the Complainant and seeking to trade off the Complainant’s goodwill and reputation for commercial gain.

The Panel therefore concludes that the disputed domain names are not being used in connection with a bona fide offering of goods or services.

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, regarding the registration in bad faith of the disputed domain names, the reputation of the Complainant’s trademark BETFURY in the field of gaming, casino, and entertainment products and services is clearly established and the Panel finds that the Respondent more likely than not knew of the Complainant and deliberately registered the disputed domain names due to the likelihood of confusion with the Complainant’s trademark, especially because the disputed domain names resolve or resolved to online casino websites, some of them with similar layouts, displaying the Complainant’s trademark BETFURY and “RACCOON” logo, in which there are central call-to-action buttons, such as “Start Now”, “Deposit”, or “Register”, redirecting automatically to third-party gambling websites.

As far as the use in bad faith of the disputed domain names, the Panel notes that the Respondent is trying to attract Internet users to its websites by creating likelihood of confusion with the Complainant’s trademark as to the website’s source, sponsorship, affiliation or endorsement, an activity clearly detrimental to the Complainant’s business.

The above suggests to the Panel that the Respondent intentionally registered and is being using the disputed domain names in order to exploit the goodwill and reputation attached to the Complainant's trademark and to attract, for commercial gain, Internet users to its websites in accordance with paragraph 4(b)(iv) of the Policy.

As regards the use of the disputed domain names <betfury-argentina.com>, <betfury.com.co> and <betfury.it.com>, being currently inactive, panels have found that the non-use of a domain name (including a blank or "coming soon" page) would not by itself prevent a finding of bad faith under the doctrine of passive holding. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 3.3. Having reviewed the record, the Panel notes the reputation of the Complainant's trademarks in the field of gaming, casino, and entertainment products and services, the nature of the disputed domain names (incorporating the Complainant's trademark in its entirety), the previous use of the disputed domain names, and the failure of the Respondent to submit a response, and finds that in the circumstances of this case, the current passive holding of the disputed domain names does not prevent a finding of bad faith under the Policy.

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.

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 names <betfury-app.com>, <betfury-brasil.com>, <betfurycanada.com>, <betfury-casino.org>, <betfury.one>, <betfury-argentina.com>, <betfury.com.co>, <betfury.site>, <betfury-casino.net>, and <betfury.it.com> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Edoardo Fano/

Edoardo Fano

Sole Panelist

Date: August 25, 2026