

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

Megapixel Services Ltd v. Artur Gradov, GRADINVEST Ltd.
Case No. D2026-3096

1. The Parties

The Complainant is Megapixel Services Ltd, Malta, represented by Abion AB, Sweden.

The Respondent is Artur Gradov, GRADINVEST Ltd., Estonia.

2. The Domain Names and Registrar

The disputed domain names <casino-wunderino.net>, <casino-wunderino.org>, <casino-wunderino.pro>, <wunderino-casino.dev>, <wunderinocasino.dev>, <wunderino-casino.pro>, <wunderinocasino.pro>, <wunderino.dev>, <wunderino.net.co>, <wunderino.pro>, <wunderino-24.com>, <wunderino-24.dev>, <wunderino24.dev>, <wunderino-24.net>, <wunderino24.net>, <wunderino24.net.co>, <wunderino-24.org>, <wunderino-24.pro>, <wunderino24.pro>, <wunderino777.com>, and <wunderino888.com> are registered with Dynadot Inc (the “Registrar”).

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the “Center”) on July 14, 2026. On July 15, 2026, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain names. On July 16, 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, Super Privacy Service LTD c/o Dynadot) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on July 17, 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 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 Respondent of the Complaint, and the proceedings commenced on August 5, 2026. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was August 25, 2026. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent’s default on August 31, 2026.

The Center appointed Manuel Wegrostek as the sole panelist in this matter on September 2, 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 active in the digital entertainment and online gaming sector. WUNDERINO, originally launched and operated by the Rhinoceros Operations Ltd., is one of the Complainant's key brands and has been used in connection with online casino, slot, live casino, and related digital entertainment services since at least 2016. The WUNDERINO platform offers a broad range of online casino games, including slot games and live casino services, as well as promotional campaigns, competitions, and bonus offers. The services have also been made available through mobile applications and have been promoted as providing secure deposits, withdrawals, and responsible gaming features.

The Complainant is the owner of numerous trademark registrations for WUNDERINO (the "WUNDERINO Trademark"), including:

- United Kingdom Trademark Registration No. UK00915057301, registered on July 18, 2016;
- European Union Trademark Registration No. 015057301, registered on July 18, 2016; and
- European Union Trademark Registration No. 017985761, registered on March 4, 2019.

The Complainant is also the owner of several domain names including the WUNDERINO Trademark, such as <wunderino.com>, registered on October 11, 2015.

The disputed domain names were all registered on the same day, December 7, 2025. At the time of the Decision, and when the Complaint was filed, the disputed domain names resolved to active German-language websites prominently displaying the WUNDERINO Trademark, together with a color scheme similar to that of the Complainant's official websites.

The websites under the disputed domain names purport to be the Complainant's official online casino, stating that it has served German players since 2016, and invite users to register and to deposit funds in order to play slot and live casino games for money, advertising a welcome bonus and free spins for that purpose. Users who follow the invitation to play are not taken to any website of the Complainant, but are redirected to a third-party website, which is unrelated to the Complainant.

Further, some of the websites under the disputed domain names state that the casino operates under Malta Gaming Authority licence MGA/B2C/309/2015, and some state that the website is managed by Rhinoceros Operations Ltd., the former operator of the Complainant's WUNDERINO online casino. According to the public register of the Malta Gaming Authority, consulted by the Panel, that licence is registered to Rhinoceros Operations Ltd., with the status "surrendered".¹

The Complainant sent a cease-and-desist letter to the Respondent through the Registrar, with a request to forward it, contacted the Respondent via the Registrar's online contact form, and sent two reminders. None of these communications received a response.

¹Noting in particular the general powers of a panel articulated inter alia in paragraphs 10 and 12 of the Rules, it has been accepted that a panel may undertake limited factual research into matters of public record if it considers such information useful to assessing the case merits and reaching a decision. WIPO Overview of WIPO Panel Views on Select UDRP Questions ("[WIPO Overview 3.1](#)"), section 4.8.

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.

On the first element of the Policy, the Complainant claims that the disputed domain names are confusingly similar to the WUNDERINO Trademark. The disputed domain names incorporate, in their second-level portion, the WUNDERINO Trademark in its entirety, followed by additional descriptive terms. The addition of these terms does not prevent the finding of confusing similarity, as the WUNDERINO Trademark remains clearly recognizable within the disputed domain names. The mere addition of terms such as "casino", "24", "777" and "888" are descriptive for the services offered under the disputed domain names.

On the second element of the Policy, the Complainant contends that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the disputed domain names. The disputed domain names were registered many years after the registration of the WUNDERINO Trademark. The Complainant has never granted the Respondent any rights to use the WUNDERINO Trademark in any form, including in the disputed domain names. Further, the Respondent's name does not correspond to the disputed domain names. The email address disclosed by the Registrar does not appear to correspond to the Respondent's name. Instead, the contact information disclosed in connection with the disputed domain names appears to be associated with another name that also does not correspond to the disputed domain names. There is no evidence that the Respondent is known by the disputed domain names or owns any corresponding registered trademarks. The Respondent's use of contact information associated with an unrelated third party raises doubts as to the accuracy and authenticity of the registration details provided. This inconsistency further supports the conclusion that the Respondent lacks rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain names.

On the third element of the Policy, the Complainant asserts that the Respondent has registered and used the disputed domain names in bad faith. The WUNDERINO Trademark was registered and used by the Complainant before the Respondent became the owner of the disputed domain names. The Respondent has never been authorized by the Complainant to register the disputed domain names. The Complainant also enjoys a strong online presence and is very active in promoting its trademark and services. Indeed, the structure of the disputed domain names shows that the Respondent registered them having the Complainant and its WUNDERINO Trademark in mind. The Respondent's disclosed registrant details further support the conclusion that the disputed domain names were registered in bad faith. The use of contact information apparently associated with an unrelated third party may indicate that the Respondent deliberately supplied false or misleading registrant information in an attempt to conceal its identity. The disputed domain names resolve to active websites displaying content promoting online gaming services. The websites feature the Complainant's WUNDERINO Trademark, together with information relating to the Complainant's business, and imitate the overall visual appearance of the Complainant's official websites, including the blue and yellow color scheme used by the Complainant. They presented themselves as official WUNDERINO online casino platforms and invite Internet users to register, claim promotional offers, and deposit funds. On June 18, 2026, the Complainant sent a cease-and-desist letter to the Respondent through the Registrar, with a request to forward it, and on July 10, 2026, it attempted to contact the Respondent via the Registrar's online contact form, followed by two reminders. None of these communications received a response.

B. Respondent

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

6. Discussion and Findings

Paragraph 15(a) of the Rules requires that the Panel's decision be made "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".

The Complainant must evidence each of the three elements required by paragraph 4(a) of the Policy in order to succeed on the Complaint with respect to each disputed domain name, namely that:

- (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 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 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 applicable Top-Level Domain ("TLD") in a domain name (e.g., ".com", ".net", ".pro", ".dev") is viewed as a standard registration requirement and as such is typically disregarded under the first element confusing similarity test. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.11.1. The same applies to a second-level suffix forming part of the applicable TLD, such as ".net.co".

The disputed domain names <wunderino.dev>, <wunderino.net.co>, and <wunderino.pro> consist of the WUNDERINO Trademark alone and are therefore identical to it. The remainder contain the WUNDERINO Trademark in its entirety, the only differences being the addition of the term "casino" or of the numbers "24", "777" or "888", in some cases separated by a hyphen. The Panel finds the mark is recognizable within the disputed domain names. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.7. The addition of other terms (whether descriptive, geographical, pejorative, meaningless, or otherwise), including numbers, does not prevent a finding of confusing similarity under the first element. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.8.

Accordingly, the Panel finds that the disputed domain names are identical or confusingly similar to the mark for the purposes of the Policy.

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.

Panels have categorically held that the use of a domain name for illegitimate activity (here, impersonation) can never confer rights or legitimate interests on a respondent. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 2.13.1.

The Complainant has not authorized, licensed, or permitted the Respondent to register or use the disputed domain names or to use the WUNDERINO Trademark. The Panel finds that there are no indications that the Respondent is commonly known by the disputed domain names or otherwise has any rights to or legitimate interests in the disputed domain names. Further, the disputed domain names are not used for a bona fide offering of goods or services. Rather, the disputed domain names resolve to active websites prominently

displaying the WUNDERINO Trademark together with a color scheme similar to that of the Complainant's official websites. The websites purport to be the Complainant's official online casino and invite users to register and to deposit funds in order to play for money, while users following that invitation are redirected to an unrelated third-party online casino. Some of the websites moreover claim the benefit of a gaming licence which was registered to the Complainant's predecessor as operator of the WUNDERINO online casino. The websites did not accurately and prominently disclose the relationship, or rather the lack thereof, between the Respondent and the Complainant, thus creating the false impression that the Respondent might be authorized by or affiliated with the Complainant.

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.

Panels have consistently found that the mere registration of a domain name that is identical or confusingly similar (particularly domain names comprising typos or incorporating the mark plus a descriptive term) to a well-known trademark, and particularly in the case of coined or fanciful marks, can by itself create a presumption of bad faith. Panels also have held that the use of a domain name for illegitimate activity (here, impersonation) can never confer rights or legitimate interests on a respondent and is manifestly considered evidence of bad faith. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 3.1.4.

Moreover, panels have found the following types of evidence to support a finding that a respondent has registered a domain name to attract, for commercial gain, Internet users to its website by creating a likelihood of confusion with the complainant's mark: (i) actual confusion; (ii) seeking to cause confusion (including by technical means beyond the domain name itself) for the respondent's commercial benefit, even if unsuccessful; (iii) the lack of a respondent's own rights to or legitimate interests in a domain name; (iv) redirecting the domain name to a different respondent-owned website, even where such website contains a disclaimer; (v) redirecting the domain name to or mimicking the complainant's (or a competitor's) website; and (vi) absence of any conceivable good faith use. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 3.1.4.

In the present case, the disputed domain names incorporate the WUNDERINO Trademark in its entirety, either alone or with the addition of the term "casino", which describes the services for which the Complainant uses the WUNDERINO Trademark, or of the numbers "24", "777" or "888", which can be considered as commonly used in the online gambling sector. Considering the distinctiveness and public presence of the WUNDERINO Trademark, Internet users may think the disputed domain names are connected to the Complainant and would resolve to websites related to the Complainant. The registration of 21 domain names incorporating the WUNDERINO Trademark on the same day, combined with the content of the associated websites, leaves no doubt that the Respondent acted with knowledge of the Complainant's rights.

Further, the disputed domain names resolve to active websites prominently displaying the WUNDERINO Trademark together with a color scheme similar to that of the Complainant's official websites. The websites under the disputed domain names purport to be the Complainant's official online casino and invite users to register and to deposit funds in order to play for money, and some of them claim the benefit of a gaming licence which was registered to the Complainant's predecessor as operator of the WUNDERINO online casino. The Respondent thus impersonates the Complainant vis-à-vis consumers, which constitutes the illegitimate activity referred to above. Users who follow the invitation to play are, however, not taken to any website of the Complainant, but are redirected to an unrelated third-party online casino. Moreover, the

websites under the disputed domain names do not accurately and prominently disclose the relationship, or rather the lack thereof, between the Respondent and the Complainant. As shown above, the Respondent lacks rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain names. Finally, the Respondent did not respond to the Complainant's cease-and-desist letter or to its further communications sent through the Registrar nor did it participate in these proceedings.

The evidence leads to the conclusion that the Respondent has registered and used the disputed domain names to attract, for commercial gain, Internet users to its websites by creating a likelihood of confusion with the WUNDERINO Trademark as to the source, sponsorship, affiliation, or endorsement of those websites.

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 <casino-wunderino.net>, <casino-wunderino.org>, <casino-wunderino.pro>, <wunderino-casino.dev>, <wunderinocasino.dev>, <wunderino-casino.pro>, <wunderinocasino.pro>, <wunderino.dev>, <wunderino.net.co>, <wunderino.pro>, <wunderino-24.com>, <wunderino-24.dev>, <wunderino24.dev>, <wunderino-24.net>, <wunderino24.net>, <wunderino24.net.co>, <wunderino-24.org>, <wunderino-24.pro>, <wunderino24.pro>, <wunderino777.com>, and <wunderino888.com> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Manuel Wegrostek/

Manuel Wegrostek

Sole Panelist

Date: September 16, 2026