

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

Sunwin Information Technology LLC v. Lucas Brown, Hai Nguyen, thi Anh vy, FBD, nguyen van nam, DUC THINH PHAN, Sunwin Vibes Limitada, Srdan Andelkovic, OKFUN Group LLC, Khanh Vu Pham, Anna Whit, Maltese Gamble Studio, Nguyen Viet Hoang, Jean Dupont, NGUYỄN HỒNG QUÂN, NICHESPRING, Hoang Nguyen Viet, Ninaka, hung le, Lam Hoai Hien, Thai Hoang Nguyen, Gem Mod, Tran Hoang Thai, quang dung, withLife138, anh van, thientranvan tran, Bui Duc, Sau, Nguyen Anh, Baron Viet
Case No. D2026-3123

1. The Parties

The Complainant is Sunwin Information Technology LLC, United Arab Emirates, internally represented.

The Respondents are Lucas Brown, Hong Kong, China, Hai Nguyen, Viet Nam, thi Anh vy, FBD, Viet Nam, nguyen van nam, Singapore, DUC THINH PHAN, Viet Nam, Sunwin Vibes Limitada, Srdan Andelkovic, Costa Rica, OKFUN Group LLC, Khanh Vu Pham, United States of America, Anna Whit, Maltese Gamble Studio, Malta, Nguyen Viet Hoang, Viet Nam, Jean Dupont, France, NGUYỄN HỒNG QUÂN, NICHESPRING, Viet Nam, Hoang Nguyen Viet, Ninaka, Viet Nam, hung le, Viet Nam, Lam Hoai Hien, Viet Nam, Thai Hoang Nguyen, Viet Nam, Gem Mod, Serbia, Tran Hoang Thai, Viet Nam, quang dung, withLife138, Burundi, anh van, Viet Nam, thientranvan tran, Viet Nam, Bui Duc, Sau, Viet Nam, Nguyen Anh, Viet Nam, Baron Viet, Viet Nam.

2. The Domain Names and Registrars

The disputed domain names: <linktaisanwin.com>, <sunnwinlt.com>, <sunnwin.one>, <suntwin.mobi>, <sunwinconggamebaidoithuongso1.club>, <sunwindpro.com>, <sunwinio.xyz>, <sunwin.mobile>, <sunwins-tech.com>, <sunwintaixiunonline.com>, <sunwintv.win>, <sunwinvietnam.com>, <sunwin2026.biz>, <sunwin2026.xyz>, <sunwin.online>, <taisanwin20.top> and <9sunwin.com> are registered with NameCheap, Inc.; <sunnwin.co>, <sunnwin.games>, <sunnwin.ink>, <sunnwin.red>, <sunwin-au.com>, <sunwinau.com>, <sunwin-bin.com>, <sunwin-co.com> and <sunwinmb.com> are registered with Spaceship, Inc.; <sunnwin.love>, <sunvvin.ec>, <sunwin.music> and <sun2026.app> are registered with Name.com, Inc.; <sunwin.mg>, <sunwin.ovh> and <sunwin.sn> are registered with OVH; <sunnwin.mobi> and <web-sunwin.ag> are registered with Nicenic International Group Co., Limited; <sunwins.ltd> and <sunwin0.live> are registered with GoDaddy.com, LLC; <sunwin20bookibet.com> is registered with NameSilo, LLC; <sunwin.pn> is registered with Dynadot Inc; and <sunwinvina.com> is registered with Global Domain Group LLC. (collectively the "Registrars").

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the “Center”) on July 16, 2026. On July 16, 2026, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrars a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain names. On July 16, and 17, 2026, the Registrars transmitted by email to the Center their verification responses disclosing registrant and contact information for the disputed domain names which differed from the named Respondent and contact information in the Complaint.

The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on July 21, 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 domain names are under common control. The Complainant filed an amended Complaint on July 31, 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 August 19, 2026. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was September 8, 2026. Three Respondents sent email communications to the Center on July 21, and 29, 2026, and August 18, 2026. Accordingly, the Center notified the Commencement of Panel appointment Process on September 9, 2026.

The Center appointed Jeremy Speres as the sole panelist in this matter on September 11, 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 operates an online gaming business under the SUN.WIN and SUNWIN marks that started in Viet Nam in 2019 and has expanded its operations to the European Union and other key territories under relevant intellectual property licenses. It holds a portfolio of registrations for its trademarks in various countries, including:

- United States Trademark Registration No. 7913235 A A A SUN.WIN (device) in International class 41, having a registration date of August 26, 2025, with first use on January 1, 2024, and first use in commerce on April 28, 2024;
- United Arab Emirates Trademark Registration No. AE/447027 SUNWIN (device) in International class 41, having a registration date of July 4, 2025; and
- German Trademark Registration No. 302025106544 SUNWIN (word) in International classes 9, 38, 41, 43 and 42, having a registration date of April 17, 2025.

The Complainant owns numerous domain names that comprise the trademark SUNWIN, including the domain names <sunwin.sx> (registered on December 15, 2023), and <sun.win> (registered on May 4, 2016).

The disputed domain names were all registered between June 1, 2025, and June 29, 2026. The Complainant’s evidence establishes that most of the disputed domain names have, at one time or another, resolved to online casino websites targeted at users in Viet Nam, with all of them having displayed logos consisting of SUN.WIN that are highly similar in design to the Complainant’s registered logos and those which the Complainant has used since 2019.

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 the disputed domain names were registered and have been used in bad faith in order to impersonate the Complainant for the Respondents' commercial gain.

B. Respondent

The Respondent for the disputed domain name <taisunwin20.top> sent an informal communication to the Center on July 29, 2026, asserting that that Respondent is the lawful registrant of that domain name, denying confusing similarity, that the Respondent has attempted to impersonate the Complainant, and requesting that the Complaint be denied for failure to establish the three cumulative Policy elements.

The Respondent for the disputed domain names <sunwin2026.xyz>, <suntwin.mobi>, and <suunwin.online> sent an informal communication to the Center on July 21, 2026, asserting independent corporate ownership and legitimate interests through a Vietnamese corporation (Sunwin VN TMDT Co., Ltd.).

The Respondent for the disputed domain names <sunwinau.com>, and <sunwinmb.com> sent an informal communication to the Center on August 18, 2026, asserting that those domain names "fully comply with all regulations".

6. Discussion and Findings

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.

The disputed domain name registrants did not comment on the Complainant's request, other than the informal emails sent by three Respondents addressed above.

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 of WIPO Panel Views on Select UDRP Questions ("[WIPO Overview 3.1](#)"), section 4.11.2.

As regards common control, given the large number of disputed domain names at issue, the Panel analyzed the Registrar-verified Whois information for all of the registrants and established that the disputed domain names could be grouped into 20 clusters, with each cluster representing disputed domain names having the same registrant contact email address disclosed by the Registrar.

Links between the clusters were then established through shared physical address elements, telephone numbers, similarities in composition of registrant names and email addresses, shared Cloudflare nameserver

pairs¹, registrars, registration dates, and, for a smaller number of the disputed domain names, matching contact details appearing on the websites to which those disputed domain names resolved. The Panel also considered the highly similar layout, branding, and content displayed at the websites associated with the disputed domain names, and three previous decisions² under the Policy in which certain of the registrant email addresses (or closely corresponding variants) disclosed by the Registrars in this proceeding were found by other panels to belong to the Respondents Srdan Andelkovic and/or Sunwin Vibes Limitada, who are named Respondents in this proceeding as well as in the three prior proceedings.

On the basis of this cumulative evidence, the Panel is satisfied that the disputed domain names are subject to common control, and that the use of differing registrant names and contact details across individual disputed domain names likely reflects a deliberate strategy to frustrate identification and consolidation. Three Respondents sent informal communications to the Center, including a substantive communication concerning <taisunwin20.top> and a communication asserting independent corporate ownership and rights in respect of three other domain names. None of those communications were supported by evidence sufficient to rebut the Complainant's prima facie case or the evidence of common control and targeting.

As regards fairness and equity, the Panel sees no reason why consolidation of the disputes would be unfair or inequitable to any Party, especially considering the fact that no substantive, evidence-based responses have been submitted, and given the evidence of targeting discussed below.

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 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 Complainant's SUNWIN mark is recognizable within the disputed domain names, which incorporate the mark or a dominant feature of it in its entirety or as an obvious typographical variant. The Panel notes that the disputed domain name <sun2026.app> follows the same construction as <sun2026.com>, which was found confusingly similar to the Complainant's SUNWIN mark in *Sunwin Information Technology LLC v. Vo Gia Cu, thuong ha, VINH TRAN VAN*, WIPO Case No. [D2026-0993](#). Accordingly, the disputed domain names are confusingly similar to the mark for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), sections 1.7 and 1.9.

Although the addition of other terms, such as, inter alia, "vina", "2026", and "tv" here, 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.

¹ The Panel has independently established that Cloudflare typically attempts to keep nameserver pair names consistent across domain names within the same user account, with each nameserver having a unique name based on a human first name. Thus, where any disputed domain names have matching pairs of Cloudflare nameservers, this is an indicator of possible common control. Of course it is not conclusive on its own, but it does constitute one factor weighing in favor of common control. In accordance with its powers articulated inter alia in paragraphs 10 and 12 of the Rules, the Panel is entitled to conduct limited independent research into matters of public record. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 4.8.

² See *Sunwin Information Technology LLC v. Srdan Andelkovic, Sunwin Vibes Limitada, Sunwin Vibes, Sunwin Vibes Content Writing Service, Srdan Andelkoic, Sunwin Vibes Limitada*, WIPO Case No. [D2025-5040](#); *Sunwin Information Technology LLC v. Srdan Andelkovic, Sunwin Vibes Limitada, Tran Hoang Thai*, WIPO Case No. [D2026-1548](#); and *Sunwin Information Technology LLC v. Karmyn Barbee, Desyrie Reyes, Srdan Andelkovic, and Sunwin Vibes Limitada*, WIPO Case No. [DIO2026-0009](#).

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 substantively 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 notes that the Respondent’s assertion of a legitimate interest based on its alleged connection with Sunwin VN TMDT Co., Ltd. is unsupported by any evidence.

As discussed below in relation to bad faith, it is likely that the Respondent registered and has used the disputed domain names in order to impersonate the Complainant. Panels have held that the use of a domain name for illegitimate activity such as impersonation in this case 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.

For the following reasons, the Panel finds that it is more likely than not that the Respondent registered and has used the disputed domain names to take advantage of the likelihood of confusion with the Complainant’s mark for the Respondent’s commercial gain, falling squarely within paragraph 4(b)(iv) of the Policy.

The Panel notes that the Complainant’s screenshot evidence shows that most of the disputed domain names have resolved to online casino websites that have displayed a logo consisting of SUN.WIN that is highly similar to the Complainant’s SUN.WIN / SUNWIN logo. The Complainant’s Internet Archive evidence shows that it has used its logo since 2019, as claimed in the Complaint. The disputed domain names’ websites have also targeted users in Viet Nam, where the Complainant began its operations and where it retains its primary business. This all points to the Respondent’s knowledge of the Complainant and its mark and an intention to impersonate the Complainant. Panels have held that the use of a domain name for illegitimate activity, here likely impersonation, constitutes bad faith. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 3.4.

As addressed above, three prior cases involving respondents that are also named in the present proceedings involved targeting of the Complainant in circumstances highly similar to the present. Given the Panel’s findings in relation to the likelihood of common control addressed above, this suggests a pattern of bad faith targeting of the Complainant. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 3.2.1.

At the time of this Decision, some of the disputed domain names continue to resolve to the above-described online casino websites displaying a logo similar to the Complainant's logo, while others do not resolve to active webpages. The Panel finds, however, that the non-use of certain disputed domain names does not preclude a finding of bad faith in the circumstances of this case, particularly given the distinctiveness and reputation of the Complainant's trademark and the composition of the disputed domain names.

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 <linktaisanwin.com>, <sunnwin.co>, <sunnwin.games>, <sunnwin.ink>, <sunnwin.love>, <sunnwinlt.com>, <sunnwin.mobi>, <sunnwin.one>, <sunnwin.red>, <suntwin.mobi>, <sunvvin.ec>, <sunwin-au.com>, <sunwinau.com>, <sunwin-bin.com>, <sunwin-co.com>, <sunwinconggamebaidoithuongso1.club>, <sunwindpro.com>, <sunwinio.xyz>, <sunwinmb.com>, <sunwin.mg>, <sunwin.mobile>, <sunwin.music>, <sunwin.ovh>, <sunwin.pn>, <sunwins.ltd>, <sunwin.sn>, <sunwins-tech.com>, <sunwintaixiuonline.com>, <sunwintv.win>, <sunwinvietnam.com>, <sunwinvina.com>, <sunwin0.live>, <sunwin20bookibet.com>, <sunwin2026.biz>, <sunwin2026.xyz>, <sun2026.app>, <suunwin.online>, <taisanwin20.top>, <web-sunwin.ag>, and <9sunwin.com> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Jeremy Speres/

Jeremy Speres

Sole Panelist

Date: September 23, 2026