

## **ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION**

Blastworks Limited v. cha bong keun

Case No. D2026-3167

### **1. The Parties**

The Complainant is Blastworks Limited, United Kingdom, represented by Keystone Law Limited, United Kingdom.

The Respondent is cha bong keun, Republic of Korea.

### **2. The Domain Name and Registrar**

The disputed domain name <slingocasino.com> is registered with GoDaddy.com, LLC (the “Registrar”).

### **3. Procedural History**

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the “Center”) on July 18, 2026. On July 20, 2026, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On July 20, 2026, the Registrar transmitted by email to the Center its verification response disclosing registrant and contact information for the disputed domain name which differed from the named Respondent (Domains By Proxy, LLC) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on July 28, 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 August 16, 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 17, 2026. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was September 6, 2026. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent’s default on September 18, 2026.

The Center appointed Deanna Wong Wai Man as the sole panelist in this matter on September 24, 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 company incorporated in England and Wales and a wholly-owned subsidiary within the Gaming Realms group, whose ultimate parent is Gaming Realms plc. The Complainant started using the SLINGO mark in 1994 and has been using it in online, social, and casino gaming. This trademark has been used on a range of formats and platforms, including online games, casino games, and gaming products. Public-source evidence submitted with the Complaint indicates that more than 55 million players have engaged with SLINGO in one or more formats and that SLINGO-branded games are licensed in a number of jurisdictions.

The Complainant is the proprietor of an international trademark portfolio, including but not limited to, United Kingdom trademark registration No. UK00900661710 for the word mark SLINGO, registered on March 23, 2001. The Complainant is also the owner of European Union Trade Mark No. 000661710 for the word mark SLINGO, registered on March 23, 2001. The registrations relied upon cover, among other things, computer and downloadable gaming software, games and gaming equipment, and entertainment services, including online gambling and casino services. The Complainant also owns the domain name <slingo.com>, which is used to host the main online website for SLINGO-branded games.

The disputed domain name <slingocasino.com> was registered on June 30, 2014. The evidence shows that the disputed domain name has been offered for sale through a variety of domain name marketplaces. An Internet Archive capture dated March 19, 2025, records an online listing offering the disputed domain name for USD 35,000, while in June 2026, the asking price was USD 295,000. On July 9 and 17, 2026, the disputed domain name resolved to a website, offering it for sale through an online marketplace at prices of USD 295,050 and USD 354,050, respectively. On the date of this Decision, the Panel notes that the disputed domain name is being offered for sale for USD 559,950.

On June 7, 2026, the Complainant's representatives wrote to the Respondent (via the privacy service and the Registrar's Whols contact form) and to the Registrar and the privacy service, putting the Respondent on notice of the Complainant's rights, seeking undertakings and requiring transfer of the disputed domain name. No reply was received from the Respondent.

#### **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 name incorporates the SLINGO trademark in its entirety, with the addition of the term "casino", and that this addition does not prevent a finding of confusing similarity. The Complainant further submits that the ".com" Top-Level Domain should be disregarded for the purpose of comparison.

As to rights or legitimate interests, the Complainant submits that it has not licensed, authorized, or otherwise permitted the Respondent to use the SLINGO trademark or to register a domain name incorporating it, and that there is no relationship between the Parties. The Complainant further contends that the Respondent is not commonly known by the disputed domain name and has made no bona fide or legitimate noncommercial or fair use of it. The Complainant relies in particular on the fact that the disputed domain name is offered for sale.

As to bad faith, the Complainant submits that the disputed domain name was registered long after the SLINGO trademark had acquired established protection and substantial reputation in its sector. It contends that the composition of the disputed domain name demonstrates targeting of the SLINGO mark and that the subsequent offers for sale at substantial prices constitute evidence of bad faith under paragraph 4(b)(i) of the Policy. The Complainant further relies on the increase in the asking price following its letter to the Respondent as described in Section 4. above.

## **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 name. 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 within the disputed domain name. Accordingly, the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to the mark for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.7.

Although the addition of another term here, "casino", may bear on assessment of the second and third elements, the Panel finds the addition of such term does not prevent a finding of confusing similarity between the disputed domain name 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 name. 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 name such as those enumerated in the Policy or otherwise.

Based on the evidence, the Complainant has not licensed, authorized, or otherwise permitted the Respondent to use the SLINGO trademark or to register a domain name incorporating it. There is no evidence of any affiliation or other relationship between the Parties. There is also no evidence that the Respondent is commonly known by the disputed domain name.

The evidence further shows that the disputed domain name has been, and is currently being offered for sale through domain name marketplaces and that there is no evidence of any past or current bona fide use, or demonstrable preparations for a bona fide use, of the disputed domain name in connection with goods or services.

Additionally, the Panel finds that the disputed domain name merely consists of the SLINGO mark in combination with the descriptive term "casino", which is indicative of the Complainant's services provided under that mark. The Panel therefore finds that the nature and composition of the disputed domain name falsely suggests sponsorship, endorsement, or authorization by the Complainant, which does not support any finding of rights or legitimate interests on the part of the Respondent, see section 2.5.1 of the [WIPO Overview 3.1](#).

The Panel finds that 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 the disputed domain name which merely consists of the SLINGO mark in combination with the descriptive term "casino", which is indicative of the Complainant's services provided under that mark. The Panel also considered that the Complainant's trademark registrations long predate the registration date of the disputed domain name and that the evidence submitted indicates substantial public use of the SLINGO brand by the registration date of the disputed domain name, including its use in online gaming and its association with casino gaming. This means that even a cursory Internet search or trademark search at the time of registration of the disputed domain name would have made it clear to the Respondent that the Complainant owned prior rights in its trademark for SLINGO and used it intensively, and the Panel therefore finds that the Respondent could not have been reasonably unaware of them. Given the composition and nature of the disputed domain name and the absence of any explanation from the Respondent as to the selection of this particular combination, the Panel finds, on the balance of probabilities, that the Respondent was aware of the SLINGO trademark when the disputed domain name was registered and that the disputed domain name was selected because of its association with, and to target, that mark in bad faith.

As to use in bad faith, the disputed domain name resolved to a website offering it for sale via online domain marketplaces, e.g., the disputed domain name was offered at a price of USD 354,050 on July 17, 2026, and on the date of this Decision, the Panel notes that the disputed domain name is being offered for sale for USD 559,950, which the Panel finds demonstrates that the Respondent is attempting to sell the disputed domain name for an amount most likely in excess of the Respondent's out-of-pocket costs related to the disputed domain name. This leads the Panel to conclude, on the balance of probabilities, that the Respondent is using the disputed domain name to try to sell it to the Complainant, who is the owner of the corresponding trademark for SLINGO, or to other parties and to obtain unjustified financial benefits through such sale. The Panel notes that this constitutes direct evidence of bad faith of the Respondent under paragraph 4(b)(i) of the

Policy. The Panel therefore finds that it has been demonstrated that the Respondent has registered and used the disputed domain name in bad faith.

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 name <slingocasino.com> be transferred to the Complainant.

*/Deanna Wong Wai Man/*

**Deanna Wong Wai Man**

Sole Panelist

Date: September 30, 2026