

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

Blastworks Limited v. Stanislav Lukianytsia
Case No. D2026-3168

1. The Parties

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

The Respondent is Stanislav Lukianytsia, Ukraine.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <slingo-casino.com> is registered with Dynadot Inc (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 21, 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 (Super Privacy Service Ltd c/o Dynadot) 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. On August 17, 2026, the Respondent sent an email communication to the Center stating that it did not object to transfer of the disputed domain name to the Complainant and requesting suspension of the proceeding to permit settlement. On August 21, 2026, the Center invited the Complainant to request suspension by August 28, 2026, if the Parties wished to explore settlement options. No suspension request was received.

The Respondent did not submit a formal Response. On September 10, 2026, the Center informed the Parties that it would proceed to panel appointment.

The Center appointed Edoardo Fano as the sole panelist in this matter on September 17, 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 Respondent regarding further submissions, waivers or extensions of deadlines, and the Panel has not found it necessary to request any further information from the Parties.

The language of the proceeding is English, being the language of the Registration Agreement, 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 the Respondent's mailing address is stated to be in Ukraine, which is subject to an international conflict at the date of this Decision, which 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 Respondent, and notified the Complaint to the Respondent by email, and the Respondent sent an email communication to the Center.

The Panel further notes that the disputed domain name was registered on May 6, 2026, several years after the commencement of the international conflict. This indicates that, at the time of registration, the Respondent was able to set up an active website, and therefore appears capable of controlling both the disputed domain name and the related content.

The Panel moreover notes (albeit in the absence of a formal Response) that it is clear the Complainant has been targeted, as is further described herein.

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

5. Factual Background

The Complainant, a wholly-owned subsidiary within the Gaming Realms group, whose ultimate parent is Gaming Realms plc., is a United Kingdom company operating in the field of gambling and casino games and services, owning several trademark registrations for SLINGO, including:

- United Kingdom Trademark Registration No. UK00900661710 for SLINGO, registered on March 23, 2001;
- European Union Trade Mark Registration No. 000661710 for SLINGO, registered on March 23, 2001; and

- United States of America Trademark Registration No. 2,651,182 for SLINGO, registered on November 19, 2002.

The Complainant also operates on the Internet through its official website at “www.slingo.com”.

The Complainant provided evidence in support of the above.

According to the Whois records, the disputed domain name was registered on May 6, 2026, and it resolves to a website in the Italian language, which reproduces the Complainant’s trademark, including in its stylized graphic form, apparently holds itself out as the Complainant’s official casino operation, and channels Internet users to an online casino and sportsbook at a third party website. The website also displays a purported UK Gambling Commission license number which does not appear on the UK Gambling Commission’s public register.

On June 7, 2026, the Complainant’s legal representatives sent a letter of claim to the Respondent, via the Registrar’s registrant-contact facility, copied to the Registrar, putting them on notice of the Complainant’s rights, seeking undertakings and requiring the transfer of the disputed domain name. An abuse complaint was also submitted to the Registrar. The Respondent did not respond, and the website remained live at the date of filing of this Complaint.

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 name.

Notably, the Complainant states that the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to its trademark SLINGO, as the disputed domain name wholly incorporates the Complainant’s trademark.

Moreover, the Complainant asserts that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the disputed domain name since it has not been authorized by the Complainant to register the disputed domain name or to use its trademark within the disputed domain name, it is not commonly known by the disputed domain name, 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 name. The disputed domain name resolves to a website in which the Complainant’s trademark in its stylized graphic form is reproduced, in order to impersonate the official Complainant’s website and misdirect consumers for commercial gain.

The Complainant submits that the Respondent has registered the disputed domain name in bad faith, since the Complainant’s trademark SLINGO is widely known in the field of gambling and casino games and services. Therefore, the Respondent targeted the Complainant’s trademark at the time of registration of the disputed domain name and the Complainant contends that the use of the disputed domain name to impersonate the Complainant and thereby fraudulently deceive consumers, attempting to create a likelihood of confusion with the Complainant’s trademark, qualifies as bad faith registration and use.

B. Respondent

The Respondent has made no formal response to the Complainant’s contentions. However, as noted above, on August 17, 2026, the Respondent sent the following informal email communication to the Center:

“We refer to the above-referenced proceeding concerning the domain name slingo-casino.com.

The Respondent confirms that it does not object to the transfer of the disputed domain name to the Complainant, without any admission of liability or wrongdoing.

Accordingly, the Respondent kindly requests that the Center suspend the proceeding to allow the Parties to complete the settlement process using WIPO's Standard Settlement Form.

Please confirm the next steps.

Sincerely".

No further Response was received by the Center.

7. Discussion and Findings

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

- (i) the disputed domain name is 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 name; and
- (iii) the disputed domain name has been registered and is 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 name. WIPO Overview of WIPO Panel Views on Selected UDRP Questions ("[WIPO Overview 3.1](#)"), section 1.7.

Based on the available record, the Panel finds 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 Panel finds 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.

While the addition of other terms, here "casino" and a hyphen, 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 name 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 generic Top-Level Domain ("gTLD"), in this case ".com", is typically disregarded when assessing the confusing similarity between a trademark and a domain name. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.11.1.

Based on the available record, 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, panels have recognized that proving that 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 name. 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.

The Complainant in its Complaint, and as set out above, has established a prima facie case that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name. It asserts that the Respondent, who is not currently associated with the Complainant in any way, is not using the disputed domain name for a legitimate noncommercial or fair use or in connection with a bona fide offering of goods or services.

The prima facie case presented by the Complainant is enough to shift the burden of production to the Respondent to demonstrate that it has rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name. However, the Respondent has not presented any evidence of any rights or legitimate interests it may have in the disputed domain name, while expressing its willingness to transfer the disputed domain name to the Complainant. The disputed domain name resolves to a website in which the Complainant's trademark in its stylized graphic form is reproduced, with the attempt to pass itself off as the official Complainant's website and mislead consumers for financial gain.

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

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

Finally, the Panel finds that the composition of the disputed domain name (incorporating the Complainant's trademark in its entirety with the addition of the term "casino", connected to the Complainant's field of activity) coupled with the use of the disputed domain name to resolve to a website in which the Respondent tries to pass itself off as the Complainant, affirms the Respondent's intention of taking unfair advantage of the likelihood of confusion between the disputed domain name and the Complainant as to the origin or affiliation of the website.

Based on the available record, 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, regarding the registration in bad faith of the disputed domain name, the reputation of the Complainant's trademark SLINGO in the field of gambling and casino games and services is clearly established, and the Panel finds that the Respondent must have known of the Complainant, and deliberately registered the disputed domain name in bad faith, especially because the disputed domain name resolves to a website on which the Complainant's trademark in its stylized graphic form is reproduced, with the attempt to impersonate the official Complainant's website and mislead consumers for financial gain.

As regards the use in bad faith of the disputed domain name, the Panel notes that the Respondent is trying to attract Internet users to its website by creating a likelihood of confusion with the Complainant's trademark as to the website's source, sponsorship, affiliation or endorsement. Panels have held that the use of a domain name for illegal activity, here impersonation/passing off, constitutes bad faith. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 3.4.

In addition, the registration and log-in prompts and promotional links on the website at the disputed domain name redirect Internet users to an online casino and sportsbook at a third party website.

The above suggests to the Panel that the Respondent intentionally registered and is using the disputed domain name in order to attract, for commercial gain, Internet users to its website in accordance with paragraph 4(b)(iv) of the Policy. Such use also disrupts the Complainant's business.

Furthermore, the Panel considers that the nature of the disputed domain name, which incorporates the Complainant's trademark in its entirety with the addition of the term "casino", connected to the Complainant's field of activity, further supports a finding of bad faith. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 3.2.1.

Having reviewed the record, the Panel finds the Respondent's registration and use of the disputed domain name constitutes bad faith under the Policy.

Based on the available record, the Panel finds the third element of the Policy has been established.

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 name <slingo-casino.com> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Edoardo Fano/

Edoardo Fano

Sole Panelist

Date: September 21, 2026