

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

Serhii Husiev v. Helga Byrne, My Site
Case No. D2026-3178

1. The Parties

The Complainant is Serhii Husiev, Ukraine, represented by IG Lawyers Limited, United Kingdom.

The Respondent is Helga Byrne, My Site, Iceland.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <mateslotscasino.com> is registered with URL Solutions, Inc. (the “Registrar”).

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the “Center”) on July 20, 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 (GLOBAL DOMAIN PRIVACY SERVICES INC) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on July 22, 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 24, 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 July 30, 2026. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was August 19, 2026. The Respondent sent an email communication to the Center on July 24, 2026. However, the Respondent did not file any formal Response. Accordingly, the Center notified Commencement of Panel Appointment Process on August 24, 2026.

The Center appointed John Swinson as the sole panelist in this matter on August 28, 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 an individual who has an address in Ukraine.

The Complainant operates a gambling website located at the domain name <mateslots.com>. This domain name was registered on April 30, 2024.

When the Panel visited the Complainant's website, it displayed various slots and "live casino" games, as well as the following text:

"Mateslots Casino with Best Pokies and Big Prizes in Australia

It is one of the top picks for Aussie players looking for a decent, safe and steady platform with hundreds of games and generous rewards for the lucky ones. Each reel spin, card flip or dice fall could become a life-changing experience in our hospitable online destination. Since Mateslots is a 100% digital platform, everyone can visit it on any desktop, mobile browser or app. Even more possibilities and services are unlocked after the Mateslots Casino login, making the time at our casino truly unforgettable.

Reasons to Pick Mateslots Casino Online

Mateslots has appeared recently, but it already has many fans thanks to the diverse collection of entertainment items and fair gaming. The platform launched this year as a bright star on the Australian digital map, and there are 785+ daily visitors now. Each customer has something on their mind, and they find it at Mateslots."

The Complainant owns Australian Registered Trademark No. 2589007 for a figurative mark  that includes the words "MATE" and "SLOTS" (on different lines) and a green hexagon with a "M" line through it (the "MATESLOTS mark"). This registration was filed on September 23, 2025, and was entered on the register on May 4, 2026. This registered trademark appears on the Complainant's website referred to above.

According to the Registrar Verification, the Respondent is an individual, having an organization name, with an address in Iceland. The Respondent did not file a formal response, so little information is known about the Respondent.

The disputed domain name was registered on January 8, 2025.

At the time of filing the Complainant, the disputed domain name resolved to a gambling website that has the same look and feel as the Complainant's website referred to above. The title bar of the website at the disputed domain name included "MateSlots Online Casino" and the Complainant's green hexagon logo. An image of a female model holding the ace of diamonds and who has a necklace with the Complainant's logo that is prominent on the Complainant's website also appeared on the website at the disputed domain name.

When a user clicked certain buttons on the website at the disputed domain name, the user was diverted to third party websites, which were also online gambling websites.

At the present time, the disputed domain name does not resolve to an active website.

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.

In summary, the Complainant makes the following submissions:

The disputed domain name is identical to the Complainant's MATESLOTS mark.

The Complainant has not licensed or authorized the Respondent to use MATESLOTS or any domain name incorporating this mark.

The disputed domain name is used to trade on the Complainant's goodwill by offering gambling services under MATESLOTS branding and funneling users through a registration flow that redirects to a third-party (Australian) online casino. This is not bona fide use prior to notice, nor legitimate noncommercial or fair use under paragraph 4(c) of the Policy.

The website at the disputed domain name impersonates the Complainant's brand in Ecuador, disrupting the Complainant's business and misleading consumers regarding licensing and affiliation.

The disputed domain name was registered after a year of international use of MATESLOTS (since at least April 30, 2024, when the Complainant's website was registered and the use of the mark has begun, making prior knowledge and opportunistic registration evident.

B. Respondent

The Respondent did not file a formal reply to the Complainant's contentions. The Respondent sent an email to the Center that asked a question about the Complainant's trademark registration and that included the following text: "And I see that Mateslots Casino doesn't have any permissions to Australian market also. At the time request has illegal status and must be rejected."

6. Discussion and Findings

To succeed, the Complainant must demonstrate that all of the elements enumerated in paragraph 4(a) of the Policy have been satisfied, namely:

- (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.

The onus of proving these elements is on the Complainant.

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 Complainant's registered trademark includes design elements as well as the term "MATE SLOTS". Assessment of identity or confusing similarity involves comparing the (alpha-numeric) domain name and the textual components of the relevant mark. To the extent that design elements are incapable of representation in the disputed domain name, these elements are largely disregarded for purposes of assessing identity or confusing similarity under the first element. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.10.

A trademark registration with design elements satisfies the requirement that the complainant show "rights in a mark", noting that panels would tend to focus on the non-design elements for purposes of assessing confusing similarity.

The Panel finds the textual components of the mark is recognizable 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 other terms (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.

Panels have held that the use of a domain name for illegitimate activity (here, a claimed copycat site) 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

Generally speaking, a finding that a domain name has been registered and is being used in bad faith requires an inference to be drawn that the respondent in question has registered and is using the disputed domain name to take advantage of its significance as a trademark owned by (usually) the complainant.

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, the Panel notes that the Respondent registered the disputed domain name in January 2025, but the Complainant did not file its application for the Australian trademark registration until September 2025.

Where a complainant had no trademark rights accrued at the time that the respondent registered the disputed domain name, it is open to the Panel to find whether or not the respondent registered the disputed domain name in bad faith, targeting of the complainant or its trademark rights. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 3.8.1.

The Complainant's evidence of its common law trademark rights prior to January 2025 is sparse. The Complainant asserts that he commenced his business through the domain name <mateslots.com> at least as early as April 30, 2024 and provided evidence of registration of that domain name in April 2024. However, the Complainant provided little evidence of use or reputation of his domain name or trademark prior to January 2025.

Nevertheless, the limited evidence of reputation does not preclude a finding of bad faith registration where the totality of the circumstances demonstrates that the Respondent targeted the gambling business offered under MATESLOTS through the website associated with the Complainant's domain name <mateslots.com>. In this regard, the disputed domain name incorporates "mateslots" in its entirety together with the term "casino", which corresponds precisely to the business offered through the website associated with the Complainant's domain name <mateslots.com>. Additionally, the website at the disputed domain name is a copycat website that includes the Complainant's logo in the website title, as described under section 4 above. The website at the disputed domain name also diverted users to third party online gambling websites.

Considered cumulatively, these circumstances, on balance, make it unlikely that the Respondent selected the disputed domain name independently. Rather, the composition of the disputed domain name and the highly specific reproduction of the Complainant's branding and website content support an inference, on the balance of probabilities, that the Respondent likely registered the disputed domain name with the intention of taking advantage of the gambling business offered under MATESLOTS on the website associated with the Complainant's domain name <mateslots.com>.

The Respondent did not provide any credible alternative explanation for its selection of the disputed domain name or for the reproduction of the Complainant's branding and website content.

The Panel finds bad faith, on balance, pursuant to paragraph 4(b)(iv) of the Policy, namely that the Respondent intentionally attempted to attract, for commercial gain, Internet users to the Respondent's website, by creating a likelihood of confusion with the Complainant's mark as to the source, sponsorship, affiliation, or endorsement of the Respondent's website.

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 <mateslotscasino.com> be transferred to the Complainant.

/John Swinson/

John Swinson

Sole Panelist

Date: September 9, 2026