

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

Mr. Vedat Erbaş, Paramaribo Turizm Limited, and Mezek Invest EOOD v.
GSR Technology Holding Limitada, berke kandemir, grandpashabet; berke
kaya, ş, ahmet yeren, organizasyon and CENGİZ PAMİR
Case No. D2026-3202

1. The Parties

The Complainants are Mr. Vedat Erbaş, Türkiye (the “First Complainant”), Paramaribo Turizm Limited, Türkiye (the “Second Complainant”), and Mezek Invest EOOD, Bulgaria (the “Third Complainant”), represented by BHLEX Law and Consultancy Bureau, Türkiye.

The Respondents are GSR Technology Holding Limitada, Costa Rica (the “First Respondent”), berke kandemir, grandpashabet, Türkiye (the “Second Respondent”), berke kaya, ş, Türkiye (the “Third Respondent”) ahmet yeren, organizasyon, Türkiye (the “Fourth Respondent”), and CENGİZ PAMİR, Türkiye (the “Fifth Respondent”).

2. The Domain Names and Registrars

The disputed domain names <grandpashabet.com>, <grandpashabet365.com>, <grandpashabet7098.com>, <grandpashabet7112.com>, <grandpashadestek.com>, and <grandpashadestek7.com> are registered with GoDaddy.com, LLC (the “First Registrar”).

The disputed domain name <grandpashabet8243.com> is registered with NameCheap, Inc. (the “Second Registrar”).

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the “Center”) on July 21, 2026, originally excluding the disputed domain name <grandpashabet8243.com>. On July 22, 2026, the Center transmitted by email to the First Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain names. On the same date, the First 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 Respondents (GSR Technology Holding Limitada / Registration Private, Domains By Proxy, LLC) and contact information in the Complaint.

The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on July 23, 2026, with the registrant and contact information of nominally multiple underlying registrants revealed by the First Registrar, requesting the Complainant to either file separate complaints 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 the first amended Complaint on July 30, 2026, adding the disputed domain name <grandpashabet8243.com> into the proceedings. On August 4, 2026, the Center transmitted by email to the Second Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name <grandpashabet8243.com>. On the same date, the Second Registrar transmitted by email to the Center its verification response disclosing registrant and contact information for this disputed domain name which differed from the named Respondent. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on the same date with the registrant and contact information of nominally multiple underlying registrant revealed by the First and Second Registrars, requesting the Complainant to either file separate complaints 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 the second and third amended Complaints on August 11, 2026, and August 14, 2026, respectively.

The Center verified that the Complaint together with the amended Complaints 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 21, 2026. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was September 10, 2026. The Fifth Respondent sent an email communication to the Center on August 28, 2026. The Center notified the Parties of Commencement of Panel Appointment Process on September 11, 2026.

The Center appointed Wilson Pinheiro Jabur as the sole panelist in this matter on September 16, 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 First Complainant is the founder, owner, beneficial owner and controlling person of the Second and Third Complainants which operate under the GRAND PASHA brand and trade names in connection with the hospitality, land-based casino, gaming and entertainment sectors.

The Second Complainant has as registered trade names before the Turkish Republic of Northern Cyprus GRAND PASHA HOTEL, originally registered in 2013 and re-registered in 2020, under Nos. TU10825, TU16793 and TU16849 and GRAND PASHA CASINO, registered in 2014, under No. TU11185, having operated under the GRAND PASHA name in connection with licensed hotel, casino, hospitality and entertainment operations ever since (Annex 3 to the Complaint).

The Third Complainant is the owner of the Bulgarian trademark registration No. BG/N/2018/154261, for the GRAND PASHA NICOSIA HOTEL CASINO SPA word and device mark, filed on March 13, 2019, registered on September 27, 2019, in classes 35, 41, 43, below reproduced:



The Complainants also own and operate the domain names <pashainternational.com>, <grandpasha.com> and <pashahotels.com>, registered on June 7, 2007, October 16, 2013, and March 17, 2016, respectively, as well as the @Grand Pasha Hotel, @Grand Pasha Casino Lefkoşa and @Grand Pasha Casino Girne profiles on Facebook., created on February 12, 2014, June 11, 2018, and February 23, 2020, respectively.

The disputed domain names were registered on and presently are used in connection with:

Disputed Domain Name	Registration Date	Present Use
<grandpashabet.com>	March 31, 2019	Online casino and gambling platform which reproduces the Complainant's logo
<grandpashabet365.com>	March 35, 2020	Redirection to third party gambling website which reproduces the Complainant's logo
<grandpashabet7098.com>	August 25, 2025	No active webpage
<grandpashabet7112.com>	August 31, 2025	No active webpage
<grandpashadestek.com>	October 2, 2025	Customer support webpage for the Complainant's services
<grandpashadestek7.com>	October 17, 2025	No active webpage
<grandpashabet8243.com>	May 12, 2026	No active webpage

At the time the complaint was filed, the disputed domain names <grandpashabet.com> and <grandpashabet8243.com> redirected Internet users to an online casino and gambling platform which reproduced the Complainant's logo, and the disputed domain name <grandpashadestek.com> resolved to a customer support website for the Complainant's services (Annex 4 to the Complaint)

5. Parties' Contentions

A. Complainants

The Complainants contend that they have satisfied each of the elements required under the Policy for a transfer of the disputed domain names.

Notably, the Complainants assert to have operated under the GRAND PASHA and PASHA brand and trade names for approximately twenty years or more in connection with hotel, hospitality, entertainment and licensed land-based casino and gaming operations, such as the Grand Pasha Hotels in Kyrenia and Nicosia, where casino and entertainment services are also offered.

Moreover, the Complainants argue that, in addition to their registered trademark rights, the Complainants have acquired substantial unregistered trademark, trade name and goodwill rights in the GRAND PASHA and PASHA identifiers through more than twenty (20) years of continuous, exclusive and extensive use in connection with hotel, hospitality, entertainment and licensed land-based casino and gaming operations. Under the Complainants' view, as a result of such longstanding use, substantial investment and commercial success, the GRAND PASHA and PASHA names have become distinctive commercial identifiers exclusively associated with the Complainants and the businesses operating under their ownership, control and/or beneficial interest, enjoying significant goodwill, reputation and consumer recognition both domestically and internationally.

The Complainants submit that the disputed domain names are under common control given that they share: (i) similar email addresses; (ii) the same naming pattern; (iii) similar telephone numbers; (iv) integrated commercial system; (v) clustered registration dates and (vi) unverifiable registration information; and, thus, should all be dealt with in a single procedure.

The Complainants further submit that the disputed domain names are confusingly similar to the Complainant's trademark, incorporating the GRAND PASHA trademark in its entirety with the addition of the terms "bet" or "destek" ("support" in Turkish) and numerals, which is not sufficient to avoid a finding of confusing similarity thereof given that the Complainants' trademark is clearly recognizable as the leading element of the disputed domain names.

The Complainants assert that the Respondents have no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the disputed domain names given that:

- (a) the Complainants have never licensed or authorized the Respondents to use any of the Complainants' marks or to register any domain name incorporating the GRAND PASHA or PASHA brand;
- (b) the Respondents are not affiliated or connected with the Complainants in any way;
- (c) the disputed domain names are being used in connection with a scheme designed to deceive consumers into engaging with the Respondent's online betting services under the GRAND PASHA / PASHA brand name, by creating the false impression that those services originate from or are affiliated with the Complainants; and
- (d) the Respondents have not been commonly known by the disputed domain names.

As to the registration of the disputed domain names in bad faith the Complainants submit that the Respondents deliberately selected the GRAND PASHA identifier and commercial identity and have been using the disputed domain names intentionally attempting to attract, for commercial gain, Internet users to their websites by creating a likelihood of confusion with the Complainants' marks as to the source, sponsorship, affiliation, or endorsement of the Respondents' services, targeting the Turkish market, where the Complainants operate. .

Thus, according to the Complainants, the Respondents are unfairly seeking to capitalize on the goodwill and fame of the Complainants' trademarks by creating a likelihood of confusion as to the source, sponsorship, affiliation or endorsement of their websites, making Internet users believe that the websites are associated, endorsed or recommended by the Complainants, which is not true. In addition to that, the Respondents' bad faith is further evidenced by the lack of reply to the formal cease and desist notice directly to the Respondents' disclosed email addresses on June 18, 2026 (Annex 5 to the Complaint).

B. Respondents

The Fifth Respondent, registrant of the disputed domain name <grandpashabet8243.com> registered with the Second Registrar, sent an email communication to the Center on August 28, 2026, affirming to be the owner of the disputed domain names registered with the First Registrar, and requesting that the hold status of the disputed domain names be lifted. No other communication or formal response was submitted either by the Fifth or other Respondents.

6. Discussion and Findings

6.1. Procedural Matter - Consolidation of 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.

As seen above, the Fifth Respondent, which is the registrant of the disputed domain name <grandpashabet8243.com>, affirmed to be the owner of the other disputed domain names <grandpashabet.com>, <grandpashabet365.com>, <grandpashabet7098.com>, <grandpashabet7112.com>, <grandpashadestek.com> and <grandpashadestek7.com>.

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.

Given the Fifth Respondent's statement, it is clear that all the disputed domain names are under common control. Therefore, as regards fairness and equity, the Panel sees no reason why consolidation of the disputes would be unfair or inequitable to any Party.

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.

6.2. Substantive Matter

In what it relates to the merits of the case, the Panel will analyze the three requisite elements under paragraph 4(a) of the Policy which have to be met for this Panel to order the transfer of the disputed domain names to the Complainants:

- (i) the disputed domain names are identical or confusingly similar to the trademarks or service marks in which the Complainants have rights; and
- (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 are being used in bad faith.

The Complainants must prove in this administrative proceeding that each of the aforesaid three elements is present so as to have the disputed domain names transferred to them, according to paragraph 4(a) of the Policy.

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 unregistered and registered rights in respect of a trademark or service mark for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.2.1.

As to the Complainants' registered rights, the Complainants have submitted evidence that they have a figurative trademark for GRAND PASHA NICOSIA HOTEL CASINO SPA.

As to the Complainants' unregistered rights, the Complainants have shown that the GRAND PASHA and PASHA have become distinctive identifiers for hotel and casino services for the purpose of the Policy (Annexes 2 and 3 to the Complaint, as well as in view of having been officially registered before the Turkish Republic of Northern Cyprus as GRAND PASHA HOTEL, originally in 2013 and re-registered in 2020, under Nos. TU10825, TU16793 and TU16849 and as GRAND PASHA CASINO, registered in 2014, under No.

TU11185). Furthermore, the Complainants also have shown online presence via the domain names <pashainternational.com>, <grandpasha.com> and <pashahotels.com>, registered on June 7, 2007, October 16, 2013, and March 17, 2016, respectively, as well as Facebook profiles @Grand Pasha Hotel, @Grand Pasha Casino Lefkoşa and @Grand Pasha Casino Girne created on February 12, 2014, June 11, 2018, and February 23, 2020, respectively.

The Panel finds the mark is recognizable within the disputed domain names. Accordingly, the disputed domain names are confusingly similar to the mark for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.7. Although the addition of other terms and numerals (“bet”, “destek”, “365”, “7098”, “7112”, “7” and “8243”) 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.

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 Complainants have established a prima facie case that the Respondent lacks rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain names. The Respondent has not rebutted the Complainants’ 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.

In that sense, the Complainants indeed state not to have ever licensed or authorized the Respondent to use any of the Complainants’ marks or to register any domain name incorporating the GRAND PASHA or PASHA brand; also not being the Respondent affiliated or connected with the Complainants in any way.

Also, the lack of evidence that the Respondent is commonly known by the disputed domain names and the absence of any trademarks registered by the Respondent corresponding to the disputed domain names, corroborates the absence of any rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain names.

Furthermore, the use of part of the disputed domain names either prior to this procedure, or presently, in connection with an online betting and gambling platform reproducing the Complainant’s device trademark and similar visual identity, targeting the same Turkish audience underscores the Respondent’s intent to create an undue association with the group to which the Complainants are connected.

Under these circumstances and absent evidence to the contrary, the Panel finds that the Respondent does not have rights or legitimate interests with respect to the disputed domain names.

The Panel finds the second element of the Policy has been established.

C. Registered and Used in Bad Faith

The Policy indicates in paragraph 4(b)(iv) that bad faith registration and use can be found where a respondent has intentionally attempted to attract, for commercial gain, Internet users to the website or other online location, by creating a likelihood of confusion with the complainant's mark as to the source, sponsorship, affiliation, or endorsement of the website or location or of a product or service on the website or location.

In this case, the Panel finds that the Respondent has intentionally attempted to attract, for commercial gain, Internet users to its websites or other online locations, by creating a likelihood of confusion with the Complainants' marks as to the source, sponsorship, affiliation, or endorsement of the websites or locations.

Other factors that corroborate the Panel's finding of the Respondent's bad faith are: (i) the use of some of the disputed domain names in connection with an online platform displaying the same device (a geometric emblem resembling a five-pointed star or pinwheel against a dark green background) highly similar to the Complainant's logo; (ii) the targeting of Turkish Internet users purportedly offering betting and casino services, particularly considering that the Complainants provide casino services at their hotels located in Turkish territory; (iii) the Respondent's failure to reply to a cease-and-desist letter sent prior to the commencement of this proceeding; and (iv) the passive holding of some of the disputed domain names which, in view of their composition and the circumstances of this case, does not prevent a finding of bad faith under the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 3.3.

For the reasons above, the Respondent's conduct has to be considered, in this Panel's view, as bad faith registration and use of the disputed domain names.

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 <grandpashabet.com>, <grandpashabet365.com>, <grandpashabet7098.com>, <grandpashabet7112.com>, <grandpashadestek.com>, <grandpashadestek7.com>, and <grandpashabet8243.com> be transferred to the First Complainant, Mr. Vedat Erbaş.

/Wilson Pinheiro Jabur/

Wilson Pinheiro Jabur

Sole Panelist

Date: September 30, 2026