

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

FS Software Ltd. v. Vasile-Ionut Crangan, Lead Total Limited
Case No. D2026-3270

1. The Parties

The Complainant is FS Software Ltd., Malta, internally represented.

The Respondent is Vasile-Ionut Crangan, Lead Total Limited, Hong Kong, China.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <lilibetno.com> is registered with Spaceship, Inc. (the “Registrar”).

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the “Center”) on July 23, 2026. On July 24, 2026, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On July 27, 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 (The RDAP server redacted the value, Privacy service provided by Withheld for Privacy ehf) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on July 27, 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 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 Respondent of the Complaint, and the proceedings commenced on August 5, 2026. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was August 25, 2026. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent’s default on August 26, 2026.

The Center appointed David Stone as the sole panelist in this matter on September 1, 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 Maltese company that operates in the online gaming market.

The Complainant owns the following trademarks for LILIBET (the “Mark”):

-  : European Union trade mark registration no. 18073802 registered on September 26, 2019 in international class 41;
-  : United Kingdom trade mark registration no. 918073802 registered on September 26, 2019 in international class 41; and
- LILIBET: United Kingdom trade mark registration no. 3400912 registered on August 9, 2019 in international class 9.

In each case, the named proprietor is Efes Club Limited, which is the former name of the Complainant.

The disputed domain name was created on June 3, 2025. At the date of this Decision, the Respondent hosts at the disputed domain name a website that: (i) uses the Complainant's Mark, including in stylized form, in the top left-hand corner of the website; (ii) purports to provide casino-related services in Norwegian; and (iii) provides an option for Internet users to create/log into an account.

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.

Under the first element, the Complainant contends that the disputed domain name incorporates the mark in its entirety, adding only the geographic abbreviation “no” signifying Norway.

Under the second element, the Complainant contends that: (i) it has not authorized, licensed or otherwise permitted the Respondent to use the Mark; (ii) the Respondent is not commonly known by the disputed domain name; (iii) the Respondent's use of the disputed domain name does not constitute a bona fide offering of goods or services; and (iv) the Respondent is not making a legitimate or fair use of the disputed domain name. The Complainant contends that the Respondent is intentionally leveraging the Complainant's Mark to divert Internet users to the Respondent's website, which competes commercially with or capitalizes on the Complainant's established presence in the online gaming market.

Under the third element, the Complainant contends that its rights in the Mark long pre-date the creation of the disputed domain name and that, given the unique and distinctive nature of the Mark within the online gaming and casino industry, it is inconceivable that the Respondent independently selected the exact same term by coincidence. The Complainant also contends that the geographic targeting of the Complainant using the additional term “no” proves that the Respondent had actual knowledge of the Complainant's mark and specific market presence at the time of registration. The Complainant also says that the Respondent is actively using the disputed domain name for illicit commercial gain by confusing Internet users.

B. Respondent

The Respondent did not reply to the Complainant's contentions.

6. Discussion and Findings

Section 4.3 of the WIPO Overview of WIPO Panel Views on Select UDRP Questions ("[WIPO Overview 3.1](#)") states that failure to respond to a complainant's contentions would not by itself mean that the complainant is deemed to have prevailed; a respondent's default is not necessarily an admission that the complainant's claims are true. Thus, although in this case the Respondent has failed to respond to the Complaint, the burden remains with the Complainant to establish the three elements of paragraph 4(a) of the Policy by a preponderance of the evidence.

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 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 other terms here, "no", 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.

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, the Panel notes that the Respondent registered the disputed domain name, which is confusingly similar for the reasons already given, and the Respondent hosts at the disputed domain name a website that: (i) uses the Complainant's Mark, including in stylized form, in the top left-hand corner of the website; (ii) purports to provide casino-related services in Norwegian; and (iii) provides an option for Internet users to create an account and log in to the same.

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.

Panels have found that evidence of a respondent seeking to cause confusion supports a finding that a respondent has registered a domain name to attract, for commercial gain, Internet users to its website by creating a likelihood of confusion with the complainant's mark. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 3.1.4.

The Panel finds that the nature of the disputed domain name and the content of the website at the disputed domain name together show an intention of the Respondent to confuse and thereby attract Internet users to its website for commercial gain.

Further, the Respondent has not attempted to refute any of the Complainant's contentions, which casts additional doubt on the nature of its conduct. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 3.2.1.

Having reviewed the record, the Panel concludes that the actions of the Respondent in choosing the disputed domain name were aimed at attracting, for commercial gain, Internet users by creating a likelihood of confusion with the Mark. The Panel therefore concludes that the disputed domain name was registered and is being used 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 <lilibetno.com> be transferred to the Complainant.

/David Stone/

David Stone

Sole Panelist

Date: September 15, 2026