

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

KamaGames Entertainment Group Limited v. Somchai Sukprasert
Case No. D2026-3286

1. The Parties

The Complainant is KamaGames Entertainment Group Limited, Isle of Man, represented by Kosnahan Law, Isle of Man.

The Respondent is Somchai Sukprasert, Singapore.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <pokerist.fun> 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 24, 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 25, 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 (REDACTED FOR PRIVACY (DT), Super Privacy Service LTD c/o Dynadot) 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 29, 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 4, 2026. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was August 24, 2026. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent’s default on August 26, 2026.

The Center appointed Rodrigo Velasco Santelices as the sole panelist in this matter on August 31, 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, KamaGames Entertainment Group Limited, is the owner of a significant portfolio of trademarks relating to the brand “Pokerist” in relation to its gaming and casino services.

The Complainant’s POKERIST trademarks have been licensed by the Complainant to approved third parties, for the exploitation of the Complainant’s software and mobile applications internationally on its behalf. The Complainant’s software and mobile applications principally focus on the social gaming market, offering games with casino themes, with products including mobile Poker, casino slot games, Roulette, 8 Ball and more.

The Complainant’s registrations for its POKERIST trademarks include, among others, the following:

- (1) A word mark for POKERIST.COM, in the United Kingdom with Registration No. UK00910675627, registered on June 15, 2012, in international classes 9, 25, 38 and 41;
- (2) A word mark for POKERIST.COM, in the European Union with Registration No. 010675627, dated June 15, 2012, in international classes 9, 25, 38 and 41;
- (3) A figurative mark which includes the wording “POKERIST.COM”, in the United States of America (“United States”) Registration No. 4328885, dated April 30, 2013, in international class 25;
- (4) A word mark for POKERIST.COM, in the United States Registration No. 4328859, dated April 30, 2013, in international class 25;
- (5) A word mark POKERIST, in the United States Registration No. 4099075, dated February 14, 2012, in international class 9; and
- (6) A word mark for POKERIST, in the United States Registration No. 4328858, dated April 30, 2013, in international class 25.

Complainant’s software and mobile applications are exploited on its behalf under its POKERIST brand across multiple different platforms, which include Steam, Google Play, the Apple App Store and online through other web-based platforms.

The Complainant claims that one of its social casino games known as “Pokerist” has been downloaded over 10 million times on the Google Play Store alone.

The disputed domain name was registered on June 11, 2026.

The Respondent appears to have used the disputed domain name to resolve to a casino-themed website, displaying POKERIST and various gambling-related content, with links inviting users to “Register” and “Download app.”

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 it is the owner of the registered trademark POKERIST so it cannot be questioned that the disputed domain name is identical the Complainant's trademark. The disputed domain name reproduces the trademark in its entirety, which is followed by the generic Top-Level Domain ("gTLD"), ".fun". The addition of this gTLD is not sufficient to prevent the finding of confusing similarity between the Complainant's trademark and the disputed domain name.

The Complainant further states that the Respondent had the Complainant's trademark in mind when registering the disputed domain name to exploit and profit from its rights.

Further, the Respondent's website content is likely to confuse Internet users into believing that the disputed domain name is operated by, approved, sponsored by, or affiliated with the Complainant.

Furthermore, the Complainant contends that the Respondent has configured the disputed domain name to resolve to a website offering betting and gaming services which compete with those of the Complainant.

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 identical to the mark for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.7.

It is the well-established view of UDRP panels that the addition of a gTLD, in this case, ".fun", to a disputed domain name does not prevent the disputed domain name from being confusingly similar to a Complainant's trademark (see [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.11.1, and cases cited thereunder).

Therefore, 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 Complainant’s trademarks were registered several years prior to the registration of the disputed domain name and referenced repeatedly on the website at the disputed domain name together with the content relating to casino gaming and sports betting. The Panel finds that this fact cannot be a simple coincidence. Therefore, with no explanation from the Respondent, the Panel finds that the Respondent most likely knew or should have known the Complainant’s trademark when registering the disputed domain name and deliberately selected it with the Complainant’s mark in mind.

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.

The Panel finds that the Respondent has intentionally attempted to attract, for commercial gain, Internet users to its website, by creating a likelihood of confusion with the Complainant’s trademark as to the source, sponsorship, or endorsement of the disputed domain name, in bad faith pursuant to paragraph 4(b)(iv) of the Policy.

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

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 <pokerist.fun> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Rodrigo Velasco Santelices/

Rodrigo Velasco Santelices

Sole Panelist

Date: September 4, 2026