

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

Level Devil B.V. v. Stonks Master
Case No. D2026-3427

1. The Parties

The Complainant is Level Devil B.V., Netherlands (Kingdom of the), represented by Poki B.V., Netherlands (Kingdom of the).

The Respondent is Stonks Master, Singapore.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

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

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the “Center”) on August 3, 2026. On August 4, 2026, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On August 5, 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 (Unknown, redacted for privacy, Privacy service provided by Withheld for Privacy ehf) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on August 5, 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 5, 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 6, 2026. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for the Response was August 26, 2026. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent’s default on August 27, 2026.

The Center appointed Jane Seager as the sole panelist in this matter on September 3, 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 company based in the Netherlands (Kingdom of the) and is the owner of the online video game "Level Devil", released in December 2023. The Complainant's related company, Poki B.V., holds an exclusive licence to publish the game on mobile and desktop web platforms. The game is available via Poki B.V.'s website at "www.poki.com".

The Complainant is the owner of United States of America Trademark Registration No. 7887332, LEVEL DEVIL, registered on August 12, 2025 (applied for on September 26, 2024), covering, inter alia, downloadable computer programs for video and computer games, downloadable game software, and related recorded game software in Class 9.

The disputed domain name was registered on July 24, 2025.

The disputed domain name resolves to a website that offers an unauthorized copy of the Complainant's Level Devil game, together with allegedly unlicensed third-party games (the "Respondent's 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.

The Complainant asserts rights in the trademark LEVEL DEVIL. The Complainant submits that the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to its trademark as it wholly incorporates the LEVEL DEVIL trademark. The Complainant argues that, in the context of the gaming industry, the additional term "full" would be understood as referring to a complete version of the Complainant's Level Devil game and would therefore reinforce, rather than dispel, an association with the Complainant's mark.

The Complainant submits that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the disputed domain name. The Complainant asserts that the disputed domain name is not being used in connection with a bona fide offering of goods or services because the associated website offers an unauthorized version of the game and displays the Complainant's trademark, thereby creating a misleading impression of affiliation with the Complainant. The Complainant further asserts that the Respondent has no trademark rights in the name "Level Devil" and submits that the Respondent is not commonly known by that name. The Complainant further contends that the Respondent is not making any legitimate noncommercial or fair use of the disputed domain name. Rather, the Respondent is using the disputed domain name to offer unauthorized copies of Level Devil and other games, to divert Internet users away from legitimate platforms, to compete for search engine rankings relating to the Complainant's trademark, and to generate advertising revenue.

The Complainant submits that the disputed domain name was registered and is being used in bad faith. The Complainant contends that Level Devil was released in December 2023 and had become one of the most popular games on mobile and web platforms before the registration of the disputed domain name. The Complainant further notes that its trademark application was filed on September 26, 2024, well before the disputed domain name was registered on July 24, 2025. According to the Complainant, both the game and

the trademark were therefore known to the relevant gaming public when the disputed domain name was registered.

The Complainant argues that the Respondent intentionally registered and is using the disputed domain name to attract Internet users for commercial gain by creating a likelihood of confusion with the Complainant's trademark. The Complainant submits that users visiting the website may believe that they are accessing an authorized version of the Level Devil game when, in fact, they are accessing an unauthorized copy.

B. Respondent

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

6. Discussion and Findings

In order to prevail, the Complainant must demonstrate on the balance of probabilities that it has satisfied the requirements of paragraph 4(a) of the Policy:

- (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 was 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 Select UDRP Questions ("[WIPO Overview 3.1](#)"), section 1.7.

The Complainant has shown rights in respect of the LEVEL DEVIL trademark for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.2.1. The filing/priority date, date of registration, and date of claimed first use are not considered relevant to the first element test. These factors may, however, bear on a panel's further substantive determination under the second and third elements. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.1.3.

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 the term "full" may bear on the assessment of the second and third elements, the Panel finds that the addition of such a 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.

According to the Complainant, the Complainant has not licensed or otherwise authorized the Respondent to use its LEVEL DEVIL trademark in a domain name or otherwise. As noted above, the Respondent's website provides an unauthorized copy of the Complainant's game. Prior UDRP panels have held that the use of a domain name for such activity does not amount to a bona fide offering of goods or services under paragraph 4(c)(i) of the Policy. See *Scottgames, LLC v. WhoisGuard Protected, WhoisGuard, Inc. / Tran Dai*, WIPO Case No. [DCO2020-0009](#):

"The evidence provided by the Complainant shows that the disputed domain name has been used to resolve to a website that competes with the Complainant by promoting unauthorized and/or pirated playable versions of the Five Nights Games for free, being games which the Complainant offers for sale. According to the present record, therefore, the disputed domain name is not being used in connection with a bona fide offering of goods or services, or for a legitimate noncommercial or fair use."

See also *Scottgames, LLC v. Tien Kieu, Tien Doan / Domain Administrator, See PrivacyGuardian.org; Dung Danh Minh / Contact Privacy Inc. Customer 0146905890*, WIPO Case No. [D2017-0764](#).

There is no evidence to suggest that the Respondent is commonly known by the disputed domain name within the meaning of paragraph 4(c)(ii) of the Policy.

Nor does the Respondent's use of the disputed domain name, as described above, amount to legitimate noncommercial or fair use pursuant to paragraph 4(c)(iii) of the Policy.

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, whether based on the circumstances contemplated by the Policy or otherwise.

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

C. Registered and Used in Bad Faith

The disputed domain name was registered on July 24, 2025, shortly before the Complainant's LEVEL DEVIL trademark matured into registration on August 12, 2025. The Panel has therefore considered whether the fact that the disputed domain name predates the registration of the Complainant's trademark prevents a finding of registration in bad faith.

As noted in [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 3.8, where a respondent registers a domain name before the complainant's trademark rights accrue, panels would not normally find bad faith on the part of the respondent. However, in certain limited circumstances, where the facts establish that the respondent's intent in registering the domain name was to unfairly capitalize on the complainant's nascent trademark rights, panels have found that the domain name was registered in bad faith.

In the present case, the Complainant's Level Devil game was released in December 2023, well before the registration of the disputed domain name. In addition, the Complainant applied to register the LEVEL DEVIL trademark on September 26, 2024, approximately ten months before the Respondent registered the disputed domain name. The trademark application and subsequent registration therefore concerned a designation that the Complainant had already been using in connection with its game.

The composition of the disputed domain name and the use to which it has been put leave little doubt that the Respondent was aware of and specifically targeted the Complainant and its Level Devil game when registering the disputed domain name. The disputed domain name reproduces the LEVEL DEVIL trademark in its entirety, with the addition of the term “full”, which, in the circumstances, may be understood as referring to a complete version of the Complainant’s game. Moreover, the disputed domain name resolves to a website offering an unauthorized copy of the Level Devil game and third-party games.

The Panel therefore finds that the Respondent registered the disputed domain name with the Complainant and its Level Devil game in mind, with the intention of taking unfair advantage of the Complainant’s nascent rights in the LEVEL DEVIL designation. The fact that the Complainant’s trademark was formally registered shortly after the registration of the disputed domain name does not prevent a finding of registration in bad faith in the circumstances of this case. The Panel finds that the disputed domain name was registered in bad faith.

As noted above, the disputed domain name resolves to a website that offers an unauthorized copy of the Complainant’s Level Devil game. The disputed domain name, comprising the Complainant’s LEVEL DEVIL trademark together with the term “full”, is likely to mislead Internet users into believing that the Respondent’s website provides an authorized or complete version of the Complainant’s game. By using the disputed domain name in such a manner, the Respondent diverts Internet users seeking the Complainant’s game to the Respondent’s website.

Prior UDRP panels have found that the use of a domain name in connection with the unauthorized provision or distribution of copyrighted software amounts to use in bad faith. See *Nintendo Co., Ltd v. NameSilo, LLC / Customer Domain Admin, Nice IT Services Group Inc.*, WIPO Case No. [D2020-0344](#):

“The examples of bad faith in Policy paragraph 4(b) are not exclusive, and the Panel also considers that the Respondent’s use of the Domain Name for a site facilitating transactions in pirated or counterfeit goods must also be considered bad faith within the meaning of the Policy, even without evidence of direct profit to the Respondent.”

See also *Adobe Inc. v. Dmitrii Panin*, WIPO Case No. [D2021-0953](#).

In light of the above, the Panel finds that the Respondent’s use of the disputed domain name to provide an unauthorized copy of the Complainant’s game amounts to use in bad faith.

Accordingly, the Panel finds that the disputed domain name was registered and is being used in bad faith. The Complainant has therefore 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 <leveldevilfull.com> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Jane Seager/

Jane Seager

Sole Panelist

Date: September 15, 2026