ARBITRATION
AND
MEDIATION CENTER

WIPO
WORLD
INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY
ORGANIZATION

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

Quickspace Marketing Management LLC v. Sunwin Vibes Limitada, Srdan Andelkovic, OKFUN Group LLC, Khanh Vu Pham, wenrui wang, Thai Hoang Nguyen, Sang Nguyen, Tran Hoang Thai, Tran Hoang Thai, JOHN NINAKA, TX, Vu Duy An, Nguyen Anh, and Srdan Andelkovic ,Sunwin Vibes Limitada
Case No. D2026-4178

1. The Parties

The Complainant is Quickspace Marketing Management LLC, United Arab Emirates, represented by Narong HENG, United Arab Emirates.

The Respondents are Sunwin Vibes Limitada, Srdan Andelkovic, Costa Rica, OKFUN Group LLC, Khanh Vu Pham, United States of America, wenrui wang, Hong Kong, China, Thai Hoang Nguyen, Viet Nam, Sang Nguyen, Cambodia, Tran Hoang Thai, Viet Nam, Tran Hoang Thai, Viet Nam, JOHN NINAKA, TX, Viet Nam, Vu Duy An, Viet Nam, Nguyen Anh, Viet Nam, and Srdan Andelkovic,Sunwin Vibes Limitada, Costa Rica.

2. The Domain Names and Registrars

The disputed domain names <hitclub-mobi.club>, <hitclub.net>, <hitclub2026.bz>, <hitclub2026.cc>, <hitclub888.net>, <789clubvip.net> and <hlt.club> are registered with NameCheap, Inc.

The disputed domain name <789clubxs.vip> is registered with Dynadot Inc.

The disputed domain name <789clud.tv> is registered with Spaceship, Inc.

The disputed domain names <hitclubx.win>, <hit2026.club>, <hltclub.app>, <taixiuhit.club>, <taixiu789.club>, <trangchuhit.club>, <789cllub.win>, <789-club.cv>, <789clubx.win>, <789clubz.app>, <789club2026.net> are registered with Nicenic International Group Co., Limited.

The registrars are collectively referred to below as the “Registrar”.

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the “Center”) on September 17, 2026. On September 18, 2026, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain names. On September 19, 20, 21, 2026, the 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 Respondent (Uknown) and contact information in the Complaint.

The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on September 23, 2026, with the registrant and contact information of nominally multiple underlying registrants revealed by the Registrar(s), requesting the Complainant to either file separate complaint(s) 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 an amended Complaint on September 28, 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 Respondents of the Complaint, and the proceedings commenced on October 12, 2026. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was November 1, 2026. The Respondents did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondents' default on November 2, 2026.

The Center appointed Deanna Wong Wai Man as the sole panelist in this matter on November 5, 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 incorporated in the United Arab Emirates. It describes its business as providing entertainment gaming platforms, mobile application games and related services, operating in regulated jurisdictions through authorised licensees. The Complainant states that it has used the domain name <789.club> since 2014 and <hit.club> since 2020. The submitted Wayback Machine records show a number of captures of the former between March 2017 and April 2026, and a number of captures of the latter between December 2021 and May 2026.

The Complainant relies on registered rights in the HITCLUB and 789.CLUB marks, among others. The registrations include Deutsches Patent- und Markenamt (German Patent and Trade Mark Office), Registration No. 302025110859, for 789.CLUB, registered on June 17, 2025; and European Union Intellectual Property Office ("EUIPO"), Registration No. 019188307, for HIT.CLUB, registered on August 31, 2025. The Complainant also owns additional registrations for a series of HITCLUB, HIT CLUB, HIT-CLUB and 789CLUB marks in the European Union, Germany, the United Kingdom, and the United States.

The 20 disputed domain names were registered on the following dates: <hitclub.net> on January 5, 2019 (i.e. before the registration date of the Complainant's trademarks); <hlt.club> on October 19, 2025; <taixiu789.club> on January 3, 2026; <789cllub.win> on January 9, 2026; <trangchuhit.club> on January 17, 2026; <789clubz.app> on January 24, 2026; <taixiuhit.club> on January 31, 2026; <789club2026.net> and <hit2026.club> on February 1, 2026; <789clubx.win> on February 2, 2026; <hitclub888.net> on February 6, 2026; <hitclub2026.cc> on February 15, 2026; <hitclubx.win> on February 22, 2026; <hitclub2026.bz> on February 25, 2026; <789clubvip.net> on March 23, 2026; <hitclub-mobi.club> on May 14, 2026; <hltclub.app> on May 16, 2026; <789clubxs.vip> on June 3, 2026; <789clud.tv> on June 14, 2026; and <789-club.cv> on June 16, 2026. The website captures provided by the Complainant show gambling-related material using HITCLUB and/or 789CLUB branding, including casino splash pages, game-lobby pages, geo-restriction notices and redirect notices. The captures include a Vietnamese-language betting page at <789clubxs.vip> and a gold HITCLUB splash page at <hitclub.net>. The monitoring records

classify a number of the domains as “Scam Detected” or “Phishing Detected” and record takedown activity. The Complainant also records a redirect from <789clud.tv> to <789-club.cv>. In a domain-status check dated October 12, 2026, most of the disputed domains were inaccessible or returned error pages; <hitclub.net> returned 301 redirects, while <789clubvip.net> returned a 301 response. Upon the Panel’s review, on the date of this Decision the disputed domain names all lead to inactive or error pages.

The original Complaint named Sunwin Vibes Limitada, represented by Srdan Andelkovic as Respondents. Following registrar verification, the Center disclosed different underlying registrants and the Complainant amended the Complaint to add them as Respondents. The registrar records identify ten of the disputed domain names as registered to Andelkovic/Sunwin Vibes Limitada, two to Khanh Vu Pham/OKFUN Group LLC, one to Thai Hoang Nguyen, two to Tran Hoang Thai, one to Nguyen Anh, and the remaining four to Vu Duy An, wenrui wang, Sang Nguyen, and John Ninaka, respectively.

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 names.

Notably, the Complainant contends that it has registered and unregistered trademark rights in HITCLUB and 789CLUB, and that all 20 disputed domain names incorporate those marks or recognizable variations of them. It submits that the addition of letters or numbers, including “888” and “2026”, the insertion or omission of letters, deliberate misspellings such as “cllub”, “clud” and “hlt”, the use of a hyphen, and the addition of other terms do not prevent the marks from remaining recognizable within the disputed domain names.

The Complainant further contends that the Respondents have no authorization or consent to use its marks and are not commonly known by the disputed domain names. It submits that the domain names have been used for gambling-related websites displaying the Complainant’s HITCLUB and/or 789CLUB branding, including casino splash pages, game-lobby pages and related promotional material, in connection with services competing with those offered by the Complainant. It argues that this use is neither a bona fide offering of goods or services nor legitimate noncommercial or fair use, but is intended to mislead Internet users as to the source, sponsorship or affiliation of the websites and to divert them for commercial gain. The Complainant also relies on the website screenshots and takedown reports submitted with the Amended Complaint.

As to bad faith, the Complainant contends that the Respondents registered and used the disputed domain names with knowledge of and intent to target its marks. It relies on the deliberate incorporation of HITCLUB and 789CLUB, the variations and misspellings used in the domain names, and their use for competing gambling websites displaying the Complainant’s branding. It further relies on the correspondence sent to the Respondents: a cease-and-desist notice dated September 12, 2025, concerning 789.CLUB, followed by a response dated October 12, 2025, in which the Respondent’s legal representatives indicated that its corresponding EUIPO trademark application would be withdrawn; and a further notice dated November 14, 2025, concerning HITCLUB, to which the Complainant says it received no response. The Complainant also relies on the Respondents’ subsequent HITCLUB trademark application and the related UK cancellation proceedings. In addition, it points to the use of privacy services and different nominal registrants, the shared registration and website characteristics relied upon in support of common control, the monitoring records showing scam or phishing classifications and takedown activity, and the prior UDRP decisions involving Respondents Sunwin Vibes Limitada, Srdan Andelkovic and other Respondents named in this proceeding. It characterizes this history as a pattern of targeting the Complainant’s marks and preventing the Complainant and other trademark owners from reflecting their marks in corresponding domain names, and relies in particular on paragraphs 4(b)(ii), 4(b)(iii) and 4(b)(iv) of the Policy.

B. Respondents

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

6. Discussion and Findings

6.1 First Preliminary Issue: Consolidation of the 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.

The disputed domain name registrants did not comment on the Complainant's request.

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 Selected UDRP Questions, ("WIPO Overview 3.1"), section 4.11.2.

The Panel shall first address the assessment of common control for all disputed domain names except for <hitclub888.net>, which shall be dealt with in the following paragraph. The Panel has carefully reviewed all elements of this case, giving particular weight to the following elements and facts: (a) these 19 disputed domain names all consist of the Complainant's HITCLUB and/or 789CLUB trademarks, or recognisable variations thereof, including the addition of letters and numbers, hyphenation and deliberate misspellings thereby exposing a pattern; (b) with the exception of <hitclub.net>, the disputed domain names were registered within a relatively short period, between October 2025 and June 2026, with nine of them registered between January 3 and February 15, 2026; (c) the registrar disclosures establish direct registration links among the principal group of domain names, with ten registered to Srdan Andelkovic and Sunwin Vibes Limitada, nine of which share the same registrant email address and telephone number, while the tenth carries the same registrant name, organization, and business address. The other disclosed registrants of several domain names, including Tran Hoang Thai, Thai Hoang Nguyen, Khanh Vu Pham of OKFUN Group LLC and Nguyen Anh, were also respondents in earlier proceedings involving Sunwin Vibes Limitada and Srdan Andelkovic in which the respective panel assessed there was common control between those entities, including notably *Sunwin Information Technology LLC v. Lucas Brown, Hai Nguyen, thi Anh vy, FBD, nguyen van nam, DUC THINH PHAN, Sunwin Vibes Limitada, Srdan Andelkovic, OKFUN Group LLC, Khanh Vu Pham, Anna Whit, Maltese Gamble Studio, Nguyen Viet Hoang, Jean Dupont, NGUYỄN HỒNG QUÂN, NICHESPRING, Hoang Nguyen Viet, Ninaka, hung le, Lam Hoai Hien, Thai Hoang Nguyen, Gem Mod, Tran Hoang Thai, quang dung, withLife138, anh van, thientranvan tran, Bui Duc, Sau, Nguyen Anh, Baron Viet*, WIPO Case No. D2026-3123; (d) the registration and website records further disclose shared Cloudflare nameserver infrastructure among a number of the domain names, as well as the use of the same contact address on several captured websites and in the registrar-disclosed contact details for disputed domain name <hitclub2026.cc>. The website evidence also shows recurring design and content features, including purple 789CLUB casino splash pages and geo-restriction notices; and (e) the website histories of <789clubvip.net> and <789clubxs.vip> show gambling-related material using 789CLUB branding, including a purple casino splash page and a Vietnamese-language betting page, respectively, together with monitoring records of scam detections and takedown activity. In addition, <hitclub.net> displayed a dark-background, gold HITCLUB-branded Vietnamese-language casino page, with design features consistent with those appearing on <hlt.club>. As to disputed domain name <hitclub.net>, its disclosed registrant is John Ninaka. The surname "Ninaka" also appears among the respondents in the abovementioned WIPO Case No. D2026-3123, who were found to be acting under common control in that case. Although the evidence

before the Panel do not include a substantive printout of the website at <hitclub.net> showing its content or branding, the Panel considers the pattern of the composition of this disputed domain name connecting it with the others and notes, based on its own research of public records, that "Ninaka" is an uncommon surname in the Complainant's and the Respondents' jurisdictions, and the Panel therefore finds on the balance of probabilities that John Ninaka is very likely the same individual identified by that surname in the earlier proceeding. Considering these factors cumulatively, the Panel finds that the 19 disputed domain names are, on balance of probabilities, subject to common control.

By contrast, the Panel finds that the evidence does not sufficiently prove common control of, nor does it establish a sufficient connection between disputed domain name <hitclub888.net> and the other disputed domain names. This disputed domain name was registered through Namecheap on February 6, 2026, by Sang Nguyen, who is not among the individuals identified in the earlier proceedings, nor clearly associated with Sunwin Vibes Limitada and Andelkovic, and whose disclosed contact information is not clearly connected to that of the other Respondents. The Complainant essentially merely relies on the addition of "888" to HITCLUB, the use of a privacy service and the monitoring record showing a "Scam Detected" classification on the registration date, followed by takedown on 8 February 2026. However, the Panel finds that these circumstances do not establish common control with the other disputed domain names. In particular, the Panel notes that the Complainant's own summary table identifies no associated domain, matching website template or on-page contact address for <hitclub888.net>. The Panel finds that the mere naming pattern and use of a privacy service, without further corroborating evidence or precedents involving this individual, are insufficient to link the domain to the other Respondents. Accordingly, the Panel excludes <hitclub888.net> from the consolidated proceeding, without prejudice to the filing by the Complainant of a new complaint regarding this disputed domain name. For the rest of this Decision, references to the "disputed domain names" shall refer to the 19 remaining disputed domain names after the exclusion of <hitclub888.net>.

As regards fairness and equity, the Panel sees no reason why consolidation of the disputes would be unfair or inequitable to any Party. The Panel also notes that the Respondents did not object to consolidation and did not respond.

Accordingly, the Panel agrees to the consolidation of the disputes regarding the nominally different registrants of the 19 aforementioned disputed domain names (referred to below as "the Respondent") in a single proceeding.

6.2 Findings on the Merits

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 Panel finds that the Complainant's marks are recognizable within all of 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 here, the numerals "2026", the letters "x" and "z", and terms such as "vip", "xs", "mobi", "taixiu" and "trangchu", as well as hyphens and misspellings such as "cllub", "clud" and "hlt", 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 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 names. 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 names such as those enumerated in the Policy or otherwise.

The Panel notes that the Complainant has not licensed, authorized or otherwise permitted the Respondent to use its HITCLUB or 789CLUB trademarks, or to register any domain name incorporating those trademarks. Further, there is no evidence that the Respondent is affiliated with the Complainant in any way, or that it has been commonly known by the disputed domain names within the meaning of paragraph 4(c)(ii) of the Policy.

The Panel also finds that there is no evidence that the Respondent has used, or made demonstrable preparations to use, the disputed domain names in connection with a bona fide offering of goods or services. The evidence of screen captures submitted by the Complainant shows that certain of the disputed domain names previously resolved to pages displaying the Complainant's HITCLUB or 789CLUB branding, including casino splash pages and game-related content, while others displayed geo-restriction or redirect notices. Such use, in the circumstances of this case, constitutes an attempt to create a false impression of association with the Complainant and cannot constitute a bona fide offering of goods or services. Further, insofar as the captured pages promoted casino and gambling-related services, such use is also commercial in nature and cannot be regarded as legitimate noncommercial or fair use within the meaning of paragraph 4(c)(iii) of the Policy.

The Panel further notes that certain of the disputed domain names did not previously resolve to active websites and that, as at the date of this Decision, all of the disputed domain names resolve to inactive websites or return error messages. The Panel finds that holding the disputed domain names passively, without making any active use of them, does not confer any rights or legitimate interests on the Respondent in the circumstances of this case (see, in this regard, earlier UDRP decisions such as *Bollore SE v. 赵竹飞 (Zhao Zhu Fei)*, WIPO Case No. D2020-0691, and *Vente-Privee.Com and Vente-Privee.com IP S.à.r.l. v. 崔郡 (jun cui)*, WIPO Case No. D2021-1685).

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

C. Registered and Used in Bad Faith

As a preliminary issue, the Panel needs to address the prior registration date of the disputed domain name <hitclub.net>, which was registered on January 5, 2019, i.e. predating the Complainant's trademark rights in HITCLUB and HIT.CLUB. However, as the WIPO Overview 3.1, section 3.8.1 states "irrespective of the original creation date, if a respondent acquires a domain name after the complainant's trademark rights

accrue, the panel will look to the circumstances at the date the UDRP respondent itself acquired the domain name". In the circumstances of this case, the Panel finds that the following elements establish an inference that this disputed domain name was actually acquired by the Respondent in or around January 2026: (a) the registrar has disclosed John Ninaka as the registrant, whom the Panel has found above, on the balance of probabilities, to be the same individual identified by the surname "Ninaka" in WIPO Case No. D2026-3123, supra, and involved in a pattern of bad faith behavior; (b) further, the WhoIs record shows an "Updated Date" of March 10, 2026, (c) the monitoring history records no gambling- or scam-related content before January 20, 2026, when the domain first began displaying a gold HITCLUB splash page, followed by a "Scam Detected" finding on February 18, 2026, and (d) recurring takedown and resurrection activity through July 2026. Additionally, the Panel notes that the Respondent has not filed a Response to rebut this inference or provided any evidence of their continuous ownership of the domain name continuously since its original registration in 2019. Therefore, although no transfer of this disputed domain name is expressly established in the evidence, the Panel finds that the facts support the unrebutted inference that the Respondent acquired the domain name in or around January 2026, i.e. after the Complainant's HITCLUB rights had arisen and the Panel shall consider January 2026 to be the relevant date to assess the Respondent's bad faith as regards this disputed domain name in this case.

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 finds that, on the balance of probabilities, the Respondent registered the disputed domain names with knowledge of the Complainant and its HITCLUB and 789CLUB trademarks. The Complainant's screen capture evidence filed in this case shows that it has used the 789.CLUB brand since at least March 2017 and the HIT.CLUB and HITCLUB brands since 2021, i.e. prior to the relevant date to assess the bad faith in registration of the disputed domain names. The Panel considers that the Complainant's established use of them in connection with its business makes it unlikely that the Respondent independently selected the same or closely similar names by coincidence. A simple trademark database or Internet search prior to registration would have disclosed the Complainant's marks and its associated business at the time of registration of the disputed domain names.

The Respondent's awareness is further supported by the cease-and-desist correspondence exchanged in 2025, which preceded the registration of the disputed domain names (other than the original 2019 registration of <hitclub.net>). Additionally, these conclusions are also reinforced by the subsequent use of certain disputed domain names for websites displaying the Complainant's HITCLUB or 789CLUB branding in connection with casino and gambling-related content, in a manner suggesting an association with the Complainant. While not all of the disputed domain names are shown to have been used in this way, the historical website evidence, considered together with their composition and the other circumstances of the case, supports the inference that the Respondent deliberately targeted the Complainant's trademarks when registering them. Accordingly, the Panel finds that the disputed domain names were registered in bad faith.

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.

As to use in bad faith, the Panel finds that the historical evidence demonstrates that certain of the disputed domain names were used to intentionally attract, for commercial gain, Internet users to websites or online pages by creating a likelihood of confusion with the Complainant's HITCLUB and 789CLUB trademarks as to the source, sponsorship, affiliation or endorsement of the websites and the services offered there. In particular, the monitoring records show that <789clubvip.net> resolved to a purple "789CLUB" casino splash page, <789clubxs.vip> displayed a branded Vietnamese-language online betting splash page, and <hitclub.net> displayed a gold "HITCLUB XANH" splash page. Other disputed domain names were also recorded as resolving to pages displaying 789CLUB or related branding, including casino or game-related content. The Panel considers that such use falls within the circumstances described in paragraph 4(b)(iv) of the Policy.

As regards those of the disputed domain names that did not previously resolve to active websites, and as regards the fact that, as at the date of this Decision, the disputed domain names all direct to inactive or error pages, the Panel highlights that panels applying the Policy have found that the non-use of a domain name (including a blank or "coming soon" page) would not by itself prevent a finding of bad faith under the doctrine of passive holding. To the contrary, in looking at the totality of circumstances in each case, panels have found that the registration and non-use of a domain name can still constitute bad faith for purposes of the Policy. WIPO Overview 3.1, section 3.3. Having reviewed the available record, the Panel notes the distinctiveness of the Complainant's trademark, the composition of the disputed domain names, and the unlikelihood of good faith use by the Respondent and finds that in the circumstances of this case the passive holding of the disputed domain names does not prevent a finding of bad faith under the Policy.

Finally, the Panel further notes that the present case forms part of a broader pattern of conduct involving the Respondent. In four previous UDRP proceedings brought by the Complainant against the Respondent,[1] prior panels ordered the transfer of domain names incorporating the Complainant's HITCLUB and 789CLUB marks, or variations thereof, employing substantially the same naming conventions found in the present case. In three of those proceedings, the Panels also found that the Respondent had used nominee registrants, privacy services, and multiple registrars. Considered together with the evidence in this proceeding, this Panel finds that this supports a finding that the Respondent has engaged in a pattern of bad faith conduct within the meaning of paragraph 4(b)(ii) of the Policy, and further reinforces the Panel's conclusion that the disputed domain names were registered and are 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 names <hitclub-mobi.club>, <hitclub.net>, <hitclubx.win>, <hitclub2026.bz>, <hitclub2026.cc>, <hit2026.club>, <hlt.club>, <hltclub.app>, <taixiuhit.club>, <taixiu789.club>, <trangchuhit.club>, <789cllub.win>, <789-club.cv>, <789clubvip.net>, <789clubxs.vip>, <789clubx.win>, <789clubz.app>, <789club2026.net> and <789clud.tv> be transferred to the Complainant.

For the foregoing reasons, the Complaint is denied without prejudice for <hitclub888.net>.

/Deanna Wong Wai Man/
Deanna Wong Wai Man
Sole Panelist
Date: November 12, 2026

[1] *Quickspace Marketing Management LLC v. Sunwin Vibes Limitada*, WIPO Case No. D2025-5044; *Quickspace Marketing Management LLC v. Srdan Andelkovic, Sunwin Vibes Limitada, Minh Thong Tran, and Tran Hoang Thai,* WIPO Case No. D2026-1196; *Quickspace Marketing Management LLC v. Srdan Andelkovic, Sunwin Vibes Limitada, Tran Hoang Thai, Thai Hoang Nguyen*, WIPO Case No. D2026-2219; *Quickspace Marketing Management LLC v. Srdan Andelkovic, Sunwin Vibes Limitada, nguyen van nam, Thai Hoang Nguyen,* WIPO Case No. D2026-2628.