

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

C Digital Technologies Limited, Casumo Services Limited v. Kelly Green
Case No. DCC2025-0014

1. The Parties

The Complainants are C Digital Technologies Limited and Casumo Services Limited, Malta, represented by Abion AB, Switzerland.

The Respondent is Kelly Green, United States of America ("United States").

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <casumogame.cc> is registered with Hosting Concepts B.V. d/b/a Registrar.eu. (the "Registrar").

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the "Center") on July 22, 2025. On July 23, 2025, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On July 24, 2025, 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) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainants on July 24, 2025, providing the registrant and contact information disclosed by the Registrar, and inviting the Complainants to submit an amendment to the Complaint. The Complainants filed an amended Complaint on July 28, 2025.

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 July 31, 2025. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was August 20, 2025. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent's default on August 22, 2025.

The Center appointed Catherine Slater as the sole panelist in this matter on September 4, 2025. 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 (as defined below under the heading “Preliminary Issue: Consolidation of Multiple Complainants”) comprises sister companies both incorporated in Malta. Since 2012, it has operated online casino and sports betting services under a portfolio of brands including CASUMO.

The Complainant owns numerous trademark registrations for CASUMO including:

- European Union Trademark 017650391 for CASUMO (plain word mark) registered on April 16, 2018;
- Canadian Trademark TMA1085780 for CASUMO (plain word mark) registered on October 21, 2020;
- United Kingdom Trademark 4105326 for CASUMO (stylized word mark) registered on January 10, 2025.

The afore-mentioned stylized word mark is hereinafter referred to as “the Complainant’s Logo Mark”.

The Complainant owns and operates a website at <casumo.com>, which domain name was registered on March 10, 2011.

The disputed domain name was registered on April 22, 2025.

On June 20, 2025, the disputed domain name resolved to a website (“the Respondent’s Website”) which offered online casino services. The Respondent’s Website displayed the Complainant’s Logo Mark prominently at the top-left of the website. There were two prominently displayed buttons inviting the Internet user to “Log-in” or “Sign-up”. Although the Respondent’s Website is in the Swedish language and no translation has been provided, the Panel nevertheless understands that a heading reads, “Casumo – Best Online Casino Sweden 2025” and a body of text starts, “Welcome to Casumo casino.....”. At the foot of the Respondent’s Website is a copyright notice that reads, “© Casumo. All rights reserved”.

On June 20, 2025, the Complainant’s representative sent a “takedown” request to the website hosting provider.

At both the date of filing the Complaint and at the date of this Decision, the disputed domain name resolves to a parking page.

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 the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to the CASUMO trademark because that trademark is incorporated in its entirety and the addition of the term “game” does not prevent a finding of confusing similarity.

The Complainant further contends that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the disputed domain name because the Complainant has neither licensed or authorized the Respondent to use the CASUMO trademark nor to register the disputed domain name, there is no evidence that the Respondent is commonly known by the disputed domain name or that it owns any trademark registrations including the term “casumo” and “game”, the nature of the disputed domain name and the use to which has been put falsely suggest an affiliation with the Complainant which is not fair use, the use of the disputed domain name with the intent to deceive users cannot constitute legitimate, noncommercial or fair use of the disputed domain name and on the contrary amounts to impersonation and can never confer rights or legitimate interests on the Respondent. Finally, in this regard, the Complainant contends that the Respondent has sought to exploit the CASUMO trademark to create commercial gain for itself.

The Complainant further contends that the disputed domain name was registered and is being used in bad faith. In relation to registration, it contends that it is inconceivable that the Respondent was unaware of the Complainant when it registered the disputed domain name and it can be inferred that it was fully aware given the composition of the disputed domain name (the CASUMO trademark combined with the word “game”, a term descriptive of the Complainant’s services) and that the disputed domain name resolved to a website showing the Complainant’s trademarks. In relation to the use of the disputed domain name, it contends that the Respondent’s Website deceived users by creating a false impression of affiliation with the Complainant.

B. Respondent

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

6. Discussion and Findings

Preliminary Issue: Consolidation of Multiple Complainants

The principles to assess a request to consolidate multiple complainants are set out in the WIPO Overview of WIPO Panel Views on Selected UDRP Questions, Third Edition ([“WIPO Overview 3.0”](#)), section 4.11.1. Noting the circumstances of the case, the Panel finds that the Complainants have a specific common grievance against the Respondent, and that it would be equitable and procedurally efficient to permit the consolidation. The record shows that both C Digital Technologies Limited and Casumo Services Limited are sister companies and both own trademark registrations for CASUMO. Accordingly, the Panel accepts the Complainants’ request to consolidate the present proceedings pursuant to the Rules, paragraph 10(e). The Complainants are therefore referred to together in this Decision as the “Complainant”.

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 3.0](#), section 1.7.

The Complainant has shown rights in respect of a trademark or service mark for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 1.2.1.

The entirety of the CASUMO 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 3.0](#), section 1.7.

Although the addition of other terms here, “game”, 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 3.0](#), 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 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 3.0](#), 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 record shows that the Respondent used the disputed domain name to point to the Respondent’s Website which, by reason of its above-identified content, falsely gave Internet users the impression that it was a website of the Complainant. Viewed in conjunction with the choice of domain name itself which contains the Complainant’s distinctive trademark with the addition of a descriptive term (“game”), the Panel finds that there is an obvious intention to take advantage of the goodwill attaching to the CASUMO trademark and the Complainant’s Logo Mark. Such use cannot therefore give rise to rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name.

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.

The Panel finds it inconceivable that, at the time of registration of the disputed domain name, the Respondent was unaware of the Complainant and/or the Complainant’s trademarks. The knowledge of the Respondent is demonstrated by the fact that after registration, the Respondent pointed the disputed domain name to a website that displayed the Complainant’s Logo Mark and offered services identical to the Complainant (online casino services). In short, the Respondent targeted the Complainant by registering the disputed domain name for the purpose of impersonating the Complainant which, as discussed below, amounts to “bad faith use”.

Paragraph 4(b)(iv) of the Policy sets out an example circumstance that amounts to use in bad faith as follows:

“by using the domain name, you have intentionally attempted to attract, for commercial gain, Internet users to your website or other on-line location, by creating a likelihood of confusion with the complainant’s mark as to the source, sponsorship, affiliation, or endorsement of your website or location or of a product or service on your website or location.”

The Respondent used the disputed domain name to point to the Respondent's Website which falsely gave Internet users the impression that it was a website of the Complainant. The panel infers that such use can be for nothing other than commercial gain. In so doing, the Respondent used the disputed domain name to intentionally attempt to attract, for commercial gain, Internet users to its website, by creating a likelihood of confusion with the Complainant's trademarks as to the source, sponsorship, affiliation or endorsement of its website. The Panel therefore finds that the disputed domain name has been used in bad faith in accordance with the circumstance set out in paragraph 4(b)(iv) of 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 <casumogame.cc> be transferred to C Digital Technologies Limited.

/Catherine Slater/

Catherine Slater

Sole Panelist

Date: September 18, 2025