

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

Guruflow Team Ltd v. Konstantin Danilidi
Case No. DEC2025-0001

1. The Parties

The Complainant is Guruflow Team Ltd, Cyprus, represented by IG Lawyers Limited, United Kingdom.

The Respondent is Konstantin Danilidi, Kazakhstan.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <pinup.ec> is registered with NIC.EC (the “Registrar”).

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the “Center”) on November 7, 2025. On November 7, 2025, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On November 7, 2025, the Registrar transmitted by email to the Center its verification response confirming that the Respondent is listed as the registrant and providing the contact details.

On November 12, 2025 the Center informed the parties in Spanish and English, that the language of the registration agreement for the disputed domain name is Spanish. On November 20, 2025, the Complainant confirmed its request that English be the language of the proceeding and filed an Amended Complaint.

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 November 21, 2025. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was December 11, 2025. The Response was filed with the Center on December 11, 2025.

The Center appointed Manuel Moreno-Torres as the sole panelist in this matter on December 16, 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 operates as a Cyprus-registered technology and licensing company in the online gambling (iGaming) sector.

The Complainant holds a portfolio in different jurisdictions. As such and before the National Service of Intellectual Rights, the Complainant holds PIN-UP trademark dated March 24, 2022.

The disputed domain name <pinup.ec> was registered on June 12, 2023 and redirects to an online casino where a modified version of Complainant's logo is displayed. On this site it is stated in Spanish that: "[t]he casino accepts multiple payment methods, including bank cards and cryptocurrencies. Join Pin Up and enjoy the excitement with attractive bonuses and 24-hour customer support". It also includes in Spanish the message "welcome bonus of US 500". Further, the website registration form redirects to a third gaming provider.

5. Language of the proceeding

The language of the administrative proceeding shall be English as agreed by the parties.

6. On the allegation about the lack of authorization of the Complainant's representative

The Panel notes that the UDRP procedure is administrative and, the parties' authorization is deemed to exist on a filed complaint or response without the Policy expressly requiring the submission of a notarized power of attorney. The Amended Complaint includes a certification that the information contained in the Complaint "is to the best of the Complainant's knowledge complete and accurate", and the Amended Complaint identifies IG LAWYERS LIMITED as the "Complainant's authorized representative in this administrative proceeding".

While the Policy and the Rules do not require expressly the submission of the document by virtue of which the Complainant's representative is entitled to submit a Complaint on behalf of the Complainant, the Panel considers that it is a good practice to submit evidence of an authorization to act as representative of the corresponding party.

For the purpose of the present case, the Panel does not find any reason to doubt that the Complainant's representative is, as he represents, the authorized representative of Complainant in the current proceedings. In the absence of any reason to doubt its authority, the Panel is prepared to accept that the law firm filing the Complaint has been authorized to do so by the Complainant.

Accordingly, the Panel accepts the Complaint as submitted.

7. 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 Respondent uses the disputed domain name to attract users for commercial gain via casino bonuses and payment integrations, creating a likelihood of confusion as to source, sponsorship, affiliation or endorsement. Besides, the Respondent impersonates the Complainant in Ecuador disrupting its business.

B. Respondent

The Respondent contends that the Complainant has not satisfied all three of the elements required under the Policy for a transfer of the disputed domain name.

The Respondent also alleges that the Complaint raises doubt that Complainant's representatives are legitimate, or that the Complaint is filed with the authorization of any valid trademark owner.

Regarding the first requirement, the Respondent asserts that the disputed domain name is not confusingly similar to the Complainant's alleged trademark because it consists of the single, common English expression "pinup", which has a well-established generic and descriptive meaning relating to imagery and illustration. Further, the Complainant operates through www.pin-up.world where the hyphen and the generic Top Level Domain (gTLD) ".world" avoids similarity between his disputed domain name with Complainant's rights. Indeed, the Respondent affirms that Internet users will not assume affiliation between both parties because the existent differences between the TLD and Country Code (cc) at stake.

The Respondent also asserts that the disputed domain name is used only for fair commentary and review purposes. That is to say, the goal of the website at "www.pinup.ec" is solely to provide independent reviews and informational commentary regarding Complainant's online casino platform on a noncommercial review website basis which does not divert customers, does not compete with the Complainant, and does not interfere with its commercial operations. Thus, the Respondent denies any attempt to impersonate the Complainant nor is a competitor.

Finally, the Respondent contends that the Complainant has failed to satisfy paragraph 4(a)(iii) of the Policy, as none of the circumstances listed under paragraph 4(b), nor any other, are present in this case

8. Discussion and Findings

Under paragraph 4(a) of the Policy, to succeed the Complainant must satisfy the Panel that:

- (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 Selected UDRP Questions, Third Edition ([“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 Panel finds the mark is recognizable 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 redaction of the hyphen may bear on assessment of the second and third elements, the Panel finds that such redaction 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 country code Top-Level Domain “.ec” can be disregarded under this element, see section 1.11 of the [WIPO Overview 3.0](#).

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).

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.

While the Policy in paragraph 4 (c) takes into consideration the three illustrative examples of Respondent rights, the Panel finds no evidence that any of them is met in this case.

Panels have held that the use of a domain name for illegal activity here, claimed as applicable to this case: impersonation/passing off can never confer rights or legitimate interests on a respondent. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 2.13.1. The evidence shows what the Panel considers as an attempt to impersonate the Complainant and to confuse Internet users when they access Respondent’s website based on the following circumstances: Complainant’s modified version of its trademark is reproduced, the composition of the disputed domain makes Complainant’s mark recognizable. While the Respondent claims that the purpose of the disputed domain name is “solely to provide independent reviews and informational commentary regarding the Complainant’s online casino platform”, the Panel notes the mentioned similarities between the disputed domain name, its website (which refers to welcome bonus or vouchers of “US 500”), and the Complainant’s mark. This is not legitimate in terms of the Policy even if the actual intention of the Respondent was to be to provide information about the Complainant, as there is a risk of a likelihood of confusion with the Complainant.

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 intentionally attempted to attract, for commercial gain, Internet users by creating a likelihood of confusion with the Complainant's mark in the terms as described in paragraph 4 b)(iv) of the Policy.

In addition, the Panel looks at [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 3.1.3: "panels have applied the notion of a 'competitor' beyond the concept of an ordinary commercial or business competitor to also include the concept of 'a person who acts in opposition to another' for some means of commercial gain, direct or otherwise." Being that as it is the circumstance of the case matches with paragraph 4b) (iii) of the Policy: "you have registered the domain name primarily for the purpose of disrupting the business of a competitor". Even if the Respondent claims not to be a competitor, the Panel considers it to be in the broader sense of the term, even if considering it from the perspective of the fact that some Internet users may reach the Respondent's website when intending to reach the Complainant.

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 3.0](#), section 3.2.1.

The Panel finds that the Respondent has not provided a reasonable explanation for the choice of the disputed domain name and the reproduction of the trademark on its website. While the Respondent claimed that the disputed domain name is used to provide a review of the Complainant's casino services clearly identifying the site as an independent review resource and not as an official site of the Complainant, the Panel finds that the prominent use of the Complainant's trademark on the website together with its use is inherently misleading.

Furthermore, the evidence shows how Internet users were redirected to a competitors' website through the disputed domain name. This further demonstrates that the Respondent aimed to benefit from the reputation and goodwill of the Complainant's trademark.

These circumstances allow to conclude that the Respondent knew of the Complainant and its trademarks at the moment of the registration of the disputed domain name, and that it has used it in bad faith.

The Panel finds that the Complainant has established the third element of the Policy.

9. 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 <pinup.ec> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Manuel Moreno-Torres/

Manuel Moreno-Torres

Sole Panelist

Date: December 30, 2025