

PANEL DECISION

Granturo Platform Ltd v. Magdalena Joanna Tambelli, Digitwind, UAB
Case No. DEU2025-0032

1. The Parties

The Complainant is Granturo Platform Ltd, Malta, represented by Wilmark Oy, Finland.

The Respondent is Magdalena Joanna Tambelli, Digitwind, UAB, Lithuania.

2. The Domain Name, Registry and Registrar

The Registry of the disputed domain name <wildz-casino.eu> is the European Registry for Internet Domains (“EURid” or the “Registry”). The Registrar of the disputed domain name is TLD Registrar Solutions Ltd. (“the Registrar”).

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the “Center”) on December 4, 2025. On December 4, 2025, the Center transmitted by email to the Registry a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On December 5, 2025, the Registry 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 and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on January 13, 2026, providing the registrant and contact information disclosed by the Registry, and inviting the Complainant to submit an amendment to the Complaint. In response to a notification by the Center that the Complaint was administratively deficient, the Complainant filed an amendment to the Complaint on January 21, 2026.

The Center verified that the Complaint together with the amendment to the Complaint satisfied the formal requirements of the .eu Alternative Dispute Resolution Rules (the “ADR Rules”) and the World Intellectual Property Organization Supplemental Rules for .eu Alternative Dispute Resolution Rules (the “Supplemental Rules”).

In accordance with the ADR Rules, Paragraph B(2), the Center formally notified the Respondent of the Complaint, and the proceedings commenced on January 22, 2026. In accordance with the ADR Rules, Paragraph B(3), the due date for Response was February 11, 2026. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent’s default on February 12, 2026.

The Center appointed Zoltán Takács as the sole panelist in this matter on February 16, 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 ADR Rules, Paragraph B(5).

4. Factual Background

The Complainant is an Internet gaming company based in Malta licensed and regulated by the Malta Gaming Authority under license MGA/B2C/599/2018.

The Complainant operates several online casinos, one of them being the online casino under the name Wildz Casino accessible at the “www.wildz.com” website. The corresponding domain name <wildz.com> was registered on May 13, 1999.

The Complainant is among others owner of the European Union Trade Mark Registration No. 017589813 for the word mark WILDZ, registered since April 25, 2018, for – among others – casino services.

The disputed domain name was registered on April 22, 2025, and has resolved to a German language online gambling website which prominently featured the Complainant’s WILDZ mark. According to the notation at the bottom of the website it was operated by Wildz Casino Ltd, a company supervised by the Malta Gaming Authority. Currently the disputed domain name resolves to a German language webpage stating among others: “Access to this website is restricted” and “To comply with German legal requirements, access to this website is blocked for users from Germany”.

5. Parties’ Contentions

A. Complainant

The Complainant contends that the disputed domain name that reproduces its WILDZ mark in its entirety with addition of the term “casino” is confusingly similar to it.

The Complainant contends that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the disputed domain name and is unable to rely on any of the circumstances set out in Paragraph B(11)(e) of the ADR Rules.

The Complainant claims that due to the recognition of its “Wildz” online casino the Respondent registered the disputed domain name with the Complainant’s business and WILDZ mark in mind intending to unlawfully profit from the reputation attached to the WILDZ mark.

The Complainant requests that the disputed domain name be transferred from the Respondent to the Complainant.

B. Respondent

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

6. Discussion and Findings

According to Paragraph B11(d)(1) of the ADR Rules “the Panel shall issue a decision granting the remedies requested under the Procedural Rules in the event that the Complainant proves in and ADR Proceeding where the Respondent is the holder of a .eu domain name registration in respect of which the Complaint was initiated, that:

- (i) The domain name is identical or confusingly similar to a name in respect of which a right is recognized or established by the national law of a Member State and/or European Union law and; either
- (ii) The domain name has been registered by the Respondent without rights or legitimate interest in the name; or
- (iii) The domain name has been registered or is being used in bad faith”.

The Panel notes that due to the substantive similarities between the ADR Rules and the Uniform Domain Name Dispute Resolution Policy (“UDRP”) it will also refer to UDRP precedents, where appropriate and take into account the WIPO Overview of WIPO Panel Views on Select UDRP Questions (“[WIPO Overview 3.1](#).”).

A. Identical or Confusingly Similar to a name in respect of which a right or rights are recognized or established by national law of a Member State and/or European Union law

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 protected in the territory of the European Union.

The disputed domain name incorporates the entirety of the Complainant’s WILDZ mark and is therefore confusingly similar to it. The addition of the generic term “casino” to the mark in the disputed domain name does not prevent a finding of confusing similarity between the disputed domain name and the mark. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), sections 1.7 and 1.8.

The Panel finds that the requirements of Paragraph B11(d)(1)(i) of the ADR Rules are met.

B. Rights or Legitimate Interests

Paragraph B11(e) of the ADR Rules provides a list of circumstances in which the Respondent may demonstrate rights or legitimate interests in a disputed domain name.

Although pursuant to paragraph B11(d) of the ADR Rules the overall burden of proof that the Respondent has registered the disputed domain name without having rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name 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 3.1](#), 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 ADR Rules or otherwise.

The Complainant has not licensed, permitted, or authorized the Respondent to use its WILDZ mark in a domain name or in any other way.

The disputed domain name was used by the Respondent to attract Internet users to its online gambling website that prominently displayed the Complainant's WILDZ mark. These facts cannot establish any rights or legitimate interests on the Respondent regarding the disputed domain name since the composition of the disputed domain name (consisting of the Complainant's mark plus the Complainant's industry-specific term "casino") effectively impersonates or suggests sponsorship or endorsement by the trademark owner. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 2.5.1.

The Panel finds that the requirements of paragraph B11(d)(1)(ii) of the ADR Rules are met.

C. Registered or Used in Bad Faith

The Complainant has met the criteria under the paragraph B(11)(d)(1)(ii) of the ADR Rules and thus it is not necessary for the Panel to examine the Complainants' assertions on the Respondent's bad faith registration and or use of the disputed domain name.

However, for the sake of completeness the Panel will also assess the Respondent's bad faith in registration and use of the disputed domain name.

In light of its power under paragraph 7(a) of the ADR Rules, the Panel performed a search at the Google search engine against the disputed domain name and visited the website linked to the disputed domain name in order to obtain more information about the Respondent or its use of the disputed domain name. The Panel also consulted the Internet Archive (www.archive.org) in order to obtain indications of how the disputed domain name was used in the relevant past, and checked the Licensee Register of the Malta Gaming Authority to look into the plausibility of the Respondent's statement on the website about its license and authorization status. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 4.8.

The Complainant's mark which the Respondent fully incorporated into the disputed domain name is distinctive for the services at issue and predates the registration of the disputed domain name. A basic Google search against the disputed domain name returns solely the Complainant and its WILDZ mark.

These facts and circumstances alone convince the Panel that the Respondent had the Complainant's activities and its WILDZ mark in mind at registration of the disputed domain name and had obtained and then used it as mentioned above in order to target the Complainant and its WILDZ mark within the meaning of paragraph B11(f)(4) of the ADR Rules, which is evidence of bad faith registration and use.

As mentioned above, at the website to which the disputed domain name resolved the Respondent claimed that the company that operated the website, Wildz Casino Ltd "is supervised by the Malta Gaming Authority in Malta, which grants approval for online gambling services". This statement appears to be false since the search of the Licensee Register of the Malta Gaming Authority returns no hits, let alone license against either the Respondent or the company the Respondent claimed to have operated the website at the disputed domain name.

In addition, the current use of the disputed domain name as mentioned above, namely to resolve to an access-restricted webpage may falsely suggest to unsuspected users that there is something wrong with the Complainant's online casino license. It creates a real or implied ongoing threat to the Complainant and is further evidence of bad faith.

The Panel finds that the Complainants have also established the criteria set out in paragraph B(11)(d)(1)(iii) of the ADR Rules.

7. Decision

For the foregoing reasons, in accordance with Paragraph B(11)(b) of the ADR Rules, the Panel orders that the disputed domain name <wildz-casino.eu> be transferred to the Complainant.¹

/Zoltán Takács/

Zoltán Takács

Sole Panelist

Date: March 2, 2026

¹ As the Complainant established in Malta, which is the Member State of the European Union it satisfies the general eligibility criteria for registration of the disputed domain name set out in Article 3 of Regulation (EU) 2019/517. The decision shall be implemented by the Registry within thirty (30) days after the notification of the decision to the Parties, unless the Respondent initiates court proceedings in a Mutual Jurisdiction, as defined in Paragraph A(1) of the ADR Rules.