

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

Ocean Star Limited v. Trifon Matveyev and Dynadot Privacy Service, Super Privacy Service LTD c/o Dynadot
Case No. DIO2025-0034

1. The Parties

The Complainant is Ocean Star Limited, Malta, represented Herzog, Fox & Neeman, Israel.

The Respondents are Trifon Matveyev, Estonia and Dynadot Privacy Service, Super Privacy Service LTD c/o Dynadot, United States of America.

2. The Domain Names and Registrars

The disputed domain name <tenbet.io> is registered with NameCheap, Inc.

The disputed domain name <tenbet8.io> is registered with Dynadot Inc (the “Registrars”).

Both disputed domain names are jointly referred to as the “Disputed Domain Names”.

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the “Center”) on August 24, 2025. On August 26, 2025, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrars a request for registrar verification in connection with the Disputed Domain Names. On August 26 and 27, 2025, the Registrars transmitted by email to the Center their verification response disclosing registrant and contact information for the Disputed Domain Names which differed from the named Respondents and contact information in the Complaint.

The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on August 27, 2025, with the registrant and contact information of nominally multiple underlying registrants revealed by the Registrars, requesting the Complainant to either file separate complaints 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 Disputed Domain Names are under common control. The Complainant sent an email communication on August 28, 2025. On August 29, and September 1, 2025, one of the Respondents (and a potential third party) sent email communications to the Center. The Complainant filed an amended Complaint on September 2, 2025. The Complainant and a Respondent sent email communications on September 2, 3, 4 and 8, 2025.

The Center verified that the Complaint together with the amended Complaint satisfied the formal requirements of the .IO Domain Name Dispute Resolution Policy (the “Policy”), the Rules for .IO Domain Name Dispute Resolution Policy (the “Rules”), and the WIPO Supplemental Rules for .IO 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 September 8, 2025. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was September 28, 2025. The Respondents did not submit any formal response. One of the Respondents sent an email communication to the Center on September 29, 2025.

The Center appointed Flip Jan Claude Petillion as the sole panelist in this matter on October 7, 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, Ocean Star Limited, was founded in 2003 and is part of a group of online betting companies offering online sports betting and live casinos. The Complainant has over one million registered customers worldwide and, through its affiliated companies, holds several gambling licenses across various jurisdictions, including the United Kingdom.

The Complainant holds several trademarks for the sign 10BET, including the following:

- 10BET, European Union trade mark (EUTM), registered on August 15, 2019 under No. 018046117 in classes 9 and 41; and
- 10BET, United Kingdom trademark, registered on August 15, 2019 under No. UK00918046117 in classes 9 and 41.

The Disputed Domain Names were registered on the following dates:

- <tenbet.io>: March 18, 2025;
- <tenbet8.io>: April 10, 2025.

According to the Complainant’s evidence, both Disputed Domain Names resolved to an identical website appearing to offer casino services similar to the Complainant’s services. The disputed domain name <tenbet.io> currently redirects to another domain name <tenobet4.io> linked to a nearly identical website, and the disputed domain name <tenbet8.io> is currently inactive.

5. Parties’ Contentions

A. Complainant

The Complainant claims that the Disputed Domain Names are under common control and refers to the Respondents as the “Respondent”.

The Complainant contends that it has satisfied each of the elements required under the Policy for a transfer of the Disputed Domain Names.

First, the Complainant contends that the Disputed Domain Names are nearly identical and confusingly similar to a trademark in which it claims to have rights.

Second, the Complainant claims that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the Disputed Domain Names as, in summary, according to the Complainant:

- the Respondent is not affiliated with any of the companies within the Complainant's group and has never been licensed or otherwise authorized to use the 10BET mark;
- to the best of the Complainant's knowledge, neither the Respondent, nor any business operated by it, is or has ever been commonly known by the Disputed Domain Names;
- the Respondent has not used, or made demonstrable preparations to use, the Disputed Domain Names or any name corresponding to the Disputed Domain Names in connection with a bona fide offering of goods or services. On the contrary, the Respondent is making illegitimate and commercial use of the 10BET Mark within the Disputed Domain Names and the websites linked to these by offering similar services.

Finally, the Complainant claims that the Disputed Domain Names were registered and are being used in bad faith. In summary, according to the Complainant:

- it is clear that the Respondent knew, or at the very least should have known, about the 10BET mark and the Complainant's group operations;
- the Respondent intentionally incorporated the 10BET mark within the Disputed Domain Names to create confusing similarity among consumers, who will inevitably assume that the Disputed Domain Names are affiliated with the Complainant or its group, and to exploit the reputation of the 10BET mark for commercial gain;
- the Respondent's use of privacy services supports the finding of bad faith registration and use.

B. Respondents

The Respondents did not formally reply to the Complainant's contentions. The Center received several informal emails on August 29, September 1, 2, 3, 4, 8 and 29, 2025.

Notably, in an email to the Complainant, a person apparently linked to the Respondents claims, i.e., that the parties' domain names, names and logos are different, that the Respondents' main audience is the UK (United Kingdom), that the Complainant's license is not permitting it to advertise in the UK, and that the disputed domain name <tenbet8.io> has been shut down in proof of good faith. This person also submitted a chart comparing the logo used on the websites linked to the Disputed Domain Names with the logo used on the Complainant's official website.

In other emails, a person apparently linked to the Respondents claims that the disputed domain name <tenbet.io> costs 250,000 EUR and offers to sell it to the Complainant.

6. Discussion and Findings

6.1. Preliminary Procedural Issue: Consolidation of Multiple Domain Names and Respondents

Paragraph 10(e) of the Rules generally empowers panels to consolidate multiple domain name disputes in accordance with the Policy and the Rules. Paragraph 3(c) of the Rules provides that a complaint may relate to more than one domain name only when the domain names are registered by the same domain name holder. Where a complaint is filed against multiple respondents, panels look at whether

- (i) the domain names or corresponding websites are subject to common control; and
- (ii) the consolidation would be fair and equitable to all parties.

Procedural efficiency would also underpin panel consideration of such a consolidation scenario.

Panels have considered a range of factors, typically present in some combination, as useful to determining whether such consolidation is appropriate, such as similarities in or relevant aspects of:

- (i) the registrants' identity(ies) including pseudonyms;
- (ii) the registrants' contact information including email address(es), postal address(es), or phone number(s), including any pattern of irregularities;
- (iii) relevant IP addresses, name servers, or webhost(s);
- (iv) the content or layout of websites corresponding to the disputed domain names;
- (v) the nature of the marks at issue (e.g., where a registrant targets a specific sector);
- (vi) any naming patterns in the disputed domain names (e.g., <mark-country> or <mark-goods>);
- (vii) the relevant language/scripts of the disputed domain names particularly where they are the same as the mark(s) at issue;
- (viii) any changes by the respondent relating to any of the above items following communications regarding the disputed domain name(s);
- (ix) any evidence of respondent affiliation with respect to the ability to control the disputed domain name(s),
- (x) any (prior) pattern of similar respondent behavior or
- (xi) other arguments made by the complainant and/or disclosures by the respondent(s). WIPO Overview of WIPO Panel Views on Selected UDRP Questions, Third Edition ("[WIPO Overview 3.0](#)"), section 4.11.2. ¹

In the present case, the Complainant presented a variety of factors justifying a consolidation scenario, including the following:

- both Disputed Domain Names share the same name servers;
- the websites linked to both Disputed Domain Names shared the same layout and content, and the same email address for support;
- the Disputed Domain Names share an identical naming pattern consisting of (a phonetically and conceptually identical sign to) the Complainant's 10BET trademark in its entirety.

In addition, the Panel observes that a person apparently linked to the Respondents stated in an email to the Complainant that the disputed domain name "<tenbet8.io> has been shut down in proof of good faith, but please leave [the disputed domain name] tenbet.io alone".

In view of the above, the Panel finds that the Disputed Domain Names are subject to the common ownership or control of the same entity or person, which will be referred to as the Respondent. The Panel also considers the consolidation of both Disputed Domain Names to be fair and procedurally efficient.

Accordingly, the Panel concludes that the consolidation of both Disputed Domain Names asserted by the Complainant against the Respondent is consistent with the Policy and Rules. The Panel will proceed to a decision on the merits regarding both Disputed Domain Names.

6.2. Substantive elements of the Policy

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

¹Given the similarities between the .IO Policy and Rules and the Uniform Domain Name Dispute Resolution Policy ("UDRP") and Rules, the Panel refers to UDRP precedent when considered relevant to this case.

a complainant's trademark and the disputed domain names. In some cases, such assessment may also entail a more holistic aural or phonetic comparison of a complainant's trademark and the disputed domain name to ascertain confusing similarity. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 1.7.

Based on the available record, the Panel finds the Complainant has shown rights in respect of trademarks or service marks for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 1.2.1.

Both Disputed Domain Names include the sign "tenbet", which is phonetically and conceptually identical to the Complainant's 10BET mark as "ten" is the word form of the number 10. The disputed domain name <tenbet.io> simply consists of this sign.

The disputed domain name <tenbet8.io> adds the number "8" to the sign. The Panel finds the addition of such term does not prevent a finding of confusing similarity between the disputed domain name and the marks for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 1.8.

Additionally, it is well established that the country-code Top-Level Domain ("ccTLD"), here ".io", may be disregarded when considering whether the Disputed Domain Names are confusingly similar to a trademark in which the Complainant has rights. See *IOTA Foundation v. Privacy Service provided by Withheld for Privacy ehf / Super Green*, WIPO Case No. [DIO2022-0001](#).

In view of the above, the Panel finds that both Disputed Domain Names are confusingly similar to the Complainant's 10BET mark. 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 .IO Policy and 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 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 Respondent has not apparently been commonly known by the Disputed Domain Names, and that the Respondent does not seem to have acquired trademark or service mark rights. According to the information provided by the Registrars, the only name linked to the Respondent which is not a privacy service is "Trifon Matveyev". The Respondent's use and registration of the Disputed Domain Names was not authorized by the Complainant. There are no indications that a connection between the Complainant and the Respondent exists or existed.

Generally speaking, .IO Policy and UDRP panels have found that domain names identical to a complainant's trademark carry a high risk of implied affiliation. Even where a domain name consists of a trademark plus an additional term, UDRP panels have largely held that such composition cannot constitute fair use if it effectively impersonates or suggests sponsorship or endorsement by the trademark owner. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 2.5.1. The disputed domain name <tenbet.io> is phonetically identical to the Complainant's

10BET mark, and the Panel finds that the addition of the single number 8 in the disputed domain name <tenbet8.io> is insufficient to avoid the confusion with the Complainant's trademark.

Beyond looking at the disputed domain name and the nature of any additional terms appended to it, .IO Policy and UDRP panels assess whether the overall facts and circumstances of the case, such as the content of the website linked to a disputed domain name and the absence of a response, support a fair use or not. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), sections 2.5.2 and 2.5.3.

According to the Complainant's undated but undisputed evidence, the Disputed Domain Names resolved to a website appearing to offer casino services similar to those of the Complainant. While the general look and feel of the website and the "Tenbet" logo differs from the Complainant's website and logo, the Panel finds that given the nature of the Disputed Domain Names and other circumstances addressed under the third element below, this neither amounts to a bona fide offering of goods or services nor a legitimate noncommercial or fair use of the Disputed Domain Names.

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

C. Registered or 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. Among these factors demonstrating bad faith registration and use is the use of a domain name to intentionally attempt to attract, for commercial gain, Internet users to a website or other online location, by creating a likelihood of confusion with the complainant's mark as to the source, sponsorship, affiliation, or endorsement of the website or location or of a product or service on the website or location.

In the present case, the Panel finds that the Respondent should have been aware of the Complainant and its trademark rights when it registered the Disputed Domain Names:

- some of the Complainant's 10BET marks predate the registration of the Disputed Domain Names by more than five years;
- the Disputed Domain Names are either phonetically identical to the Complainant's 10BET mark or merely add one number which is insufficient to avoid the confusion with the Complainant's mark;
- the Respondent appears to be active in the same sector as the Complainant, as the website linked to the Disputed Domain Names appear(ed) to offer casino services similar to the Complainant's services;
- a person apparently linked to the Respondent stated that its main audience is the UK. The Complainant has at least one registered trademark covering the UK and appears to be licensed to provide services in the UK.

In the Panel's view, the circumstances of this case indicate that the Respondent has intentionally attempted to attract Internet users to its website for commercial gain by creating a likelihood of confusion with the Complainant's trademark. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 3.2.4.

In addition, the Panel finds that the Respondent's use of multiple privacy services and its offer to sell one of the Disputed Domain Names in excess of the Respondent's documented out-of-pocket costs during the present proceedings are additional indications of bad faith.

By failing to formally respond to the Complaint, the Respondent did not make a significant effort to contest the foregoing. Pursuant to paragraph 14 of the Rules, the Panel may draw the conclusions it considers appropriate.

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, <tenbet.io> and <tenbet8.io> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Flip Jan Claude Petillion/

Flip Jan Claude Petillion

Sole Panelist

Date: October 21, 2025