

## ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

Ninja Global OÜ v. C. F.  
Case No. DLV2026-0001

### 1. The Parties

The Complainant is Ninja Global OÜ, Estonia, represented by AAA Patendibüroo OÜ (AAA Legal Services), Estonia.

The Respondent is C. F., Italy.

### 2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <ninjacasino.com.lv> is registered with NIC.LV (the “Registry”) through Hosting Concepts bv (the “Registrar”).

### 3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the “Center”) on March 2, 2026. On March 3, 2026, the Center transmitted by email to the Registry a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On March 4, 2026, 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 in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on March 5, 2026, providing the registrant and contact information disclosed by the Registry, and inviting the Complainant to amend the Complaint. The Complainant replied on March 11, 2026, requesting that the Registry-disclosed registrant information be added to the Complaint.

The Center verified that the Complaint together with the amendment to the Complaint satisfied the formal requirements of the .LV Domain Name Dispute Resolution Policy (the “.LV Dispute Policy” or “lvDRP”), the Rules for .LV Domain Name Dispute Resolution Policy (the “.LV Dispute Rules”), and the WIPO Supplemental Rules for .LV Domain Name Dispute Resolution Policy (the “WIPO lvDRP Supplemental Rules”).

In accordance with the .LV Rules, paragraphs 2 and 4, the Center formally notified the Respondent of the Complaint, and the proceedings commenced on March 12, 2026. In accordance with the .LV Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was April 1, 2026. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent’s default on April 3, 2026.

The Center appointed Andris Tauriņš as the sole panelist in this matter on April 13, 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 .LV Rules, paragraph 7.

#### **4. Factual Background**

The Complainant is an Estonian private limited company and, according to the Complaint, a wholly owned subsidiary of Entain plc operating the NINJA CASINO brand. The Complaint states that NINJA CASINO is a well-known online gaming brand in the Baltic and Nordic regions.

The Complainant has provided evidence of trademark rights, including European Union Trade Mark registration No. 015743685 for NINJACASINO, registered on November 28, 2016, and European Union Trade Mark registrations Nos. 017754516 and 017754573 for NINJA CASINO, both registered on May 14, 2018.

According to the Registry verification, the disputed domain name was created on October 23, 2025, and the current registrant acquired it on the same date.

The screenshots submitted by the Complainant show that the disputed domain name resolved to a website prominently using the NINJA CASINO mark and presenting itself as an online casino for Latvian users. The website contained extensive gambling-related content in Latvian and English and made references to NINJA CASINO.

The submitted screenshots further show that the website claimed, among other things, operation under an Estonian remote gambling license HKT000035 and described itself as NINJA CASINO for Latvian players. The Complaint also states that the website copied the look and feel of the Complainant's official website and used corporate and regulatory details associated with the Complainant in order to create an appearance of authenticity.

The Complaint also annexed evidence that the disputed domain name redirected users to third-party gambling-related websites. The record therefore indicates commercial use of the disputed domain name in connection with online gambling content and redirection.

#### **5. Parties' Contentions**

##### **A. Complainant**

The Complainant contends that it has established all three elements required under paragraph 4.1.1 of the .LV Dispute Policy for a transfer of the disputed domain name.

The Complainant argues that the disputed domain name is identical or confusingly similar to its trademarks because it wholly reproduces the trademark and the ".com.lv" Top Level Domain does not dispel confusing similarity.

The Complainant further contends that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name because the Complainant has not authorized the Respondent to use its trademark, the Respondent is not commonly known by the disputed domain name, and the Respondent's use is not bona fide or fair. According to the Complaint, the Respondent's website imitates the Complainant's website and redirects users to third-party gambling services for commercial gain.

Finally, the Complainant submits that the disputed domain name was registered and is being used in bad faith because the Respondent must have been aware of the Complainant's well-known mark, and because the Respondent intentionally attempted to attract Internet users for commercial gain by creating a likelihood of confusion with the Complainant's mark.

## **B. Respondent**

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

## **6. Discussion and Findings**

Paragraph 4.1.1 of the .LV Dispute Policy requires the Complainant to prove that: (i) the disputed domain name is identical or confusingly similar to either (a) a trademark or service mark protected in Latvia in which the Complainant has rights, (b) a geographical indication protected in Latvia or by European Union law, or (c) a merchant's name (firm name) as registered in the Commercial Register of Latvia; (ii) the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the disputed domain name; and (iii) the disputed domain name has been registered or is being used in bad faith.

### **A. Identical or Confusingly Similar**

The Panel finds that the Complainant has shown rights in respect of trademarks protected in Latvia for the purposes of the .LV Dispute Policy by virtue of its European Union Trade Mark registrations for NINJACASINO and NINJA CASINO.

The disputed domain name <ninjacasino.com.lv> reproduces the textual elements of the Complainant's mark NINJA CASINO in their entirety, without any material alteration.

The addition of the Top Level Domain ".com.lv" is a technical registration element and does not prevent a finding of confusing similarity. The Panel finds that the Complainant's mark is clearly recognisable within the disputed domain name.

Accordingly, the Panel finds that the disputed domain name is identical to the trademarks in which the Complainant has rights, and that the first element of paragraph 4.1.1 of the .LV Dispute Policy has been established.

### **B. Rights or Legitimate Interests**

Paragraph 4.1.3 of the .LV Dispute Policy sets out a non-exhaustive list of circumstances by which a respondent may demonstrate rights or legitimate interests in a domain name, including bona fide use before notice of the dispute, being commonly known by the domain name, or legitimate noncommercial use without intent for commercial gain.

The Complainant has stated that it did not authorise the Respondent to use its marks, and there is no evidence in the record that the Respondent is commonly known by the disputed domain name. The disclosed registrant name bears no apparent resemblance to the disputed domain name.

The evidence submitted by the Complainant shows use of the disputed domain name for a website prominently branded NINJA CASINO, displaying the Complainant's logo, directed at Latvian users, containing online gambling content, and referring to the disputed domain name as the relevant website address. The Complaint also states, and the annexed screenshots support, that the website was designed to evoke the Complainant's branding and that the disputed domain name also redirected users to third-party gambling-related websites.

Such use does not amount to a bona fide offering of goods or services or to legitimate noncommercial or fair use. Rather, the record supports the conclusion that the Respondent used the disputed domain name to capitalise on the Complainant's trademark value and to create an impression of association with the Complainant.

Accordingly, the Complainant has made a prima facie case that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name. The Respondent has not come forward with any evidence to rebut the Complainant's prima facie case. In these circumstances, the Panel finds that the Complainant has established that the Respondent lacks rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name.

Accordingly, the second element of paragraph 4.1.1 of the .LV Dispute Policy has been established.

### **C. Registered or Used in Bad Faith**

Under paragraph 4.1.2(iv) of the .LV Dispute Policy, bad faith may be found where, by using the domain name, the domain name holder has attempted to attract Internet users to its website or another online venue for commercial gain by creating a likelihood of confusion with the complainant's rights.

The Panel finds that the Respondent more likely than not knew of the Complainant and its NINJA CASINO mark when registering the disputed domain name in October 2025. The disputed domain name exactly targets the Complainant's distinctive mark, and the associated website used that same mark prominently in connection with gambling-related content aimed at the same market segment.

The annexed screenshots show that the disputed domain name was used for a website branded "NINJA CASINO", displaying the Complainant's logo, containing extensive casino-related material, and purporting to describe the relevant casino offering for Latvian players. The Complaint also states that the website copied elements of the Complainant's official website and redirected users to third-party gambling services, which supports an inference of commercial gain through user diversion.

On this record, the Panel finds that the Respondent intentionally attempted to attract Internet users, for commercial gain, by creating a likelihood of confusion with the Complainant's trademark as to source, sponsorship, affiliation, or endorsement. This falls squarely within paragraph 4.1.2(iv) of the .LV Dispute Policy.

The Panel therefore finds that the disputed domain name was registered and is being used in bad faith.

Accordingly, the third element of paragraph 4.1.1 of the .LV Dispute Policy has been established.

## **7. Decision**

For the foregoing reasons, in accordance with paragraphs 4.1.9 of the .LV Dispute Policy and 15 of the .LV Dispute Rules, the Panel orders that the disputed domain name <ninjacasino.com.lv> be transferred to the Complainant.

*/Andris Tauriņš/*

**Andris Tauriņš**

Sole Panelist

Date: April 28, 2026