

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

Ninja Global OÜ v. Q. A.
Case No. DLV2026-0002

1. The Parties

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

The Respondent is Q. A., Italy.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name is <ninjacasino.org.lv> (the “Disputed Domain Name”) 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, indicating that it wished to add the Registry-disclosed registrant information 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 Dispute 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 Dispute 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 a wholly owned subsidiary of Entain plc. According to the Complaint, the Complainant serves as the operating entity for the NINJA CASINO brand, which is used in connection with online gaming and betting services and is established in the Baltic and Nordic regions.

The Complainant has provided evidence of European Union Trade Mark registrations for NINJACASINO and NINJA CASINO, 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, registered on May 14, 2018.

The Disputed Domain Name was created on October 23, 2025.

The evidence submitted by the Complainant shows that the website to which the Disputed Domain Name resolved prominently used the term "NINJA CASINO", presented itself as an "official" website for Latvian players, reproduced branding and content suggestive of the Complainant's business, and displayed information about gambling services, payments, bonuses, and gaming content. The Complaint also includes evidence that the Disputed Domain Name redirected users to third-party gambling-related websites.

5. Parties' Contentions

A. Complainant

The Complainant contends that the Disputed Domain Name is identical or confusingly similar to trademarks in which it has rights, because it wholly incorporates the Complainant's NINJA CASINO mark, with the ".org.lv" Top Level Domain being irrelevant for purposes of the confusing similarity test under the .LV Dispute Policy.

The Complainant further contends that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in the Disputed Domain Name, as the Respondent is not affiliated with the Complainant, has not been authorized to use the Complainant's mark, and is using the Disputed Domain Name for a website that imitates the Complainant's branding and redirects Internet users to third-party gambling services for commercial gain.

Finally, the Complainant contends that the Disputed Domain Name was registered and is being used in bad faith because the Respondent knew of the Complainant and its mark, intentionally targeted the Complainant's business, created a likelihood of confusion, and used the Disputed Domain Name to attract Internet users for commercial gain, including by impersonation-style presentation and redirection.

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 each of the following three elements: (i) the Disputed Domain Name is identical or confusingly similar to either (a) a trademark or service mark protected in Latvia, (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 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 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 trademarks for NINJACASINO and NINJA CASINO by virtue of its European Union Trade Mark registrations. Such rights are sufficient for the purposes of the .LV Dispute Policy.

The Disputed Domain Name incorporates the textual element of the Complainant's marks in its entirety. The Panel considers that the addition of the ".org.lv" Top Level Domain does not prevent a finding of identity or confusing similarity. This approach is consistent with previous WIPO case law, such as *Whaleco Inc. and Whaleco Technology Limited v. S. L.*, WIPO Case No. [DLV2025-0001](#).

Accordingly, the Panel finds that the Disputed Domain Name is identical to the trademarks in which the Complainant has rights. The first element of the .LV Dispute Policy has been established.

B. Rights or Legitimate Interests

Paragraph 4.1.3 of the .LV Dispute Policy provides non-exhaustive circumstances by which a respondent may demonstrate rights or legitimate interests in a domain name. As reflected in WIPO practice, once a complainant makes out a prima facie case, the burden of production shifts to the respondent to come forward with relevant evidence of rights or legitimate interests.

Here, the Complainant has stated that it has not authorized the Respondent to use its marks, and there is no evidence before the Panel that the Respondent has been commonly known by the Disputed Domain Name.

Moreover, the record indicates that the Disputed Domain Name was used for a website that prominently reproduced the Complainant's mark and presented itself as an "official" NINJA CASINO website for Latvian players, while also redirecting users to third-party gambling-related websites. Such use is not a bona fide offering of goods or services and does not amount to legitimate noncommercial or fair use.

To the contrary, the Respondent's use of the Disputed Domain Name appears calculated to impersonate or pass itself off as the Complainant or an official site connected with the Complainant. In circumstances such as these, use of a domain name for such misleading or illegitimate activity can never confer rights or legitimate interests on a respondent.

The Respondent has not rebutted the Complainant's prima facie showing and has not come forward with any evidence demonstrating rights or legitimate interests in the Disputed Domain Name. The Panel therefore finds that the second element of the .LV Dispute Policy has been established.

C. Registered or Used in Bad Faith

Paragraph 4.1.2(iv) of the .LV Dispute Policy provides that 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.

In the present case, the Panel finds that the Respondent was more likely than not aware of the Complainant and its NINJA CASINO marks when registering the Disputed Domain Name. The Disputed Domain Name is identical to the Complainant's principal mark apart from the Top Level Domain, and the associated website made extensive use of the Complainant's branding and business-related subject matter.

The evidence shows that the Respondent used the Disputed Domain Name to present a website designed to appear connected with the Complainant and to direct users interested in the Complainant's gambling services to third-party destinations. In the Panel's view, this constitutes an intentional attempt to attract Internet users for commercial gain by creating a likelihood of confusion as to source, sponsorship, affiliation, or endorsement.

The absence of any Response reinforces the inference of bad faith in these circumstances. The Panel also notes that the registration date of October 23, 2025, postdates the Complainant's trademark registrations by several years.

Accordingly, the Panel finds that the Disputed Domain Name was registered and is being used in bad faith. The third element 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.org.lv> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Andris Tauriņš/

Andris Tauriņš

Sole Panelist

Date: April 28, 2026