

## **ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION**

### **MGM Resorts International v. Yuliia Petlenko Case No. DNL2026-0008**

#### **1. The Parties**

The Complainant is MGM Resorts International, United States of America, represented by Com Laude Limited, United Kingdom.

The registrant of the disputed domain names is Yuliia Petlenko, Ukraine, (the “Respondent”).

#### **2. The Domain Names and Registrar**

The disputed domain names <betmgm-casino-nl.nl>, <betmgmcasino-nl.nl>, <betmgm-inloggen.nl>, <betmgminloggen.nl>, <betmgm-login.nl>, <betmgmlogin.nl>, <betmgm-nederland.nl>, <betmgm-nl.nl> (the “Domain Names”) are registered with SIDN through Dynadot LLC.

#### **3. Procedural History**

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the “Center”) on March 30, 2026. On March 31, 2026, the Center transmitted by email to SIDN a request for registrar verification in connection with the Domain Names.

On April 1, 2026, SIDN transmitted by email to the Center its verification response disclosing registrant and contact information for the Domain Names which differed from the named respondent and contact information in the Complaint.

The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on April 7, 2026, providing the information disclosed by SIDN, and inviting the Complainant to amend the Complaint in this light. The Complainant filed an amended Complaint on April 9, 2026.

The Center verified that the Complaint as amended satisfies the formal requirements of the Dispute Resolution Regulations for .nl Domain Names (the “Regulations”).

In accordance with the Regulations, articles 5.1 and 16.4, the Center formally notified the Respondent of the Complaint and the proceedings commenced on April 16, 2026. In accordance with the Regulations, article 7.1, the due date for Response was May 6, 2026. The Center did not receive any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent’s default on May 7, 2026.

The Center appointed Wolter Wefers Bettink as the panelist in this matter on May 29, 2026. The Panel finds that it was properly constituted. The Panelist has submitted the Statement of Acceptance and Declaration of Impartiality and Independence, as required to ensure compliance with the Regulations, article 9.2.

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

The Complainant, MGM Resorts International, is an American global gaming and entertainment company with headquarters in Las Vegas, United States of America (“USA”). The Complainant offers a wide range of experiences, including hotels and casinos, meeting and conference spaces, live and theatrical entertainment, as well as a diverse selection of restaurants, nightlife, and retail options. Its history goes back to the late 1960s, and its portfolio now encompasses over thirty hotel and gaming destinations globally. In 2018, the Complainant launched BetMGM, a gaming, casino and online sports betting platform. In 2023, the Complainant expanded its BetMGM operations to the United Kingdom (“UK”). Based on the success in the UK, the “BetMGM” brand and operation were further expanded to Sweden and the Netherlands (Kingdom of the) (the “Netherlands”) in 2024. Its Dutch main operational website is located at <betmgm.nl>. BetMGM reported a net revenue of USD 2.1 billion in 2024, and operates in 29 active markets as of November 2024. It has won the Casino Operator of the Year award eight times, including being named Casino Operator of the Year by SBC North America in 2021, 2022, 2023, and 2025.

The Complainant holds several trade mark rights in various countries, including but not limited to (hereafter the “Trade Marks”):

- USA trade mark MGM registered under No. 1060489 on March 1, 1977
- European Union trade mark MGM registered under No. 010355691 on July 14, 2017
- USA trade mark BETMGM registered under No. 6025462 on March 31, 2020
- European Union trade mark BETMGM registered under No. 018390081 on June 26, 2021
- UK trade mark BETMGM registered under No. UK00003590035 on July 9, 2021
- UK trade mark BETMGM registered under No. UK00003974797 on March 1, 2024.

The Domain Names were registered by the Respondent on November 10, 2025. The Domain Names resolve to active websites which appear to offer online betting opportunities and casino games (the “Websites”). On the Websites, the Respondent refers to itself as “BetMGM” and prominently displays the BetMGM logo at the top and throughout the Websites. The Websites use a black-and-gold background. When clicking on any of the page titles (e.g. “App” or the “Login” or “Register” buttons present on the Websites), users are redirected to third-party casino and gaming websites. Such redirection also occurs when users visiting one of the Websites click on any of the casino game icons to “play”.

#### **5. Parties’ Contentions**

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

The Complainant contends that it has satisfied each of the elements required under the Regulations for it to become the registrant of the Domain Names instead of the Respondent.

Notably, the Complainant contends the following.

The Domain Names are confusingly similar to the Trade Marks as they incorporate both the MGM Trade Mark and the BetMGM Trade Mark in their entirety. The Domain Names only differ by the addition of descriptive terms like “-bet” (if compared to the MGM Trade Mark) and of terms such as “-casino”, “-inloggen”, “-login” and “-casino-nl”. The Complainant notes that these terms relate to its core business in the Netherlands and pertain to online casino login platforms. The addition of such terms does not serve to distinguish the Domain Names from the Trade Marks. On the contrary, given that the Complainant operates casinos and other betting brands online and is one of the

largest casino companies in the world, this significantly increases the likelihood that Internet users will be confused. The country code (“ccTLD”) Top-Level Domain “.nl” is wholly generic in that it is required only for technical reasons and should be disregarded for the purposes of comparison with the Trade Marks. The Complainant avers that anyone who sees the Domain Names will likely perceive each as a domain name belonging to the Complainant, or at least an entity related to or endorsed by the Complainant.

The Complainant has established a prima facie case that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in the Domain Names. The Complainant has found no evidence that the Respondent has been commonly known as “MGM” or “BetMGM” prior to or after the registration of the Domain Names. The Respondent is not a licensee of the Complainant and has not received any permission or consent from the Complainant to use the Trade Marks. The Respondent’s name does not bear any resemblance to the Domain Names and the Complainant has found no evidence that the Respondent owns any trade marks incorporating the term “MGM” or “BetMGM”. Equally, the Complainant has found no evidence that the Respondent has ever traded legitimately under the name “MGM” or “BetMGM”. The Complainant contends that given the fame of the Trade Marks and that the Domain Names are confusingly similar to the Trade Marks, there is no conceivable use to which the Domain Names could be put now, or in the future, that would confer any legitimate interest upon the Respondent. The Respondent specifically cannot claim a legitimate “fair use” interest as the nature of the Domain Names carries a risk of implied affiliation. This is increased by the inclusion of business-related descriptive terms which appear to indicate services related to the Trade Marks, effectively impersonating, or at least suggesting endorsement by, the Complainant.

The Respondent has not made legitimate noncommercial or fair use of the Domain Names and its intention, when it registered the Domain Names, was to mislead the Complainant’s (potential) customers. The Domain Names currently resolve to active websites, which offer casino and betting opportunities under the Trade Marks. The Websites lack any disclaimer clarifying the lack of relationship between the Parties. Instead, the Respondent is using the Trade Marks and the logo of the Complainant throughout the Websites. The Websites closely mimic the appearance of the Complainant’s own website at <betmgm.nl>, including by replicating its black-and-gold colour scheme. Thus, the Respondent targets the Complainant to deceive Internet users into believing that the Websites are operated by or associated with the Complainant and the Trade Marks. In conclusion, no such misleading and confusing use could relate to a genuine, bona fide offering of goods and services and such use could not grant the Respondent a legitimate interest in the Domain Names.

Furthermore, the Complainant observes that the Websites host links which redirect users to third-party casino platforms, thereby appearing to offer competing casino and betting games. Accordingly, the Respondent is using the Domain Names with the intention of misleadingly diverting consumers drawn to the Trade Marks towards third party websites for the Respondent’s own commercial gain. In addition, the Respondent has used the Domain Names for commercial gain by attracting Internet users to a website of the registrant or other online location through the likelihood of confusion which may arise with a trade mark, for example, the source, sponsorship, affiliation or endorsement of the website of the registrant or other online location(s) or of products or services on the domain registrant’s website or another online location. The Domain Names incorporate the Trade Marks in their entirety with certain business and brand related terms and Internet users seeing the Domain Names in search engine results would reasonably assume that each is operated by, connected with or endorsed by the Complainant. Furthermore, any initial interest confusion is not dispelled upon the arrival of an Internet user on the Websites as they misuse the Complainant’s branding, Trade Marks and logo and mimic the Complainant’s own websites, which is further supported by the use of the same black and gold color scheme. Therefore, the Websites are likely to mislead Internet users into believing that they are operated by or otherwise associated with the Complainant, given that the Complainant operates casinos and betting platforms under the Trade Marks.

Considering the above, the Respondent intended to create websites that mislead web users into believing that they are operated by the Complainant, indicating that the Domain Names were registered and used in bad faith. This is enhanced by the fact that the Websites lack any disclaimer that would dispel the confusion regarding the Domain Names and the Websites. Furthermore, each of the Websites operates as a basic,

single-page interface presenting a gaming front with a click-through to various third-party casino platforms offering competing, or at least similar, services. Therefore, the Respondent is diverting potential customers looking for the Complainant's website to third-party casino platforms offering competing services for its own commercial gain. Additional bad faith factors are the incorporation of the Trade Marks in their entirety and the addition of various business and brand-related adornments, as outlined above. In view of the significant global visibility of the Complainant and the Trade Marks, it is more likely than not that the Respondent knew of, or should have known of, the Complainant when registering the Domain Names. This is further supported by the fact that the Respondent appears to offer similar betting and casino products/services under the Trade Marks and trading style on the Websites.

For all these reasons, there are reasonable grounds to conclude that the Domain Names are, on balance, likely to have been registered and used in bad faith in terms of the Regulations.

## **B. Respondent**

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

## **6. Discussion and Findings**

Pursuant to article 2.1 of the Regulations, the Complainant must prove each of the following three elements:

- a) the Domain Names are identical or confusingly similar to: I) a trademark, trade name or geographical indication protected under Dutch law in which the Complainant has rights; or II) a personal name registered in the General Municipal Register (Gemeentelijke Basisadministratie) of a municipality in the Netherlands, or the name of a Dutch public legal entity or the name of an association or foundation registered in the Netherlands under which the Complainant undertakes public activities on a permanent basis; and b) the Respondent has no rights to or legitimate interests in the Domain Names; and
- c) the Domain Names been registered or are being used in bad faith.

The Respondent did not provide a response to the Complaint. Therefore, based on article 10.3 of the Regulations, the Panel decides on the dispute on the basis of the Complaint. In that case, the Complaint shall be granted, unless the Panel considers it to be without basis in law or in fact.

### **6.1. Preliminary Matter**

The Panel notes that no communication has been received from the Respondent.

Since the Respondent's location is Ukraine, which is subject to an international conflict at the date of this Decision, is it necessary for the Panel to consider whether the proceedings should continue. The Panel is of the view that it should, having considered the circumstances of the case. The Panel notes that the Center has used the Respondent's email address as disclosed by SIDN for the purposes of notifying the Complaint. There is no evidence that the case notification email was not successfully delivered to this email address. Further, the Panel notes that the Domain Names were registered in November 2025 and thus would appear being capable of controlling the Domain Names and the related content, and it would have been able to submit a Response if it wished to do so. Accordingly, the Panel considers it is able to proceed to determine this Complaint.

### **6.2 Substantive Issues**

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

The Complainant has shown that it has registered rights in the Trade Marks. The Domain Names are confusingly similar to the Trade Marks as each of the Domain Names incorporates the Trade Marks in their entirety (see also WIPO Overview of WIPO Panel Views on Select UDRP Questions ("[WIPO Overview 3.1](#)")),

section 1.7).<sup>1</sup> The addition of descriptive terms, such as “-casino”, “-inloggen”, “-login”, and “-casino-nl”, does not prevent a finding of confusing similarity under the first element ([WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.8). The ccTLD “.nl” is typically disregarded under the confusing similarity test, since it is a technical registration requirement (see [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.11).

Therefore, the Panel finds that the Domain Names are confusingly similar to the Trade Marks in which the Complainant has rights.

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

Article 3.1 of the Regulations 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 .NL 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.

The Panel finds that, since the Domain Names incorporate the Trade Marks in their entirety, each of them carries a high risk of implied affiliation ([WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 2.5.1). Furthermore, based on the evidence and the undisputed submissions of the Complainant, the Panel concludes that the Respondent has not received the Complainant’s consent to use the Trade Marks in the Domain Names and that it is not an authorized retailer or distributor of the Complainant’s services or otherwise authorized to use the Trade Marks. The Respondent has not provided evidence, nor is there any indication in the record of this case that the Respondent is commonly known by the Domain Names (article 3.1(b) of the Regulations). Furthermore, the Domain Names resolve to Websites which use the Trade Marks and logo of the Complainant’s website, while containing clickthrough buttons to websites offering competing or similar services as the Complainant offers. Based on all of the above, there is no evidence that the Respondent is making a legitimate noncommercial or fair use of the Domain Name.

The Panel concludes that the Complainant has met the second requirement of article 2.1(b) of the Regulations.

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

In accordance with article 3.2 of the Regulations, the Complainant has to show that the Domain Names were registered or are being used in bad faith.

Based on the information and the unrefuted evidence provided by the Complainant, the Panel notes that (i) the Complainant has been using the MGM Trade Mark since 1977 and the BETMGM Trade Mark since 2020; (ii) the Domain Names were registered years after the registration of the Complainant’s trade marks, all on the same date; (iii) the Domain Names incorporate the Trade Marks in their entirety; (iv) the Domain Names include the term “bet” and, in two cases, the term “casino”, which terms are descriptive of the services the Complainant offers under the Trade Marks; (v) “MGM” does not appear to be a term of which the Respondent was likely to spontaneously or accidentally think at the time of registration; (vi) a simple search on the Internet at the time of registration would have alerted the Respondent to the Trade Marks and the Complainant.

---

<sup>1</sup> Noting the similarities between the UDRP and the Regulations, the Panel deems [WIPO Overview 3.1](#) as relevant to the determination of this proceeding (see e.g. *Aktiebolaget Electrolux v. Beuk Horeca B.V.*, WIPO Case No. [DNL2008-0050](#)).

Therefore, on the basis of the above circumstances the Panel concludes that at the time of registration of the Domain Names, the Respondent was or should have been aware of the Trade Marks and that the Respondent registered the Domain Names in bad faith.

In addition, it is clear that the aim of the registration was to take advantage of the confusing similarity between the Domain Names and the Trade Marks, also taking into account the following circumstances:

(i) the Websites to which the Domain Names resolve use the Trade Marks and logo of the Complainant's website and have a black-and-gold colour scheme very similar to that used on the Complainant's website, and (ii) the Websites contain clickthrough buttons to websites offering competing or similar services to the ones Complainant offers.

In light of its considerations under this Section, the facts presented by the Complainant, and the lack of a Response by the Respondent, the Panel finds that the Domain Names have been registered and are used in bad faith.

The Panel finds the third element of the Regulations has been established.

## **7. Decision**

For all the foregoing reasons, in accordance with articles 1 and 14 of the Regulations, the Panel orders that the Complainant becomes the registrant of the Domain Names <betmgm-casino-nl.nl>, <betmgmcasino-nl.nl>, <betmgm-inloggen.nl>, <betmgminloggen.nl>, <betmgm-login.nl>, <betmgmlogin.nl>, <betmgm-nederland.nl>, and <betmgm-nl.nl> instead of the Respondent.

*/Wolter Wefers Bettink/*

**Wolter Wefers Bettink**

Panelist

Date: June 12, 2026