ARBITRATION
AND
MEDIATION CENTER

WIPO
WORLD
INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY
ORGANIZATION

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION
Casino de Spa S.A. v. EDUARD LIASHOV
Case No. DNL2026-0027

1. The Parties

The complainant is Casino de Spa S.A., Belgium, (the "Complainant") represented by COGITUS SRL, Belgium.

The registrant of the disputed domain names is EDUARD LIASHOV, Ukraine, (the "Respondent").

2. The Domain Names and Registrar

The disputed domain names <casino777-app.nl>, <casino777app.nl>, <casino777-netherlands.nl>, <casino777netherlands.nl>, <casino777-nl.nl>, <casino777-online.nl>, and <casino777online.nl> (the "Disputed Domain Names") are registered with SIDN through Registrar.eu.

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the "Center") on May 27, 2026. On May 28, 2026, the Center transmitted by email to SIDN a request for registrar verification in connection with the Disputed Domain Names.

On May 29, 2026, SIDN transmitted by email to the Center its verification response disclosing registrant and contact information for the Disputed Domain Names which differed from the named respondent and contact information in the Complaint.

The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on June 1, 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 June 1, 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 June 8, 2026. In accordance with the Regulations, Article 7.1, the due date for Response was June 28, 2026. The Center did not receive any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent's default on July 2, 2026.

On July 7, 2026, the Center informed the Complainant that annex 19 to the Complaint was missing. The Complainant responded on July 8, 2026, by submitting annex 19, a revised annex 18 as well as an amended Complaint incorporating correct references to these annexes.

The Center appointed Rogier de Vrey as the panelist in this matter on July 14, 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 following facts are undisputed.

The Complainant operates a casino in Belgium as well as an online casino in the Netherlands. The Complainant has obtained a permit from the Netherlands Gaming Authority to operate an online casino via the domain name <casino777.nl> and through the brand name Casino777. In this respect, the Complainant is the registered proprietor of various trademark registrations, including

- European Union trademark registration for the trademark CASINO 777 (figurative mark), registration number 018384332, with registration date of September 11, 2021, registered for goods and services in classes 9, 16, 28, 35, 38 and 41;



- European Union trademark registration for the trademark 777 (figurative mark), registration number 017178451, with registration date of January 9, 2018, registered for goods and services in classes 9, 28, 35, 38 and 41;



- European Union trademark registration for the trademark CASINO 777 (word mark), registration number 014632244, with registration date of March 31, 2016, registered for goods and services in classes 9, 28 and 41.

The Complainant also operates several domain names, including <casino777.nl> and <777.nl>, the latter of which redirects back to the first.

Three of the seven Disputed Domain Names were registered on November 11, 2025 whilst the other four were registered on November 12, 2025. All Disputed Domain Names lead to the same website, namely a Dutch language website through which it appears that an online casino is operated. This website uses a logo in the top-left corner displaying one of the Complainant's trademarks:



When clicking on a game, consumers are redirected to third-party online gambling or casino websites.

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 Disputed Domain Names instead of the Respondent.

Notably, the Complainant contends the following.

The Complainant argues the Disputed Domain Names merely add descriptive/geographic terms (“online”, “app”, “nl”, “Netherlands”) to its distinctive trademarks, which does not dispel confusion. The Complainant cites several supporting EUIPO opposition and cancellation decisions from which it follows that third parties incorporating the 777-element in the gambling and casino sectors create confusion with the Complainant's trademarks.

The Complainant contends the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in the Disputed Domain Names, noting the Disputed Domain Names lead to a website which reproduces its registered 777 trademark as a logo, use “Casino777”-branded titles and Dutch-targeted wording, and present a casino interface, thereby creating a false impression of an official and licensed online casino.

With regards to the third element, the Complainant argues that the registration of the Disputed Domain Names occurred years after its trademark registrations and Dutch license, that the Disputed Domain Names were registered as a coordinated cluster (same registrar, contacts, and Cloudflare servers), and that call-to-action buttons on the websites where the Disputed Domain Names lead to, redirect users to unrelated third-party gambling operators for commercial gain. Moreover, the Respondent has no apparent connection to the Netherlands nor is there any indications that the Respondent has licensed casino activities in the Netherlands.

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 disputed domain name is 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 disputed domain name; and
c) the disputed domain name has been registered or is 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.

The Panel notes that the Respondent is located in Ukraine, which is currently subjected to an international conflict. However, in the Panel’s view, this does not necessitate departure from Article 10.3. From the file it is apparent that the Complaint has been forwarded to the Respondent physically via mail as well as to numerous email addresses. The file contains evidence that these messages were not delivered with success to a number of generic email addresses nor to the physical address. However, the primary email address associated with the registration did not reject receiving the file. Moreover, the Panel notes the number (seven) and recent timing (November 2025) of the registration of the Disputed Domain Names. Thus, the Panel finds that the Respondent has had the opportunity to respond to the Complaint, and finds it appropriate to proceed.

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 the Complainant's trademarks and the Disputed Domain Names.

The Complainant has shown rights in respect of a trademark for the purposes of the Regulations.

The entirety of the trademark is reproduced within the Disputed Domain Names, with the addition of various descriptive elements, such as "online", "app", "netherlands" or the abbreviation thereof, "nl". Although the addition of other terms may bear on assessment of the second and third elements, the Panel finds the addition of such terms does not prevent a finding of confusing similarity between the Disputed Domain Names and the trademark for the purposes of the Regulations. Accordingly, the Disputed Domain Names are confusingly similar to the trademarks for the purposes of the Regulations.

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

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 the 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 the 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.

Having reviewed the available record, the Panel, taking into account that the Respondent has not submitted a Response, finds that the Complainant has established a prima facie case that the Respondent lacks rights or legitimate interests in the Disputed Domain Names.

As has been undisputedly submitted by the Complainant that to operate an online casino in the Netherlands, a license should be obtained from the Netherlands Gaming Authority. There is no indication that Respondent has obtained such a license. Based on that alone, the Respondent cannot be deemed to have rights or legitimate interests in the Disputed Domain Names. In addition, from the evidence provided to the panel, it does not appear that the Disputed Domain Names are used for a bona fide offering but rather serve to redirect consumers to third-party online gambling websites. The Respondent is furthermore not commonly known by the Disputed Domain Names nor is there any evidence that the Respondent is making legitimate noncommercial use of the Disputed Domain Names.

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

C. Registered or Used in Bad Faith

In light of its considerations under Section 6.B, the facts presented by the Complainant, and the lack of a response by the Respondent, the Panel finds that the Disputed Domain Names have been registered and are used in bad faith.

The Panel notes that, for the purposes of paragraph Article 2.1(c) of the Regulations, Article 3.2 of the Regulations establishes circumstances, in particular, but without limitation, that, if found by the Panel to be

present, shall be evidence of the registration or use of a domain name in bad faith. In the present case, the Panel finds that the circumstances mentioned under Article 3.2(c) and 3.2(d) of the Regulations are present.

The Disputed Domain Names all lead to a website incorporating the entirety of the Complainant's trademark 777 as well as the trademark CASINO777, which is the Complainant's licensed brand name under which it is allowed to operate an online casino business in the Netherlands. These websites subsequently redirect to other third-party online gambling and casino platforms. The Panel finds this disrupts the business of the Complainant as consumers attempting to visit the online casino of the Complainant can unwillingly end up on the Disputed Domain Names. Moreover, the Respondent is clearly using the Disputed Domain Names for commercial gain by attempting to attract Internet users to its website by means of the confusion created by the Disputed Domain Names vis-à-vis the Complainant's trademarks.

The Panel finds that the Complainant has established the third element of the Regulations.

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 below Disputed Domain Names instead of the Respondent:
<casino777-app.nl>,
<casino777app.nl>,
<casino777-netherlands.nl>,
<casino777netherlands.nl>,
<casino777-nl.nl>,
<casino777-online.nl>, and
<casino777online.nl>.

/Rogier de Vrey/
Rogier de Vrey
Panelist
Date: July 24, 2026