ARBITRATION
AND
MEDIATION CENTER

WIPO
WORLD
INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY
ORGANIZATION

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION
Dinotech Limited v. Peter Sherif
Case No. DNU2026-0001

1. The Parties

The Complainant is Dinotech Limited, Malta, represented by Wilmark Oy, Finland.

The Respondent is Peter Sherif, United Kingdom.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <djack.nu> is registered with ODERLAND Webbhotell AB (the "Registrar").

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the "Center") on January 1, 2026. On January 2, 2026, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On January 8, 2026, the Registrar 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 (not available) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on January 9, 2026, providing the registrant and contact information disclosed by the Registrar, and inviting the Complainant to submit an amendment to the Complaint. The Complainant did not file an amendment to the Complaint.

The Center verified that the Complaint satisfied the formal requirements of the Uniform Domain Name Dispute Resolution Policy (the "Policy" or "UDRP"), the Rules for Uniform Domain Name Dispute Resolution Policy (the "Rules"), and the WIPO Supplemental Rules for Uniform Domain Name Dispute Resolution Policy (the "Supplemental Rules").

In accordance with the Rules, paragraphs 2 and 4, the Center formally notified the Respondent of the Complaint, and the proceedings commenced on January 16, 2026. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was February 5, 2026. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent's default on February 6, 2026.

The Center appointed Knud Wallberg as the sole panelist in this matter on February 11, 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 Rules, paragraph 7.

4. Factual Background

The Complainant is an igaming company based in Malta.

The Complainant is the owner of the European Union Trade Mark registration No. 018772130 of the word mark DJACK, registered on February 3, 2023, for goods and services in international classes 9, 28, 35, 38, 41, and 42.

The Complainant is also the owner of the domain name <djack.com>, which connects to its website through which the Complainant's offers its services.

The disputed domain name <djack.nu> was registered on August 29, 2025, and resolves to a website that features the Complainant's registered word mark and which in general appears as an imitation of the Complainant's website, which contains links to a competing online casino.

5. Parties' Contentions

A. Complainant

The Complainant contends that it has satisfied each of the elements required under the Policy for a transfer of the disputed domain name.

Notably, the Complainant contends that the disputed domain name <djack.nu> is confusingly similar to its trademark DJACK. The disputed domain name reproduces the Complainant's trademark DJACK in its entirety and is used for services in direct competition with the Complainant's business.

The Complainant further submits that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the disputed domain name. The Respondent has not received permission or authorization to use the Complainant's trademark DJACK and does not have any trademark rights (registered or unregistered) in "djack". There is no evidence that the Respondent is commonly known by the disputed domain name or owns a trademark or is making a legitimate noncommercial or fair use of the disputed domain name. The Respondent is opportunistically using the Complainant's DJACK trademark in order to attract Internet users to its website and divert them to a competing online casino.

Finally, the Complainant submits that the disputed domain name was registered and is being used in bad faith. The Respondent is using the disputed domain name to intentionally attempt to attract, for commercial gain, Internet users to their website by creating a likelihood of confusion with the DJACK trademark as to the source, sponsorship, affiliation, or endorsement of the Respondents website. The fact that the disputed domain name has links to a competing online casino constitutes a clear attempt to generate a commercial gain particularly by misleading online users with the disputed domain name and subsequently redirecting those online users to a third-party website.

B. Respondent

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

6. Discussion and Findings

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 trademark and the disputed domain name. WIPO Overview of WIPO Panel Views on Selected UDRP Questions ("WIPO Overview 3.1"), section 1.7.

The Complainant has shown rights in respect of a trademark or service mark for the purposes of the Policy. WIPO Overview 3.1, section 1.2.1.

The entirety of the mark is reproduced within the disputed domain name. Accordingly, the disputed domain name is identical to the mark for the purposes of the Policy. WIPO Overview 3.1, section 1.7.

The Panel finds 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 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 3.1, 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 name. 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 name such as those enumerated in the Policy or otherwise.

Furthermore, the Panel finds that the use of the disputed domain name to impersonate the Complainant can never confer rights or legitimate interests on the Respondent. WIPO Overview 3.1, section 2.13.1.

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

C. Registered and 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.

In the present case, the Panel considers that the record of this case reflects that the Respondent has intentionally attempted to attract, for commercial gain, Internet users to its website, by creating a likelihood of confusion with the Complainant's mark as to the source, sponsorship, affiliation, or endorsement of the Respondent's website or of a service on the Respondent's website. Paragraph 4(b)(iv) of the Policy, and WIPO Overview 3.1, section 3.1.4.

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 name <djack.nu> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Knud Wallberg/
Knud Wallberg
Sole Panelist
Date: February 18, 2026